



## Deepening of Security Conception and Violent Non-State Actors as the Challengers of Human Security



### Güvenlik Anlayışının Derinleşmesi ve İnsan Güvenliğinin Meydan Okuyucuları Olarak Şiddet Kullanan Devlet-dışı Aktörler

#### Abstract

Traditional security approach focuses on the state and the problem of national security. However, it is argued that individuals should be privileged as the referent object of security. Human security concept consists of actors and agendas that are not evaluated by traditional security approach. Human security holds that the security of the state does not necessarily ensure the security of its citizens. The nation-state is experiencing an erosion of power and sovereignty, and non-state actors are part of the cause. One aspect of them is violent non-state actor (VNSA) that contests the monopoly on violence of the state and pose a pressing challenge to human security. This paper aims to identify factors, trends, and developments that have contributed to the emergence of VNSAs and their implications upon human security.

Keywords: Security, Human Security, Violent Non-State Actor, Terrorism, Organized Crime

*Bülent Sarper Ağır\**

*Murat Necip Arman\*\**

*\*Yrd. Doç. Dr.*

*Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi  
Nazilli İİBF  
Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü*

*\*\*Yrd. Doç. Dr.*

*Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi  
Nazilli İİBF  
Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü*



## Deepening of Security Conception and Violent Non-State Actors as the Challengers of Human Security



### Güvenlik Anlayışının Derinleşmesi ve İnsan Güvenliğinin Meydan Okuyucuları Olarak Şiddet Kullanan Devlet-dışı Aktörler

#### Özet

*Geleneksel güvenlik yaklaşımı, devlet ve ulusal güvenlik sorunsalı üzerine odaklanır. Bununla birlikte, bireylerin güvenliğinin referans nesnesi olarak ayrıcalıklı kılınması gerektiği ileri sürülmektedir. İnsan güvenliği kavramı, geleneksel güvenlik yaklaşımı tarafından değerlendirmeye alınmayan aktörleri ve gündemleri içerir. İnsan güvenliği, devletin güvenliğinin zorunlu olarak insanların güvenliği anlamına gelmediği anlayışına sahiptir. Ulus-devlet, egemenlik ve güç anlamında bir erozyon yaşamaktadır ve devlet-dışı aktörler, bu sürecin bir nedenidir. Devlet-dışı aktörlerin bir yönünü, devletin kuvvet kullanma tekeline sorgulayan ve insan güvenliğine yönelik bir meydan okuma oluşturan şiddet içeren devlet dışı aktörler oluşturur. Bu çalışma, şiddet içeren devlet-dışı aktörlerin ortaya çıkışına katkıda bulunan faktörleri, eğilimleri ve gelişmeleri insan güvenliğine olan yansımaları çerçevesinde ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır.*

*Anahtar Kelimeler: Güvenlik, İnsan Güvenliği, Şiddet İçermeyen*

## 1. Introduction

The concept of security has long been a key concept in International Relations (IR) discipline. However, in the post-Cold War era, the focus on non-traditional security issues such as organized crime, environmental degradation, terrorism, and trafficking in human-being are given great attention. In addition to widening agenda of security, a lively debate has occurred on broadening the security studies beyond the state-centric conception. Debates about the concept of human security within the security studies are not directly related with a new theoretical attempt, but rather emerge from the humanitarian values and needs that take significant place in determination process of security policy agenda.

Conception of human security holds that security of the state does not necessarily ensure the security of its citizens. In this respect, one issue that has generated considerable debate in security studies is the question of the referent object of security. Traditional security approach has focused on the state and problem of national security. However, recently it is increasingly argued that individuals should be privileged as the referent object of security. This debate encourages security analysts to specify what their preferred level of analysis and why they have chosen this level rather than another.

In the post-Cold War era, the proliferation of non-state actors plays a critical role in heightening or lessening human security. One aspect of the non-state actors in the new security environment is violent non-state actor (VNSA) that refers to any organization that uses illegal violence to reach its goals, thereby contesting the monopoly on violence of the state. Actually, there exist many violent non-state actors such as warlords, militias, criminal organizations and terrorist organizations that operate without state control and are involved in trans-border conflicts and pose a pressing challenge to human security.

The objective of this paper is to highlight the persisting insecurities of individuals or groups of individuals caused by VNSAs. The analysis aims to examine the implications of VNSAs upon human security in the context of referent object problem of Security Studies. For purposes of structure, this paper is divided into two main parts. The first part examines the concept of human security and the referent object problem in the security studies with reference to the extension of security concept. The second part engages with the VNSAs in the international security as the challengers of human security.

## 2. Widening and Deepening of the Security Concept

The Cold War context of security conception was comparatively simple and well defined, but the new security context is very complex and multidimensional. While the globalisation has dramatically changed the way the world operates, the end of the Cold War has become a constitutive event that threw some central assumptions of traditional security conception into question. As Bill McSweeney has argued, the problem with traditional security conception was not only that it emphasized the military dimension of security to the neglect of other dimensions, but also that it focused on military and non-military issues from a statist perspective (McSweeney, 1999: 35). Actually, military-oriented and state-centric conception of security is being replaced by a new security conception that emphasizes the role of non-state actors and threats beyond the state-centric security.

Advocates of traditional security conception argue that issues such as poverty, immigration and environmental degradation are not intrinsically security issues. They become a concern for security studies only when they threaten to provoke an armed conflict. Because, traditionalist approach to security persists in defining the field of security exclusively in terms of the study of threat, use, and control of military force (Walt, 1991: 211-239). On the other hand, critical approaches to the security concept criticize the traditional conception of security for focusing on external challenges, most notably, military threats posed by rival states. Critics of traditional conception argue that rather than originating from rival states, the origin of contemporary security threats is either non-state (domestic or transnational) or in a different conception, the state itself poses a threat to its citizens (Miller, 2001: 19). Indeed, many threats to humankind now originate not from aggressive states, but are global and transnational in nature, such as pollution, diseases, drugs and

the threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The expanders of the security concept not only see non-military problems as the source of conflicts, but also argue that non-military threats are much of the relevant to most people than military ones, especially since the end of the Cold War.

Even before the end of the Cold War, some analysts like Richard Ullman argue that defining national security primarily in military terms conveys a profoundly false image of reality and there is a need to reexamine the meaning of security (Ullman, 1983: 129-153). However, in particular since the end of the Cold War the concept of security has become increasingly contested in IR theory. At the heart of this debate, there have been attempts to deepen and widen the concept of security from the level of the state to societies and individuals, and from military to non-military issues.

In the post-Cold War world, many security risks and challenges lack the physicality and directness of the East-West conflict, with its clear and present dangers. Instead, the new security agenda is increasingly composed of more intangible and diffuse risks and challenges (Hyde-Price, 2001: 27). Two key developments have been central to international security in the post-Cold War era; the emergence of new threats such as terrorism, transnational organized crime, and small arms, and the proliferation of non-state actors such as non-governmental organizations (NGO), transnational corporations, and private security companies in the provision of human, national, and international security.

### **3. Human Security Conception as an Emerging Paradigm**

During the Cold War the realist model of international relations prevailed, and according to this approach, international politics was based on the need for states to survive and increase power in an anarchical international system. All priorities and needs within states were secondary to this approach. In the post-Cold War era, academic debates on security are accompanied by practitioners' increasing interest in "human security" which in turn is warranted by a series of developments that were visible during the Cold War but became more apparent in its aftermath. These developments included (a) growing disparities in economic opportunities both within and between states; (b) increasing hardships faced by peoples in the developing world who found themselves on the margins of a globalizing world economy; (c) diminishing nonrenewable resources leading families and groups to become refugees; (d) rising anti-foreigner feelings and violence in reaction to migration pressures from the developing to the developed world; (e) proliferating intra-state conflicts public interest in, and pressure for, humanitarian intervention (Bilgin, 2003: 207). In this context, human security is an emerging paradigm for understanding global vulnerabilities whose proponents challenge the traditional notion of security. This section provides a critical analysis related to rethinking the nature of post-Cold War security in the respect of human security.

The first articulation of human security in international politics came in 1991 at a Pan African conference co-sponsored by the United Nations (UN) and the Organization of African Unity. In this conference, it was argued that the concept of security goes beyond military considerations and it must be construed in terms of the security of the individuals to live in peace with access to basic necessities of life (Hough, 2008: 14). 1994 Human Development Report of United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has been an important turning point for developing of human security concept. This report made four points concerning the need to move away from a national security approach toward an approach that emphasizes human security. First, the report presented human security as a universal concern that is relevant to people across the world regardless of geographical location. Second, the report maintained that the components of security are interdependent; distress in one part of the world is likely to affect other parts of the world. Third, human security is best ensured through prevention rather than intervention after the crisis takes its toll. Fourth, the report argued that the referent for security should be the people rather than states.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For details of the United Nations Development Programme (1994): Human Development Report, accessed June 01, 2010, <http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr1994/>.

The concept of human security has emerged out of the recognition that individual's security does not necessarily follow from the security of the state in which they are citizens. In other words, the individual security is no longer defined exclusively within the realm of states or of state security. That is why; the concept of human security should be seen as an extension of traditional security conception. The most obvious difference of human-based security strategies from the state-based ones is to give great attention to the needs of human security instead of state's ones.

Emergence of the concept of human security reflects the impact of values and norms on international relations. Human security is a normative, ethical movement. It is normative in the sense that it argues that there is an ethical responsibility to reorient security concept around the individual in a redistributive sense, in the context of changes in political community and the emergence of transnational norms relating to human rights. Because of this ethical responsibility, the concept of human security establishes a new measure for judging the success or failure of national and international security policy (Newman, 2001: 239-251). Indeed, the challengers of the traditional security conception argue that a process of value change is under way. The new values, which are supposedly replacing the centrality of the nation-state, are located at both the individual and global levels. On the individual level, the new values are associated with human rights and needs (Miller, 2001: 22). While the traditional conception emphasizes the territorial integrity and national independence as the primary values that need to be protected, individual safety and well-being are paramount values of the human security conception. Individual safety implies two things: protection of the body from pain and destruction; and some at least minimal level of physical well-being. Well-being can be thought about in terms of two components: the basic freedom of the individual in relation to one's most intimate and meaningful life choices, and freedom of the individual to associate with others (Bajpai, 2000).

What are the threats to these human security values? The UNDP report appears to distinguish between two sets of threats. First of all, some threats are more localized. According to the report, the more localized threats can be understood in relation to the seven values of human security. They include threats to economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security, and political security. Secondly, in addition to the more localized threats, the report cites a number of more global or transnational threats such as population growth, growing disparities in global income, international migration, environmental degradation, drug trafficking, and international terrorism (UNDP Human Development Report, 1994). Shifting the focus of security to the individual paradoxically allows an engagement with the broadest global threats (Krause and Williams, 1997: 45).

The practices of the state for searching security can transform into threats for human security. Accordingly, for instance, Amnesty International's annual report of 2002 concluded that with respect to the security of the individual citizen, states still pose more important threats than terrorists (Sjursen, 2003). Although traditional security threats continue to harm well-being of humanity, the impact of environmental disasters, communicable disease, and poverty are often far greater. It can be observed that evaluating the individual as the focus of security is required to give attention to the global threats. That is why, it is argued that emancipation from oppressive power structures -be they global, national, or local in origin and scope- is necessary for human security (Newman, 2001: 242).

In the human security conception, threats must be reckoned as both direct and indirect, from identifiable sources, such as other states or non-state actors of various kinds, as also from structural sources, that is, from relations of power at various levels. Direct violence includes violent death/disablement (terrorism, genocide, killing of dissidents, war casualties), dehumanization (slavery and trafficking in women and children; use of child soldiers; kidnapping), discrimination and domination. Indirect violence includes deprivation, disease, natural and man-made disasters, underdevelopment, population displacement and environmental degradation (Bajpai, 2000).

While traditional IR theories privilege power and order as the bases for security, critical security studies privilege emancipation. In this context, Ken Booth placed human beings at the center and gave priority to human emancipation. In Booth's words, emancipation means that 'all those physical and human constraints which stop them from carrying out what they would freely choose to do' (Booth, 1991: 319). Such

constraints may include human rights abuses, water shortage, illiteracy, lack of access to health care and birth control, militarisation of society, environmental degradation and economic deprivation as well as armed conflict at the state- and sub-state level (Bilgin, 2005: 44).

Who is to provide human security? Surely the individual himself/herself is in no position to provide for his/her own security. Logically, the provision of human security can only be guaranteed by a larger entity such as society, the state, or some global institutions (Floyd, 2007: 40). Because, individual himself/herself has not resources and power to couple with threats to direct against the human security. Particularly, states constitute the primary nexus when it comes to security for individuals and groups. Even when our primary concern is security of human beings, states need a significant place in the analysis, because states constitute the single most important macro-structure with consequences for individual security (Sorensen, 1996: 374) and in the context of human security, the state becomes the means for providing human security. In addition to the role of the state in the realm of human security, it is required the cooperation with civil society. That cooperation is important to increase awareness of individuals about their rights and respect them.

In the conceptual development of the conception of human security, there is a lively debate that has coalesced around two rival definitions. The “freedom from fear” part of this debate argues that the broad vision of human security is ultimately nothing more than a shopping list; it involves slapping the label human security on a wide range of issues that have no necessary link. This approach seeks to limit the conception of human security to protecting individuals from violent conflicts while recognizing that these violent threats are strongly associated with poverty, lack of state capacity and other forms of inequities.<sup>2</sup> This approach argues that limiting the focus to violence is a realistic and manageable approach towards human security. On the other hand, “freedom from want” part of the debate favours a holistic approach in achieving human security and argues that the threat agenda should be broadened to include hunger, disease and natural disasters because they are inseparable concepts in addressing the root of human insecurity (UNDP Human Development Report, 1994). Finally, despite their differences, these two approaches to human security can be considered complementary rather than contradictory and the human security requires attention to both *freedoms from fear* and *freedom from want*.

#### **4. Referent Object Problem in the Security Studies**

With the end of the Cold War, a major debate has unfolded on the meaning and character of security. One of the important dimensions of this debate is the problem of the appropriate referent object of security. Referent objects as things that are seen to be existentially threatened and that have a legitimate claim to survival (Buzan et. al. 1998: 36). In this context, security is largely a problem about the referent point. When the referent point of security is determined, quality, nature and means of security appear clearly.

Traditional security conception does not have much to say about the agency of non-state actors. However, recently it is increasingly argued that individual citizens should be privileged as the referent object of security. In this respect, critical security studies which rejects the notion of anarchy as a defining feature of international relations, replaces the state by either societal groups or individuals as the referent object of security; emphasizes the role of both non-state actors and the non-military dimension of security (Krause, 1998: 298-333). The debate upon the referent object of security encourages security analysts to specify what their preferred level of analysis and why they have chosen this level rather than another.

Security as a concept clearly requires a referent object, and Barry Buzan maintained that security has many potential referent objects. These objects of security multiply not only as the membership of the society of states increases, but also as one moves down through the state to the level of individuals, and up beyond it to the level of international system as a whole (Buzan, 1991: 26). Thus, Buzan called for looking below and beyond the state for other referent objects. Buzan, whilst mentioning other potential referents at the sub- and

---

<sup>2</sup> Human Security Centre, “What is Human Security”, accessed July 21, 2010, <http://www.humansecurityreport.info/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=24&itemid=59>.

supra-state levels, nevertheless made a case for focusing on the security of states. He built his argument in two moves. First, argued Buzan, the anarchic structure of the international system rendered the units the 'natural focus of security concerns'. Since states were the 'dominant' units, 'national security' was 'the central issue' (1991: 19). Buzan's second move was to look at the state's agency and infer from its privileged position as a security agent that its security should be prioritised over other potential referents. 'Because security policy-making is very largely an activity of states', argued Buzan (1991: 328).

Buzan's first move could be criticised first, for its depiction of the international system as anarchical and second, for identifying individuals' security with citizenship and the state. Buzan's second move has been the less contested of the two. The state has traditionally been viewed as both the primary referent of and agent for security in the Cold War Security Studies. Although the privileged status of the state as the primary referent has been challenged, Security Studies continues to accord the state a central position largely due to its status as the dominant agent for security. Because, it is argued that there are a number of reasons for the prominence of the state's agency in the Security Studies. First, states have a monopoly over the legitimate use of violence in international society. Second, they are considered well equipped to meet threats to security. Third, our analytical lenses have become conditioned to focus on states in the analysis of security (Bilgin, 2003: 216).

Conversely, Booth argued that individuals' security should come first and for advancing his argument, he made three interrelated points. First, the security of the state is not necessarily synonymous with that of the people who live within its physical boundaries. Second, even those states that fit the textbook definition by standing guard over their populace are generally doing so as a means to an end, not as an end in itself. Third, and finally, differences among states in both character and capacity make them unlikely to engage in a comprehensive approach to security (Booth, 1991: 319-320). Indeed, state-based approaches to security do not allow us to examine the insecurities of individuals and communities within state borders.

In terms of subject matter of Security Studies, the sub-field has moved away from its initial concentration on military issues and national security. A broader security agenda requires us to look at the activities of agents other than the state, such as transnational corporations, grassroots movements, and individuals, instead of restricting the analysis to the state's agency. This is necessary because broadening security without attempting a re-conceptualisation of agency would result in falling back on the agency of the state in meeting non-military threats to security (Bilgin, 2005: 35). It has taken on a much wider range of referent objects for security, still with the state in a strong position, but now with much more scope for individual human beings (human security), non-human things and entities (aspect of environmental security), and social structures (the world economy), collective identities of various sorts (Buzan and Hansen, 2009: 258). Buzan notes that what can be clearly observed is that the state is less important in the new security agenda than in the old one. It still remains central, but no longer dominates either as the exclusive referent object or as the principle embodiment of threat (Buzan, 1997: 11). So, in the post-Cold War era, the primacy of the state in considerations of security has come under increasing challenge from a variety of perspectives.

The concept of the state has become simultaneously problematized in the academic world of IR theory. This new attitude towards the state led many -both policymakers and academics- to postulate referent objects other than the state at the centre of a particular security dynamic. In this context, especially, making individuals qua persons the object of security, opens up the state for critical scrutiny. Embracing statism affirms the centrality of the state as the primary referent of and agent for security, thereby challenging the 'possibility of referring to humanity (Bilgin, 2005: 46). However, critical security studies argue that individuals are the ultimate referent for security (Booth, 1991: 319-320). Connected to this, the key argument of human security conception is that ultimately state security is for individual security. Only the security of the individual can be the meaningful objective of security. Accordingly, the object of security should not remain the state, since what is really threatened is the material well-being of individuals. As Keith Krause stated that only the constraints imposed by traditional categories of thought have limited our grasp of reality, and hence our conceptions of security must change to meet new challenges (1998: 310).

## 5. Violent Non-State Actors

The proliferation of non-state actors in the post-Cold War era has been one of the factors affecting the human security. Non-state actors are to some extent autonomous agents with their own interests, aims, and capabilities. Types of non-state actors can be classified as non-governmental organizations, multinational corporations, religious groups, other non-state actors such as Amnesty International and Greenpeace, and violent non-state actors that include terrorist organizations, militias, warlords, and criminal organizations. VNSA refers to any organization that uses illegal violence to reach its goals, thereby contesting the monopoly on violence of the state. Their few shared characteristics result from their unofficial nature (compared with state actors) and their greater flexibility.

Most VNSAs emerge in response to inadequacies or shortcomings; i.e. when the state does not/can not provide safety, security, and the basic public services for its citizens, or certain groups of citizens (minorities). When the state lacks legitimacy and/or capacity, others will fill the gap, take advantage, or directly confront the state. For example, the efforts of groups, like the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS) in Algeria, that undertook grassroots activism during the 1980s by setting up a network of medical clinics and charitable associations to serve the poorest and most crowded localities not reached by the government were clouded by the violent practices that characterized most of their activities in the period following the 1991 elections (Bilgin, 2003: 206).

While the vocabulary of conflict in international security traditionally centered on interstate war, with globalization, terms such as global violence and human security become common parlance, where the fight is between irregular sub-state units such as paramilitary groups, criminal organizations, and terrorists. Extremist groups because of their ability to organize transnationally and meet virtually, utilize terrorist tactics that have been substantially enhanced by the globalization process. Furthermore, globalization has given rise to a 'skill revolution' that enhances the capabilities of groups such as drug smugglers, terrorists, and criminal organizations to carry out their agenda more effectively than ever before (Cha, 2000: 393-394).

Types of violent crime constitute the direct threats to the human security. One of the most important direct threats to human security is organized violence such as terrorism. The transnational crime, narcotics trafficking, and the proliferation of small arms, all of which endanger personal safety and well being, are the other examples of direct organized violence. Terrorism, like other forms of violence, undermines the individual security directly. Terrorists are frequently prepared to engage in the indiscriminate murder of civilians. Terrorism is implicitly prepared to sacrifice all moral and humanitarian considerations for the sake of its end (Wilkinson, 1974: 17). Acts of international terrorism by non-state actors are an unfortunate side-effect of a more open and closely connected world. That's why; international networks have developed among organized criminals, drug traffickers, and arms dealers creating an infrastructure for terrorism around the world.

Empirical data on the degree of threat posed by terrorism shows that it causes relatively few deaths if compared to other security concerns such as interstate war, or civil conflict. In recent years, the number of global deaths caused by terrorist attacks averages to less than 2,000 annually. However, recent data show an increase in the lethality of individual terrorist incidents (Krahman, 2005: 5). The most worrying issue is the possibility of terrorist groups' access to weapons of mass destruction (Ağır, 2008: 99-129). Because, weapons of mass destruction are becoming more easily obtainable and so-called "dirty bombs" of nuclear material do not require sophisticated knowledge or material. The potential of weapons of mass destruction reaching the hands of terrorist groups has received particular attention. For instance, the sarin gas attacks by the Japanese Aum sect in Tokyo in 1995 has illustrated the relative ease with which chemical agents can be manufactured by radical groups.

While the potential for weapons of mass destruction to spread into the hands of terrorist organizations has generated considerable concern in the post-Cold War era, it is Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) that routinely spread to non-state actors engaged in violence. They are the primary weapons of many non-state actors with which this study is concerned: militia, criminals, and terrorist organizations (Bourne, 2005: 155-



156). Their widespread availability and misuse contributes to transnational organized crime and conflicts of all types.

Crime has always represented a threat to the security of ordinary people in all countries. The goal of a large number of criminal acts is to generate profit for the individual or group that carries out the act. Therefore, criminal organizations that organize and pursue the crime activities are essentially illegal business organizations and no one actor can effectively fight against transnational organized crime in a unilateral manner. Because, with the globalization, crime is less local and more organized, and beyond the border. Organized crime is a new form of warfare (Bigo, 2001: 92). In this respect, the 1990s witnessed a significant rise in the scale of transnational organized crime. As well as providing a major human security threat to ordinary citizens, criminal organizations (in tandem with violent political organizations) have seriously undermined the capacity of the government to rule the country. At the 1994 UN Conference on Internationally Organized Crime, UN Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali referred to an ‘empire of criminals’ to highlight the problem of globally operating criminal gangs (see, Hough, 2008: 231-238).

The type of illegal activity that generates the funds can vary but is often linked to corrupt practices, transnational organized crime networks, and increasingly terrorist groups. For instance, it has been suggested that the global narcotics market amounts to around 400 billion dollar, roughly equal to the world tourist industry. By 2006 money-laundering transactions were accounting for around 1.5 trillion dollar per year, somewhere between 2 and 5 per cent of global gross domestic product (Hough, 2008: 230). Terrorist groups are financed by drug activities, and thus, narco-trafficking is a threat not only because drug poses danger to mankind, but it is also a source of funding for the terrorist groups. Thus, criminal terrorism can be defined as the systematic use of acts of terror for objectives of private material gain (Wilkinson, 1974: 32).

Currently, one of the most dramatic threats to human security is internal armed conflict. A crucial feature of internal conflicts is the widespread violation of human rights by armed groups, from rebel movements to militias. With the proliferation of weapons, especially small arms and landmines, and the erosion of state control, threats to human security are increased, both because people are the direct targets of violence and as a result of the organized crime and random violence that occurs in these chaotic conditions.

For armed groups, violence is often employed not as a military tactic aiming for a takeover, but as a means to render the political status quo unsustainable. Violence in this context can take innumerable forms, particularly towards civilians; they include killing, raping, kidnapping, torture and extortion; attacks on crops, water sources, and other civilian infrastructures. Combatants often engage in parallel criminal activities, using force to extract resources for their own personal gain, through extortion, drug trafficking and illegal timber for example. A resultant environment of pervasive insecurity can contribute to the growth of “cultures of violence” and destroy social capital.

Nation-states are characterized as having a “monopoly on violence” within a territory. In the 21st century, the state monopoly on violence is being reduced to a convenient fiction. For instance, warlords and militias have a territory over which they exercise some of the control functions of a government. Thus, it seems that states’ superior resources and authority are not necessarily sufficient to contain contemporary security threats. Terrorists, transnational crime networks, and arms traffickers are learning the art of “asymmetrical warfare,” that is, to avoid state strengths and seek out its weaknesses. Instead of facing an overwhelming military enemy, they target civilians; instead of using central kingpins, they work in small independent groups; and instead of facing governmental controls, they move to offshore safe havens (Krahman, 2005: 202). With the end of the bipolar system, some power and authority vacuum appeared and they were employed by organized crime networks and terrorist organizations in order to extend their own influence spheres. Additionally, the transnational nature of these threats means that borders and national armed forces are increasingly unsuited for the provision of human, national, and international security. Moreover, they put into question the foundations of a security system based on the norms of national sovereignty and a state monopoly of the legitimate use of violence.

The state responses to non-state violence include appeasement, zero tolerance, containment, legal measures, diplomatic measures, inter-governmental cooperation, and covert operations. In addition to responses of the state, it can be considered the global responses to non-state violence. This kind of responses consists of the UN Conventions, resolutions of the UN Security Council and General Assembly and Interpol investigations. For instance, Interpol represents an acknowledgment that domestic issues such as crime, drug-trafficking, and terrorism increasingly require transnational cooperation (Hough, 2008: 240). States must also reach out to international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and any other agencies in civil society. And also states, international organizations, and NGOs can combine to foster norms of conduct in various areas of human security. The spread of norms must be accompanied by the invigoration of global institutions. These institutions will help to enforce norms (Bajpai, 2010).

## **6. Conclusion**

Traditional security approach has hardly provided understanding for achieving security in the post-Cold War world. Because, in the new security environment, the focus on “non-traditional” security issues such as drugs, organized crime, environmental degradation, micro-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, cyberwar and trafficking in human beings is given great attention. In addition to widening agenda of security, a lively debate has occurred on broadening the security studies beyond the state-centric conception. Debates about the concept of human security within the security studies is not directly related with a new theoretical attempt, but rather emerge from the humanitarian values and needs that take important place in the determination of process of security policy agenda.

If we are to develop understandings of security more adequate to human security, the ways of thinking about security and inquiry of it should be moved away the supposed certainties of neorealist security studies. In this context, a reorientation of security toward human needs can be more effective, more cost efficient, more stable in systemic terms, and ethically more sound than a conception of security that rests solely upon military defense of territory (Newman, 2001: 249). However, it has been easier the accepting of the extension of security agenda than solving the referent object problem in the Security Studies.

This paper deals specifically with the role and responsibility of VNSAs with regard to the concept of human security. Actually, there exist many VNSAs such as warlords, militias, criminal organizations and terrorist organizations that operate without state control and are involved in trans-border conflicts and pose a pressing challenge to human security across the geo-political landscape. While the threat posed by terrorism, and transnational crime has been intensified precisely because of globalization, the security solutions to these problems in terms of enforcement or containment increasingly are ineffective through national or unilateral means. It is hoped that this exercise will inspire further attempts to develop new strategies to engage VNSAs and other non-state actors on human security issues.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

AĞIR, Bülent Sarper (2008), “Küreselleşen Dünyada Kitle İmha Silahları ve Terörizm.” In Küreselleşmeden Post-Küreselleşmeye Değişim Sürecindeki Dünya Düzeni ve Türkiye, edited by Murat Saraçlı, Lotus, Ankara, s. 99-129.

BAJPAI, Kanti (2010), “Human Security: Concept and Measurement.” Kroc Institute Occasional Paper, August 2000 Accessed July 11. [http://www.hegoa.ehu.es/dossierra/seguridad/Human\\_security\\_concept\\_and\\_measurement.pdf](http://www.hegoa.ehu.es/dossierra/seguridad/Human_security_concept_and_measurement.pdf).

BİGO, Didier (2001), “The Möbius Ribbon of Internal and External Security(ies).” In Identities, Borders and Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory, edited by Mathias Albert, David Jacobson and Yosef Lapid, Minnesota University Pres, Minneapolis, s. 91-116.

BİLGİN, Pınar (2005), Regional Security in the Middle East - A Critical Perspective. Routledge, London.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2003), “Individual Security and Societal Dimensions of Security.” International Studies Review 5, s. 203-222.

BOOTH, Ken (1991), “Security and Emancipation.” Review of International Studies 17, no. 4, s. 313-326.

BOURNE, Mike (2005), “The Proliferation of Small Arms and Ligh Weapons.” In New Threats and New Actors in International Security, edited by Elke Krahan, Macmillan, New York, s. 155-176.

BUZAN, Barry (1991) People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era, Harvester, Hemel Hempstead.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1997), “Rethinking Security After the Cold War.” Cooperation and Conflict 32, no. 1, s. 5-28.

BUZAN, Barry, WæVER, Ole, and WILDE, Jaap (1998), Security: A New Framework for Analysis, Lynne Reinner Publishers, London.

BUZAN, Barry, and HANSEN, Lene (2009), The Evolution of International Security Studies, Cambridge University Pres, New York.

CHA, Victor D (2000), “Globalization and the Study of International Security.” Journal of Peace Research 37, no. 3, s. 391-403.

FLOYD, Rita (2007), “Human Security and the Copenhagen School’s Securitization Approach: Conceptualizing Human Security as a Securitizing Move.” Human Security Journal 5, s. 38-49.

HOUGH, Peter (2008), Understanding Global Security, Routledge, New York.

HUMAN SECURITY CENTER, “What is Human Security”, Accessed July 21, 2010. <http://www.humansecurityreport.info/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=24&itemid=59>.

HYDE-PRICE, Adrian (2001), “Beware the Jabberwock!”: Security Studies in the Twenty-First Century.” In Europe’s New Security Challenges, edited by Heinz Görtner, Adrian Hyde-Price and Erich Reiter, Boulder, London, s. 27-54.

KRAHMAN, Elke (2005), "From State to Non-State Actors: The Emergence of Security Governance." In *New Threats and New Actors in International Security*, edited by Elke Krahman, Macmillan, New York, s. 3-19.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2005), "New Threats and New Actors in Security Governance: Developments, Problems, and Solutions." In *New Threats and New Actors in International Security*, edited by Elke Krahman, Macmillan, New York, s. 199-212.

KRAUSE, Keith (1998), "Critical Theory and Security Studies: The Research Programme of 'Critical Security Studies'." *Cooperation and Conflict* 33, no. 3, s. 298-333.

KRAUSE, Keith, and WILLIAMS, Michael C. (1997), "From Strategy to Security: Foundations of Critical Security Studies." In *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, edited by Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams, UCL Pres, London, s. 33-59.

McSWEENEY, Bill (1999), *Security, Identity and Interest: A Sociology of International Relations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

MILLER, Benjamin (2001), "The Concept of Security: Should it be Redefined?." *The Journal of Strategic Studies* 24, no. 2, s. 1-52.

NEWMAN, Edward (2001), "Human Security and Constructivism." *International Studies Perspectives* 2, s. 239-251.

SJURSEN, Helene (2003), "Security and Defence." ARENA Working Paper 10, Accessed October 10, 2009. [http://www.arena.uio.no/publications/wp\\_03\\_10\\_sjursen.pdf](http://www.arena.uio.no/publications/wp_03_10_sjursen.pdf).

SORENSEN, Georg (1996), "Individual Security and National Security: The State Remains the Principal Problem." *Security Dialogue* 27, no. 4, s. 371-386.

ULLMAN, Richard (1983), "Redefining Security." *International Security* 8, no. 1, s. 129-153.

WALT, Stephen (1991), "The Renaissance of Security Studies." *International Studies Quarterly* 35, no. 2, s. 211-239.

WILKINSON, Paul (1974), *Political Terrorism*, Macmillan Press, London.

UNDP, Human Development Report 1994, Accessed June 01, 2010. <http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr1994/>  
<http://www.humansecurityreport.info/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=24&itemid=59>