

# Human Security Norms and Reconstruction of Global Governance: Meta-Governance for Human Security

**Dr. Yoochul Lee**

*Lecturer, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Seoul National University  
uchul83@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3952-4878>*

---

## KEYWORDS    ABSTRACT

In the past decade, human security has significantly shaped the principles and practices of the United Nations, governments, and NGOs. This paper examines human security as a "compound norm," integrating existing norms like people-centered development and human rights with new standards. This fusion addresses comprehensive issues from non-combatant safety during conflicts to hunger, human rights oppression, environmental degradation, and infectious diseases. The evolving concept highlights tensions between state security and a people-centered approach, and between national sovereignty and humanitarianism. Governance under human security often involves "compound global governance," engaging diverse actors such as governments, international organizations, NGOs, and corporations. Despite varying intensities across areas, these actors form partnerships to align their goals and practices with the aim of ensuring people's safety. This study analyzes the emerging governance characteristics within the human security framework, focusing on the adjustment of regimes and networks across various sectors.

---

## Introduction

It has been ten years since human security was introduced as a policy concept, and it has significantly influenced the principles and practices of the United Nations, governments, and NGOs. The norms and governance of human security observed today have the following characteristics. Firstly, there is the comprehensiveness of problem areas, ranging from the safety of non-combatants during armed conflicts to security from hunger, human rights oppression, environmental degradation, and infectious diseases. Consequently, existing norms such as people-centered development, respect for human rights, the prohibition of anti-personnel landmines, and sustainable development are being combined or adjusted with new "norms" to form a "compound norm" known as human security. On the other hand, human security is often threatened in situations where government governance, which should fundamentally provide an important basis for people's lives, is lacking. To ensure people's safety, involvement by governments, international organizations, and NGOs is undertaken, directly impacting the societies of recipient countries significantly. In response to this situation, traditional international political norms (such as the principle of non-interference in domestic affairs) have become inadequate, leading to tensions between "state security" and a "people-centered approach to security," as well as between "national sovereignty" and "human rights and humanitarianism."

This paper aims to re-examine human security from the perspective of it being a "compound norm" and the competition/fusion (norm adjustment function) between existing and new norms, in order to delineate the systematic characteristics of human security norms. Governance under the "compound norm" often spans multiple areas, such as development, human rights, and conflict prevention, and may take the form of "compound global governance," involving diverse actors including not only governments but also international organizations, NGOs, and

corporations (Hewson, 1999, Rosenau, 1992). Although there are variations in intensity across individual problem areas, there is a tendency for diverse actors—international organizations, states, NGOs, and corporations—to form partnerships and engage in governance. This involves adjusting regimes and networks, which have been formed under separate norms and rules in individual areas, by aligning their goals, rules, and practices with the common thread of people's safety. Therefore, this paper also attempts to analyze the emerging characteristics of governance observed under human security norms.

## **1. Formation of "Compound Norms"**

### **(1) Norm Formation and Development: Perspective of Social Constructivism and Its Complement**

Norms are defined as "shared expectations concerning behaviors that are deemed appropriate within a community (Finnemore, 2017: 22-24)." They are shared among agents, become established in society, and construct behavior, meaning standards that are generally accepted and taken for granted. This refers to a situation where the validity of certain actions is accepted, and their rightness or wrongness is no longer subject to political discussion (they are "depoliticized"). The existence of a norm is confirmed when actions are taken in accordance with the norm, or when agents rely on certain norms in their discourse to justify their actions or persuade others Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Changes"(Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998).

Conversely, when existing norms and practices are challenged, competition may arise between old and new norms or actions, leading to politics through discourse. New "norms" (Norm B), which emerge in opposition to existing norms (Norm A), do not have assured "taken-for-grantedness" during the period of competition with Norm A. This is because there are differing views and practices concerning what constitutes appropriate behavior and fairness in society. The process of establishing a new "norm" usually requires a long-term perspective. The emergence of demand for new "norms" can be attributed to: ① large-scale security or economic events that cast doubt on existing rules and norms, ② changes in the power structure of the international system, and ③ domestic political changes(Acharya, 2004). According to studies in social constructivism, emerging "norms" are created through mutual practices and discussions among states, civil society, and international organizations, and become internalized and established through a process of "socialization" and "imitation" via persuasion. In the early stages of norm creation, the active norm-constructing activities of "norm entrepreneurs" are highlighted. This entire process is referred to as the "norm life cycle" hypothesis, which consists of three stages: norm emergence, norm diffusion and acceptance, and internalization. A key research theme of this school of thought is how the claim of "oughtness" by some actors—"norm" (B) at the emergence stage—spreads in society and begins to operate as a "logic of appropriateness (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998: 902-903, Risse-Kappen et al., 1999)."

In existing major studies, the content of new "norms" is treated as given and fixed, and the life cycle of the norm is tracked on that basis (Klotz, 2018). In contrast, when new "norms" are introduced into various societies, there is a hypothesis suggesting that they may undergo a reinterpretation process of "grafting" or "pre-adaptation" with existing cultures, norms, and customs, leading to internalization (Crandall et al., 2002). Conversely, if they do not align with the social context or power structure, they may be rejected at the entry point. This hypothesis suggests the possibility of mutual adjustment and reinterpretation resulting from clashes between old and new norms, in contrast to the social constructivism hypothesis depicting the process of new norms replacing old ones. Firstly, a new "norm" may not completely

disseminate through socialization or isomorphism to entirely exclude old norms. Rather, the old norms and new "norms," which were supposed to be competing, may be mutually adjusted and reinterpreted. Secondly, a new "norm" might be a "compound norm" that combines existing norms. It is also necessary to track the content changes of new "norms" (B) presented internationally in stages and see how they have impacted the reorganization of existing norm (A) areas. As demonstrated by studies like those of Finnemore et al., there are also cases where new norms spread and replace old norms. The prohibition of anti-personnel landmines is an example where norm entrepreneurs like NGOs achieved its total abolition based on humanitarian norms, in opposition to the old norm of "state security" (Ayoob, 2002, Garcia, 2015)." What should be noted here is the need to consider not only the replacement of old norms by new norms but also the multivalent paths of norm development such as rejection, adjustment, and compounding.

## **(2) Compound Norms**

New "norms" do not necessarily appear as contradictory to existing norms; rather, multiple existing norms may be combined and integrated under specific principles to be newly presented. This is referred to as a "compound norm." Human security, which combines traditional norms like people-centered development and civilian protection during wartime under the principle of human safety, is a "compound norm" (Hysing, 2021)." Similarly, the "corporate social responsibility" (CSR) of the UN Global Compact (GC), comprising ten principles concerning human rights, the environment, and labor, is a "compound norm." Criticisms that human security might merely be a continuation of old norms and practices, like human development and human rights, are in a sense correct. Precisely because it is a compound norm that synthesizes existing fields under the principle of human safety, such criticisms arise. Human security consists of new "norm" elements that are becoming established among states and existing norms that are being implemented by various actors.

## **(3) Norm Adjustment Function**

As stated in (1), newly emerged "norms" may be adjusted with competing existing norms, leading to reinterpretation of both. This is an integrative development of contradictory norms. For instance, solutions that adjust and reinterpret opposing norms, such as economic development vs. the environment, and national sovereignty vs. humanitarian intervention, can advance norm setting. This inherent nature of norms is referred to as the "adjustment function."

When adjusting competing norms, a unifying idea may be necessary (Goldstein et al., 2019). NGOs have begun to assert new normative claims against the traditional norm of companies pursuing profits to fulfill their responsibilities to shareholders, arguing that they should also be responsible to stakeholders. In this process, CSR, which reconstructs corporate responsibility as encompassing economic benefits, the environment, and social justice (triple bottom line), is being accepted as an idea that adjusts and unites both sides. As human security reorganizes the concept of safety around people, it naturally includes the normative aspect of "freedom from fear," leading to contradictions and competition with national sovereignty (Erskine, 2003: 138-158). As shown in Table 1, the report by the "International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty" (ICISS) used "responsibility to protect" as an idea to adjust the demand for "humanitarian intervention" and "national sovereignty." Furthermore, even when looking at the entirety of the human security "norm," it is progressing in a direction to adjust "non-interference in internal affairs" and "national security" with a people-centered approach.

The adjustment of new "norms" to incorporate existing norms implies changes in the boundaries of the existing norms themselves, which are contradictory or competitive. Existing

norms such as national sovereignty, national security, and corporate profit pursuit continue to exist, but their content is moving towards consideration of human security and CSR.

#### **(4) Role of Norm Entrepreneurs: Norm Creation, Adaptation, and Editing**

Actors attempting to create "norms" are called "norm entrepreneurs." Norm entrepreneurs are defined as those motivated by altruism, empathy for humanity, and a belief in problem-solving, persuading others to accept specific norms (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998: 896-898). In traditional studies, all actors involved in the process of norm creation have been collectively referred to as "norm entrepreneurs," but understanding the characteristics of "compound norms" requires a more detailed re-examination of their emergence process and conceptualization of their roles. Here, I propose the processes of "original creation," "adaptation," and "editing" of "norms," to conceptualize the formation of "compound norms."

A "norm creator" is responsible for creating the original "compound norm." In the realm of norms, creators do not have copyright, allowing those who wish to use them to adapt the norm's content to justify their own actions or objectives (adaptation). Adaptors can add or delete norm elements to the original "compound norm" without altering the main structure. "Adaptations" are publicly presented in the global discourse arena, such as being declared as the platform for a government's foreign policy or becoming a policy assertion by NGOs. The development of international expert organizations and the expansion of citizens' cross-border networks increase such open opportunities, enabling access from diverse actors and further "adaptations."

Actors such as the UN Secretariat or independent international commissions may gather such "adaptations" and "edit" them into content with broader acceptance, publishing them. This is akin to the role of an editor. The human security "norm" was developed from the discourse and practices of UNDP, the governments of Japan and Canada, NGOs, and think tanks. The UNDP's "Human Development Report 1994" serves as the "original creation," which was later "adapted" individually by Japan and Canada and "edited" by the Commission on Human Security.

Both "original creations" and "adaptations" can be made by actors from any sector, including governments, NGOs, and international organizations. The intention of "adaptation" is not necessarily altruistic and may be an action to justify one's policies. Meanwhile, "norm editors" are responsible for listening to the opinions of people directly affected by the implementation of the norm, collecting pioneering best practices, and compiling a "norm" that is more widely internationally acceptable. Through the actions and discourse of actors, the adjustment of contradictory and competing norms takes place, with editors also playing the role of coordinating this process. The Brundtland Commission and ICISS enabled adjustment by creating "adhesive" ideas such as "sustainable development" and "responsibility to protect." "Compound norms" are presented as a "norm inventory" through such editorial work. "Editing" is conducted at places recognized to have a certain degree of universality and legitimacy and serve as hubs of information accumulation, such as the UN or independent international commissions, rather than by governments or NGOs. However, it is practically unavoidable for the normative orientations of editors to be reflected in the editing process.

## **2. Norm Entrepreneurs and Normative Theory**

The act of creating norms is inextricably linked to normative theories,<sup>1</sup> which address what

---

<sup>1</sup> Next references are explaining distinguish Normative Theory of International Relations from the positivist normative analysis: Beitz, Charles R. (1979) *Political Theory and*

constitutes justice in society. "Norm entrepreneurs," particularly independent international commissions involved in norm editing, consciously pursue questions of what is just and what constitutes appropriate action in the international/global society to varying degrees in their creation of "norms." How are these issues of norm creation discussed in normative international relations theory?

In today's world, composed of diverse actors and under the premise that a priori "absolute ethical principles" do not exist, two main methods of norm creation have been proposed. First, scholars attempting to apply Habermas's concept of the public sphere or Rawls's normative theory to international relations argue that, through rational discourse among members of society, minimal consensus on "norms" can be achieved beyond diverse cultures and histories (Beitz, 1979, Rawls, 1993, Habermas, 1998, Habermas, 1992). However, there is criticism that rational discourse is impossible in international/global society, where there is a clear power imbalance among members. Therefore, the second method involves third parties listening to the opinions of people from diverse cultural and social backgrounds, especially those directly involved, and extracting normative common elements to present a "norm inventory (Nussbaum, 2000)." This is because the content of "norms" must transcend specific cultural and social contexts to be widely accepted. For instance, in the case of norm inventories related to "preventing and stopping physical violence against innocent people" and "legal equality," research indicates that they are relatively successful in dissemination due to their cross-cultural commonality (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998: 907). However, because third parties' normative tendencies are reflected in this process, there is a normative view that these should be subjected again to social discourse and selection in the next stage. The normative theories discussed here can be observed in the specific norm creation processes through the discourse of "editors."

Next, I would like to overview the normative issues in international relations—whether justice should be prioritized (e.g., cosmopolitanism), whether order should be emphasized (e.g., classical realism or the pluralism of the English School), and whether it is possible to reconcile order and justice through international cooperation and institutions (liberal internationalism)—and consider which perspectives "editors" have reflected in the human security "norm."

Firstly, there is a humanitarian claim that all humans, as rational agents, are equally deserving of respect and should empathize with the fate of people in other countries just as they do with their own citizens. Furthermore, humans have an obligation to engage in assisting those who suffer, even across borders (e.g., cosmopolitanism) (Nussbaum, 2000: 72-74). However, defending human dignity, which should be prioritized over state sovereignty, can sometimes involve coercive engagement in the domestic affairs of other countries, leading to normative tension between the "principle of non-interference in domestic affairs" and "humanitarianism." In contrast, scholars more concerned with maintaining international order are cautious about prioritizing justice over order to the point of engaging in domestic affairs (Jackson, 2000, Bull, 1977, Bull, 1966). The Westphalian system's principle of non-interference in domestic matters remains a major constitutive norm in today's "international society (Jackson, 2000: 41-43)." States are primarily responsible to their citizens, not foreigners, and also bear the responsibility of maintaining international order. Therefore, they argue for the necessity of "ethics of

---

*International Relations*. [Revised edition]. edn.: Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press, Jackson, Robert H. (2000) *The Global Covenant : Human Conduct in a World of States*. New York : Oxford University Press, Vincent, Raymond John (1986) *Human Rights and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

situation," which involves responding cautiously to protect national interests and maintain international order based on the context. Thirdly, the approach of placing the basis of international activities on the rationality of states, corporations, and individuals as actors and having a high orientation towards international institutions and norms is referred to as "liberal internationalism" in the normative theory of liberalism.<sup>2</sup> Liberal internationalism strongly tends to view the mutual complementarity and coexistence of international "order" and "justice" as possible through institutional building and modification.

In the following, relying on the aforementioned framework, I aim to suggest the normative tendencies of editors concerning the human security norm and further clarify the formation process and characteristics of human security as a compound norm.

### **3. Human Security and the Formation of Compound Norms**

The creation of new international "norms" holds fundamental significance in global governance regarding the principles that underlie the management of common challenges. Two leading initiatives in setting norms for human security include the "Commission on Human Security" and the ICISS. Here, we will examine related activities of independent international commissions, the United Nations, and various national governments. When considering the normative content of the concept of human security presented by independent international commissions in light of normative theories, it becomes evident that while they ethically resonate with cosmopolitanism, they exhibit a strong revisionist tendency towards incremental reform of the current order (Knight, 2008: 102). In other words, as editors, the independent international commissions embody a liberal internationalist tendency, making liberal internationalism a normative foundation supporting the claims of human security, alongside cosmopolitan humanitarianism.

#### **(1) The Role of Independent International Commissions and Liberal Internationalism**

Independent international commissions such as the Palme Commission, the Commission on Global Governance, and ICISS have been active in creating new "norms" in response to significant changes in the international system. This is an effort to establish fundamental principles when attempting to design governance in a socio-engineering manner. These commissions consider it desirable to listen to the opinions of people with diverse cultural and social backgrounds, selecting members with different cultural, experiential, and regional backgrounds, and emphasizing outreach through regional meetings and country- or sector-specific conferences (analogous to the editing of a "norm inventory" by third parties mentioned earlier). Nevertheless, much of the content of their reports reflects specific normative inclinations of the editors, projecting a strong character of "liberal internationalism." The reports from the Commission on Human Security and ICISS also pursue cosmopolitan values while adopting institutional and policy approaches that are liberal internationalist in nature (ICISS et al., 2001: ch. 6).

The reason for the liberal internationalist nature of the activities of these international commissions partly lies in the backgrounds of their members. While there is an awareness of

---

<sup>2</sup> The American neoliberal institutionalism school, while not a normative theory, possesses a certain orientation toward regime formation and democratic peace. Here, I will refer to the normative orientation that aligns with liberal international relations theory as liberal internationalism.

selecting members from countries with diverse cultural and economic development situations, many are said to be close to social democratic parties in developed countries. There is a tendency to project the image of a domestic welfare state onto the world, making them susceptible to influences from the liberal institutionalist school, such as democratic peace theory and civil society theory. The overlap of members across multiple independent international commissions further accentuates this tendency (Thakur, 2008). Efforts are made to ensure participation from the Global South, yet the participation of conservative leaders from developed countries and the presence of major powers like the United States are limited. Although efforts are made to include diverse geographical perspectives, the outcome remains a product within the "camp" of liberal internationalism.

## **(2) The Emergence of Human Security: Development as a "Compound Norm"**

The emergence of the human security norm can be observed in the report of the Commission on Global Governance. Established in 1992 with the support of then UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the commission aimed to address the dramatic changes in the international society post-Cold War by introducing the concept of global governance as a policy term and advocating for UN reform. The report argues that the cornerstone of global governance should be "core values" that people from different cultural and religious backgrounds can support, including the respect for life, liberty, justice, equality, mutual respect, compassion, and solidarity (Commission on Global, 1995: 48-49). The proposal to allow military intervention by the UN Security Council in cases where many lives are lost in domestic conflicts and the government's response is inadequate is carried forward by ICISS (Commission on Global, 1995: 91). On the other hand, regarding the appropriate form of governance, the commission asserts that fundamentally governments should play the most important role while advocating for the urgency of UN reform, suggesting that the UN should be complemented by partnerships including governments, NGOs, and corporations, setting a precedent for subsequent reports.

The term "human security" was coined around the same time during NGO consultations for the World Summit for Social Development and in the publication process of the 1993 and 1994 editions of the UNDP's Human Development Reports.<sup>3</sup> The original creators of the new "norm" were economists such as Mahbub ul Haq, NGOs, and the UNDP, which supported them (Haq, 2023). Human security emerged from the UNDP's lessons that ensuring people's safety is a crucial foundation for implementing human development. This was due to situations where people could not live safely as a result of armed conflicts, increased military expenditure, and the negative aspects of macroeconomic policies by international financial institutions, hindering human development. In the UNDP's "original creation," human security was a compound norm centered on "freedom from want," combining elements such as eradicating hunger and people-centered development.

Examples of "adaptations" by the Japanese and Canadian governments followed, with various actors exhibiting patterns of discourse and practice over how to define human security as a norm. The Japanese government was already interested in the concept during the administrations of Prime Ministers Murayama and Hashimoto, and during Foreign Minister and later Prime Minister Obuchi's tenure, human security was actively introduced as it aligned with his beliefs (Eves, 2006). As Japan's international policy, human security was mainly

---

<sup>3</sup> Social Development: A New Definition for Security Final Report of the 46<sup>th</sup> Annual DPI/ NGO conference, September, 1993 at New York. New York: UNDP 1994.

consistent with the UNDP's approach but was used to effectively market Japan's financial assistance during the Asian financial crisis under a new brand name and to emphasize changes in Japan's ODA policy since the 1990s.

The Canadian government introduced human security in its international policy due to the need to assert the distinctiveness of Canadian diplomacy, replacing peacekeeping operations, and because of the personal beliefs of Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy (Jockel and Sokolsky, 2001). Canada was particularly focused on promoting the Ottawa Process for the abolition of anti-personnel landmines and the establishment of the International Criminal Court, viewing human security as an effective concept for expressing humanitarian diplomacy. As indicated by the title of a pamphlet published by the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, they "adapted" the content of human security in the direction of "freedom from fear (Anan, 2001)."

The introduction of "freedom from fear," referring to the protection of civilians from armed conflict, was an inevitable result of the implications of the norm of human security—centering safety around people. Thus, two approaches to human security—"freedom from want" and "freedom from fear"—were presented, leading to movements toward synthesis centered around the United Nations. In a report written for the Millennium Summit, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan outlined human security as a "compound norm" consisting of two groups of norms: "freedom from want" and "freedom from fear," stating that a coalition of diverse actors is necessary for the UN to realize a people-centered approach (Sakhi, 2022, Ikeda, 2019).

The Millennium Summit speech by UN Secretary-General Annan catalyzed the editing work towards forming a "compound norm." At the Secretary-General's request and with the support of Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the "Commission on Human Security," co-chaired by Sadako Ogata and Amartya Sen, was established in 2001. The commission aimed to build broad consensus on the human security norm among governments and civil society, submitting the report "Human Security Now" to the Secretary-General in 2003 (Fukushima and Tow, 2009, Newman, 2005). This report edited the normative elements related to human security, such as the protection of people from violence, refugee safety, poverty alleviation, and health improvement, into a "compound norm" based on the principle of human security. Additionally, the report emphasized that the realization of human security requires not only "protection" by states and the UN but also the "empowerment" of individuals and communities to enhance their own capabilities, while providing an image of local actors actively participating in governance and collaborating with NGOs, governments, and international organizations. This contrasts with ICISS's focus on "protection" by external actors.

The Commission on Human Security referenced the content of the ICISS report regarding military intervention to save humanitarian crises but did not conduct a detailed examination of specific norms. Thus, while they worked on creating a norm that comprehensively captures people's safety, they avoided direct discussion of humanitarian intervention issues, presenting only a framework that could easily gain broad consensus. On military intervention, where conflicting opinions were anticipated, they intentionally treated it ambiguously in the editing of "norms." Considering the activities of both commissions, it can be said that their work resulted in the editing of a norm that comprehensively addresses human security, although this was partly intended by both commissions as well as a result of pursuing each commission's unique interests. Furthermore, human security exists in a mutually complementary relationship with other compound norms, such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) centered on human development, and the Global Compact (GC), which combines CSR in environmental degradation and child labor (Runhaar and Lafferty, 2009).

A common theme observed here is the positioning of states as the fundamental actors in governance for realizing human security, but when this is insufficient, advocating for multisectoral partnerships involving diverse actors as an appropriate mode of action. Human security becomes an issue often in situations where governments cannot adequately provide safety and welfare, and the public sector does not function sufficiently. This necessitates multilateralism and further requires the practice of diverse actors forming partnerships across public and private sectors to address issues collaboratively. This shift indicates a transition in viewing the relationship between governments and NGOs or corporations from one of "conflict" to an "appropriate relationship," namely "partnerships," in terms of appropriate modes of action in global governance (Anan, 2001: 70).

On the other hand, ICISS, anticipating incidents like large-scale human casualties and ethnic cleansing, discussed the responsibility for people's safety from comprehensive perspectives of prevention, response, and rebuilding. Humanitarian intervention, which gained increased necessity for norm setting through experiences such as the Bosnian and Rwandan conflicts, focused on how to position the relationship between national sovereignty and military intervention for humanitarian purposes. The co-chairs of ICISS were Algerian diplomat Mohamed Sahnoun, who served as a special advisor to the UN Secretary-General, and former Australian Foreign Minister Gareth Evans. The final report, "The Responsibility to Protect," was submitted in 2001, supported by the Canadian government, and reflected Canada's human security concept from the late 1990s (McRae et al., 2004).

The report comprehensively discussed aspects of humanitarian intervention, stating that "states should primarily protect their citizens from serious humanitarian crises, but if they lack the will or capacity, the international community has the responsibility to protect," suggesting the use of military force as a last resort. It specified that intervention should be limited to large-scale human casualties and ethnic cleansing, decided under proper authority (the UN Security Council), and that fundamental causes should be addressed to prevent the conflict itself. In doing so, instead of the "right to intervene," which would be difficult for states defending sovereignty to accept, it proposed the "responsibility to protect," attempting to converge international consensus (High-level Panel, 2004). The logic was that state sovereignty entails responsibility for the welfare and safety of its citizens and, further, responsibility to the international community through the United Nations, linking state sovereignty with the "responsibility to protect." This served as a bridging idea to reconcile the desire for "humanitarian intervention/interference" with "non-interference in domestic affairs," while also treating "responsibility to protect" as an exception to "non-interference," thus altering but sustaining the domain of the "non-interference" norm.

Human security, as a "compound norm" composed of multiple existing normative elements, has varying levels of support. The Commission on Human Security broadly edited from "freedom from want" to "freedom from fear." The "ambiguity" of the compound norm of human security can be said to have attracted interest from actors with diverse concerns. Regarding "humanitarian intervention," where the Commission on Human Security left ambiguity, ICISS presented "the responsibility to protect." The latter, while a norm carrying a wing of the comprehensive compound norm, still faces hesitation from developing countries regarding attempts to reorganize the principle of non-interference. Compared to other elements of the human security "compound norm," linking it to actual actions may not be easy.

### **3. Human Security and the Formation of Compound Norms**

The creation of new international "norms" holds fundamental significance in global governance regarding the principles that underlie the management of common challenges. Two leading

initiatives in setting norms for human security include the "Commission on Human Security" and the ICISS. Here, we will examine related activities of independent international commissions, the United Nations, and various national governments. When considering the normative content of the concept of human security presented by independent international commissions in light of normative theories, it becomes evident that while they ethically resonate with cosmopolitanism, they exhibit a strong revisionist tendency towards incremental reform of the current order. In other words, as editors, the independent international commissions embody a liberal internationalist tendency, making liberal internationalism a normative foundation supporting the claims of human security, alongside cosmopolitan humanitarianism.

### **(1) The Role of Independent International Commissions and Liberal Internationalism**

Independent international commissions such as the Palme Commission, the Commission on Global Governance, and ICISS have been active in creating new "norms" in response to significant changes in the international system. This is an effort to establish fundamental principles when attempting to design governance in a socio-engineering manner. These commissions consider it desirable to listen to the opinions of people with diverse cultural and social backgrounds, selecting members with different cultural, experiential, and regional backgrounds, and emphasizing outreach through regional meetings and country- or sector-specific conferences (analogous to the editing of a "norm inventory" by third parties mentioned earlier). Nevertheless, much of the content of their reports reflects specific normative inclinations of the editors, projecting a strong character of "liberal internationalism." The reports from the Commission on Human Security and ICISS also pursue cosmopolitan values while adopting institutional and policy approaches that are liberal internationalist in nature.

The reason for the liberal internationalist nature of the activities of these international commissions partly lies in the backgrounds of their members. While there is an awareness of selecting members from countries with diverse cultural and economic development situations, many are said to be close to social democratic parties in developed countries. There is a tendency to project the image of a domestic welfare state onto the world, making them susceptible to influences from the liberal institutionalist school, such as democratic peace theory and civil society theory. The overlap of members across multiple independent international commissions further accentuates this tendency. Efforts are made to ensure participation from the Global South, yet the participation of conservative leaders from developed countries and the presence of major powers like the United States are limited. Although efforts are made to include diverse geographical perspectives, the outcome remains a product within the "camp" of liberal internationalism.

### **(2) The Emergence of Human Security: Development as a "Compound Norm"**

The emergence of the human security norm can be observed in the report of the Commission on Global Governance. Established in 1992 with the support of then UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the commission aimed to address the dramatic changes in the international society post-Cold War by introducing the concept of global governance as a policy term and advocating for UN reform. The report argues that the cornerstone of global governance should be "core values" that people from different cultural and religious backgrounds can support, including the respect for life, liberty, justice, equality, mutual respect, compassion, and solidarity. The proposal to allow military intervention by the UN Security Council in cases where many lives are lost in domestic conflicts and the government's response is inadequate is carried forward by ICISS. On the other hand, regarding the appropriate form of governance, the commission asserts that fundamentally governments should play the most

important role while advocating for the urgency of UN reform, suggesting that the UN should be complemented by partnerships including governments, NGOs, and corporations, setting a precedent for subsequent reports.

The term "human security" was coined around the same time during NGO consultations for the World Summit for Social Development and in the publication process of the 1993 and 1994 editions of the UNDP's Human Development Reports. The original creators of the new "norm" were economists such as Mahbub ul Haq, NGOs, and the UNDP, which supported them. Human security emerged from the UNDP's lessons that ensuring people's safety is a crucial foundation for implementing human development. This was due to situations where people could not live safely as a result of armed conflicts, increased military expenditure, and the negative aspects of macroeconomic policies by international financial institutions, hindering human development. In the UNDP's "original creation," human security was a compound norm centered on "freedom from want," combining elements such as eradicating hunger and people-centered development.

Examples of "adaptations" by the Japanese and Canadian governments followed, with various actors exhibiting patterns of discourse and practice over how to define human security as a norm. The Japanese government was already interested in the concept during the administrations of Prime Ministers Murayama and Hashimoto, and during Foreign Minister and later Prime Minister Obuchi's tenure, human security was actively introduced as it aligned with his beliefs. As Japan's international policy, human security was mainly consistent with the UNDP's approach but was used to effectively market Japan's financial assistance during the Asian financial crisis under a new brand name and to emphasize changes in Japan's ODA policy since the 1990s.

The Canadian government introduced human security in its international policy due to the need to assert the distinctiveness of Canadian diplomacy, replacing peacekeeping operations, and because of the personal beliefs of Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy. Canada was particularly focused on promoting the Ottawa Process for the abolition of anti-personnel landmines and the establishment of the International Criminal Court, viewing human security as an effective concept for expressing humanitarian diplomacy. As indicated by the title of a pamphlet published by the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, they "adapted" the content of human security in the direction of "freedom from fear."

The introduction of "freedom from fear," referring to the protection of civilians from armed conflict, was an inevitable result of the implications of the norm of human security—centering safety around people. Thus, two approaches to human security—"freedom from want" and "freedom from fear"—were presented, leading to movements toward synthesis centered around the United Nations. In a report written for the Millennium Summit, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan outlined human security as a "compound norm" consisting of two groups of norms: "freedom from want" and "freedom from fear," stating that a coalition of diverse actors is necessary for the UN to realize a people-centered approach.

The Millennium Summit speech by UN Secretary-General Annan catalyzed the editing work towards forming a "compound norm." At the Secretary-General's request and with the support of Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the "Commission on Human Security," co-chaired by Sadako Ogata and Amartya Sen, was established in 2001. The commission aimed to build broad consensus on the human security norm among governments and civil society, submitting the report "Human Security Now" to the Secretary-General in 2003. This report edited the normative elements related to human security, such as the protection of people from violence, refugee safety, poverty alleviation, and health improvement, into a "compound norm" based on

the principle of human security. Additionally, the report emphasized that the realization of human security requires not only "protection" by states and the UN but also the "empowerment" of individuals and communities to enhance their own capabilities, while providing an image of local actors actively participating in governance and collaborating with NGOs, governments, and international organizations. This contrasts with ICISS's focus on "protection" by external actors.

The Commission on Human Security referenced the content of the ICISS report regarding military intervention to save humanitarian crises but did not conduct a detailed examination of specific norms. Thus, while they worked on creating a norm that comprehensively captures people's safety, they avoided direct discussion of humanitarian intervention issues, presenting only a framework that could easily gain broad consensus. On military intervention, where conflicting opinions were anticipated, they intentionally treated it ambiguously in the editing of "norms." Considering the activities of both commissions, it can be said that their work resulted in the editing of a norm that comprehensively addresses human security, although this was partly intended by both commissions as well as a result of pursuing each commission's unique interests. Furthermore, human security exists in a mutually complementary relationship with other compound norms, such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) centered on human development, and the Global Compact (GC), which combines CSR in environmental degradation and child labor.

A common theme observed here is the positioning of states as the fundamental actors in governance for realizing human security, but when this is insufficient, advocating for multisectoral partnerships involving diverse actors as an appropriate mode of action. Human security becomes an issue often in situations where governments cannot adequately provide safety and welfare, and the public sector does not function sufficiently. This necessitates multilateralism and further requires the practice of diverse actors forming partnerships across public and private sectors to address issues collaboratively. This shift indicates a transition in viewing the relationship between governments and NGOs or corporations from one of "conflict" to an "appropriate relationship," namely "partnerships," in terms of appropriate modes of action in global governance.

On the other hand, ICISS, anticipating incidents like large-scale human casualties and ethnic cleansing, discussed the responsibility for people's safety from comprehensive perspectives of prevention, response, and rebuilding. Humanitarian intervention, which gained increased necessity for norm setting through experiences such as the Bosnian and Rwandan conflicts, focused on how to position the relationship between national sovereignty and military intervention for humanitarian purposes. The co-chairs of ICISS were Algerian diplomat Mohamed Sahnoun, who served as a special advisor to the UN Secretary-General, and former Australian Foreign Minister Gareth Evans. The final report, "The Responsibility to Protect," was submitted in 2001, supported by the Canadian government, and reflected Canada's human security concept from the late 1990s.

The report comprehensively discussed aspects of humanitarian intervention, stating that "states should primarily protect their citizens from serious humanitarian crises, but if they lack the will or capacity, the international community has the responsibility to protect," suggesting the use of military force as a last resort. It specified that intervention should be limited to large-scale human casualties and ethnic cleansing, decided under proper authority (the UN Security Council), and that fundamental causes should be addressed to prevent the conflict itself. In doing so, instead of the "right to intervene," which would be difficult for states defending sovereignty to accept, it proposed the "responsibility to protect," attempting to converge international consensus. The logic was that state sovereignty entails responsibility for the

welfare and safety of its citizens and, further, responsibility to the international community through the United Nations, linking state sovereignty with the "responsibility to protect." This served as a bridging idea to reconcile the desire for "humanitarian intervention/interference" with "non-interference in domestic affairs," while also treating "responsibility to protect" as an exception to "non-interference," thus altering but sustaining the domain of the "non-interference" norm.

Human security, as a "compound norm" composed of multiple existing normative elements, has varying levels of support. The Commission on Human Security broadly edited from "freedom from want" to "freedom from fear." The "ambiguity" of the compound norm of human security can be said to have attracted interest from actors with diverse concerns. Regarding "humanitarian intervention," where the Commission on Human Security left ambiguity, ICISS presented "the responsibility to protect." The latter, while a norm carrying a wing of the comprehensive compound norm, still faces hesitation from developing countries regarding attempts to reorganize the principle of non-interference. Compared to other elements of the human security "compound norm," linking it to actual actions may not be easy.

#### **4. Compound Global Governance and Human Security**

How does the formation of "compound norms" reflect emerging practices, and how does it influence the mode of human security governance? Norm "editors" have established states as the fundamental governance actors for realizing human security, yet when states are inadequate, they have normatively embraced partnerships among diverse actors as "appropriate action." How has this been implemented?

##### **(1) Forms of Global Governance and Compound Global Governance**

To consider the characteristics of governance that implements human security as a "compound norm," we must examine the various forms of global governance. Yamamoto classifies global governance based on: ① whether the issue area is single or comprehensive, ② whether the actors are unisectoral or multisectoral, and ③ whether the implementation principle includes only regimes or also networks (Stokke, 1997). Under "compound norms," global governance can potentially encompass all combinations of ① to ③ (eight types). However, emphasizing the new features of human security governance might highlight the following points: Regarding ①, while many activities are implemented in individual areas such as human rights and the environment, the feature brought by "compound norms" is governance that links multiple related issue areas. Regarding ②, in cases where governments are unable to adequately ensure the safety of citizens, external actors such as NGOs, local governments, corporations, and international organizations have sometimes substituted or supplemented the functions of the public sector in the assisted country. Network-type organizations or projects have been formed among actors with different functions, leading to division of labor and accumulation of experience and know-how.

Regarding ③, the principles of governance implementation include three ideal types suggested by Jessop: (i) coordination and cooperation based on rational calculation of mutual benefits like international regimes, (ii) hierarchical organization like command-and-control systems, and (iii) horizontal network formation and reflexive self-organization among actors (Jessop, 2002: 51). In human security, while NGOs or governments sometimes act alone, regulatory regimes between states, such as bans on inhumane weapons, are conventional implementations. However, in recent years, network forms where diverse actors with various resources voluntarily connect for functional purposes, as in (iii), have become prominent. This is because issues have emerged that cannot be effectively addressed by international regimes implemented

only through member state governments. Additionally, in post-conflict countries, there is an increasing combination of hierarchical governance (ii) and functional governance in restoring order and rule of law.

If human security governance possesses all the new features mentioned above, it would closely resemble what Yamamoto calls "compound global governance" in the typology of global governance. This implies ① governance that integrates multiple issue areas, ② diverse actors such as NGOs, corporations, governments, and local governments participating, and ③ not only regimes but also networks and other principles functioning in implementation (Haggard and Simmons, 1987). However, in reality, these features do not always fully constitute governance. Below, we will examine the new forms of network-type governance involving diverse actors and "compound global governance."

## **2) Network-Type Governance and Human Security**

As discussed in Section Three, cooperation and network formation among diverse actors have been regarded by norm "editors" as "appropriate action" for realizing human security. Global networks active in individual international public policy areas are called Global Public Policy Networks (GPPN) (Banuri and Spanger-Siegfried, 2001). GPPN ranges from NGO networks like the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and the Human Security Network of like-minded countries to multisectoral entities like the World Commission on Dams (WCD) (Osborne, 2000). Additionally, the public sector, NGOs, and private sector companies form networks to implement projects, collaboratively addressing human security issues. For example, the "From Mines to Vines" project in post-conflict Croatia linked mine clearance to sustainable employment creation. The international NGO "Roots of Peace" led this initiative with collaboration from the Napa Valley Vintners Association in California, Chevron (providing funding), the U.S. State Department, Croatian municipalities, and Silicon Valley (providing mine detection systems), through division of labor and information sharing (Haufler, 2002). The know-how and knowledge of this network are accumulated as best practices, applied to mine clearance activities in other regions, and further publicized to enhance the legitimacy of the "norm."

The characteristics of public policy networks and network-type projects include: ① mutual complementarity of resources like funding and knowledge towards common goals, ② emergence of trust-building and sharing of best practices, ③ loose horizontal connections between organizations (Ansell and Weber, 1999: 78-81), and ④ self-organization. While the power and interest relations among actors may not be symmetrical, governance is established in networks through resource sharing and division of labor under common goals. This does not necessarily imply a diminished role for governments; rather, as seen in the example above, new roles for public institutions, such as providing public infrastructure and monitoring activities, are created, leading to a reconstruction of the boundaries of the "public."

## **(3) Compound Global Governance: Synthesis and Coordination of Different Governance Principles**

Peacebuilding activities in post-conflict settings exemplify compound global governance. In peacebuilding, international "territorial management" based on hierarchical governance principles occurs alongside diverse actors forming networks and projects engaged in functional governance. UN (international) interim administrations in Bosnia and East Timor are examples of hierarchical governance, conducted as international "territorial management" when the government should govern the territory but lacks the capability or has collapsed (Walsh et al., 2018). In Bosnia, post-Dayton Peace Agreement, interim administration by a High

Representative appointed by the Peace Implementation Council, centered on supporting governments, was implemented on the foundation of security provided by multinational forces. This is international "territorial management" for implementing the peace agreement, stabilizing regional order, building state institutions, and enforcing the rule of law. While the applied norm is primarily "maintenance of order" at the regional and domestic level, which should also be foundational for human security, in reality, contradictions arise for the human security "norm" due to the lack of local participation and paternalism under international governance.

In peacebuilding processes, alongside "territorial management," diverse GPPNs and project-based functional governance operate. In Bosnia, the High Representative's office acts as a hub, forming an international organization network with OSCE (elections), UN and EU (police and judicial reform), and UNHCR (refugee and displaced person support), further implementing various projects in functional areas like education, mine clearance, and refugee support with international NGOs, local NGOs, and governments. The "facilitator" role, mediating between local communities and external actors by capturing community needs, serves as a contact point between local people and GPPNs (Deshler and Edmonds, 2004). The pilot project, "Imagine Coexistence" conducted by UNHCR and local NGOs in Bosnia aimed at reintegrating communities divided by conflict, with local NGO, Genesis' leading efforts to address the needs of opposing local communities through vocational training, reflects the lessons incorporated in the "editing" work of the Commission on Human Security.

Meta-Governance? In compound governance, diverse governance principles, from international regimes to hierarchical governance and networks, can be applied, raising the issue of "meta-governance," which concerns how the relative relationships among different governance principles applied in implementing public values are adjusted (Jessop, 2002: 51-52). Under the "compound norm" of human security, it involves determining the balance in which different governance principles are employed and the manner of adjusting and modifying interrelations. Using peacebuilding as an example, it might involve strategies to leverage the benefits (e.g., order maintenance) brought by international territorial management for the safety of people in the assisted country while utilizing other governance principles (ensuring people's participation through networks) to address drawbacks (lack of democracy). Clarifying this principle will be a task in the study of "compound global governance" (Ansell, 2018).

## **Conclusion**

Human security, while adopting a people-centered approach, has been formed as a "compound norm" that integrates normative elements across various fields such as development, environment, and human rights, and is currently in the process of disseminating to diverse actors. The strong expectation to address humanitarian crises has led to the proposal of the "responsibility to protect." However, there is insufficient normative support for the use of military force for this purpose, and the Commission on Human Security has attempted to build a broad consensus while leaving some ambiguity. In relation to national security norms, although some factions emphasize the aspect of human security as a counter-norm, there is likely to be a mutual "adjustment" and stabilization of these domains in the future. In the problem areas related to human security, the positive role played by the state (or national security) is being re-evaluated and incorporated, and in national security, consideration for human security is becoming necessary. Assuming this process progresses, in the long term, human security may become a norm that states naturally need to consider.

Human security governance is a continuous process that comprehensively addresses multiple problem areas related to human safety, creates new normative standards, and reorganizes

various activities. Its mechanisms include not only traditional international regimes but also hierarchical principles like international territorial administration, and heterarchical principles like GPPNs. Furthermore, the focus is on the nature of "meta-governance" for the mutual coordination of these mechanisms. Within these new developments, there is a visible first step from the Westphalian system, where sovereign states have exclusive authority, towards a "post-Westphalian system" with diverse authorities, but this does not necessarily signify the decline of sovereign states. States remain central institutions in governance and, because they hold sovereignty, are increasingly required to adhere to numerous norms, including human security. Human security governance faces several normative challenges, such as the lack of participation by the people of the recipient (or intervened) countries in the decision-making process, accountability issues arising from the involvement of non-governmental actors in public policy, and the value biases and paternalism of governments and NGOs from developed countries. It might be the characteristic of "compound norms" to adjust these issues arising from such practices and incorporate them as normative elements.

## Reference

- Acharya, Amitav (2004) 'How Ideas Spread: Whose Norms Matter? Norm Localization and Institutional Change in Asian Regionalism', *International Organization*, 58(2), pp. 239-275. DOI: 10.1017/S0020818304582024.
- Anan, Kofi (2001) *'We the Peoples' : The Role of the United Nations, 21st Century / Kofi A. Annan, Secretary-General of the United Nations*. New York: UN Department of Public Information.
- Ansell, Chris (2018) 'When Collaborative Governance Scales Up: Lessons from Global Public Health About Compound Collaboration', *How Does Collaborative Governance Scale? : Policy Press*, pp. 95-116.
- Ansell, Christopher K. and Weber, Steven (1999) 'Organizing International Politics: Sovereignty and Open Systems', *International political science review*, 20(1), pp. 73-93. DOI: 10.1177/0192512199201004.
- Ayoob, Mohammed (2002) 'Humanitarian Intervention and State Sovereignty', *The international journal of human rights*, 6(1), pp. 81-102.
- Banuri, Tariq and Spanger-Siegfried, Erika (2001) *Global Public Policy Networks: An Emerging Innovation In*. Stokhom: Stokhom Environment Institute-Boston Center.
- Beitz, Charles R. (1979) *Political Theory and International Relations*. [Revised edition]. edn.: Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press.
- Bull, Hedley (1966) 'The Grotian Conception of International Society', in Butterfield, H. & Wight, M. (eds.) *Diplomatic Investigations: Essays in the Theory of International Politics*: London: Allen and Unwin, pp. 51-73.
- Bull, Hedley (1977) *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. London: Macmillan.
- Commission on Global, Governance (1995) *Our Global Neighbourhood : The Report of the Commission on Global Governance*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Crandall, Christian S, Eshleman, Amy and O'brien, Laurie (2002) 'Social Norms and the Expression and Suppression of Prejudice: The Struggle for Internalization', *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 82(3), pp. 359-378.
- Deshler, David and Edmonds, Kirby (2004) 'Conflict Management and Collaborative Problem-Solving in a Protected Area in Ghana', in Lovan, R., Murray, M. & Shaffer, R. (eds.) *Participatory Governance: Planning, Conflict Mediation and Public Decision-Making in Civil Society*: Ithaca: Cornell University, pp. 129-146.
- Erskine, Toni (2003) *Can Institutions Have Responsibilities?: Collective Moral Agency and International Relations*. London: Springer.

- Eves, Carol-Anne (2006) *Continuity and Japan's Inaugural Human Security-Centred Foreign Policy*. Calgary: University of Calgary.
- Finnemore, Martha (2017) *National Interests in International Society*. 1st . edn.: Ithaca, NY : Cornell University Press.
- Finnemore, Martha and Sikkink, Kathryn (1998) 'International Norm Dynamics and Political Change', *Int Org*, 52(4), pp. 887-917. DOI: 10.1162/002081898550789.
- Fukushima, Akiko and Tow, William T (2009) 'Human Security and Global Governance', *Security Politics in the Asia-Pacific: A Regional-Global Nexus*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 167-187.
- Garcia, Denise (2015) 'Humanitarian Security Regimes', *International Affairs*, 91(1), pp. 55-75.
- Goldstein, Judith, Keohane, Robert O. and Social Science Research Council . Committee on Foreign Policy, Studies (2019) *Ideas and Foreign Policy : Beliefs, Institutions, and Political Change*. 1st . edn.: Ithaca, NY : Cornell University Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1992) 'Future Reflections on the Public Sphere', in Calhoun, C. (ed.) *Habermas and the Public Sphere* Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 421-461.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1998) 'Human Rights: Global and Internal', in Cronin, C. & De Greiff, P. (eds.): Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. pp. 165-238.
- Haggard, Stephan and Simmons, Beth A (1987) 'Theories of International Regimes', *International organization*, 41(3), pp. 491-517.
- Haq, Mahbub ul (2023) *Reflections on Human Development : How the Focus of Development Economics Shifted from National Income Accounting to People-Centred Policies, Told by One of the Chief Architects of the New Paradigm*. Oxford University Press.
- Haufler, Virginia (2002) 'Case Studies of Multistakeholder Partnership: Policy Dialogue on Business in Zones of Conflict ', in Haufler, V. (ed.) *Un Global Compact*: New York: UNDP, pp. 47-55.
- Hewson, Martin (1999) *Approaches to Global Governance Theory*. Albany, NY Albany: Albany, NY : State University of New York Press.
- High-level Panel, UN (2004) 'A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility', *Terrorism*, 145(164), pp. 97–198.
- Hysing, Erik (2021) 'Responsibilization: The Case of Road Safety Governance', *Regulation & Governance*, 15(2), pp. 356-369.
- ICISS, International Commission on Intervention, Sovereignty, State and Centre, International Development Research (2001) *The Responsibility to Protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty*. New York: IDRC.
- Ikeda, Daisaku (2019) *Toward a New Era of Peace and Disarmament: A People-Centered Approach*. Tokyo: Soka Gakkai.
- Jackson, Robert H. (2000) *The Global Covenant : Human Conduct in a World of States*. New York : Oxford University Press.
- Jessop, Bob (2002) *The Future of the Capitalist State. Capitalist State*: Cambridge, UK : Polity Malden, MA : Distributed in the USA by Blackwell Pub.
- Jockel, Joe and Sokolsky, Joel (2001) 'Lloyd Axworthy's Legacy: Human Security and the Rescue of Canadian Defence Policy', *International Journal*, 56(1), pp. 1-18.
- Klotz, Audie (2018) *Norms in International Relations Theory*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Knight, Andy (2008) 'Equivocating on the Future of World Order', in Thakur, R., Cooper, A.F., English, J. & Agarwal, Y. (eds.) *International Commissions and the Power of Ideas: Vol. 3*: New York: United Nation University Press pp. 99-121.
- McRae, Rob, Hubert, Don and Richmond, Oliver (2004) 'Human Security and the New

- Diplomacy: Protecting People, Promoting Peace', *Peace and conflict*, 10(2), pp. 185-188. Available at: [http://snu-primho.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/82SNU:TN\\_cdi\\_proquest\\_miscellaneous\\_38006450](http://snu-primho.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/82SNU:TN_cdi_proquest_miscellaneous_38006450).
- Newman, Edward (2005) 'Human Security', *St Antony's International Review*, 1(2), pp. 24-36.
- Nussbaum, Martha Craven (2000) *Women and Human Development : The Capabilities Approach*. New York : Cambridge University Press.
- Osborne, Stephen (2000) *Public-Private Partnerships*. London: Routledge
- Rawls, John (1993) 'The Law of Peoples', *Critical inquiry*, 20(1), pp. 36-68.
- Risse-Kappen, Thomas, Ropp, Steve C. and Sikkink, Kathryn (1999) *The Power of Human Rights : International Norms and Domestic Change*. New York : Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenau, James N (1992) *Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Runhaar, Hens and Lafferty, Helene (2009) 'Governing Corporate Social Responsibility: An Assessment of the Contribution of the Un Global Compact to Csr Strategies in the Telecommunications Industry', *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84, pp. 479-495.
- Sakhi, Nilofar (2022) 'A People-Centered Approach to Development and Human Security in Afghanistan', *Pulte Institute for Global Development Policy Brief (Nov.)*, 14, pp. 1-6.
- Stokke, Olav Schram (1997) 'Regimes as Governance Systems', *Global governance: Drawing insights from the environmental experience*, pp. 27-63.
- Thakur, Ramesh (2008) 'Intervention, Sovereignty and the Responsibility to Protect', in Thakur, R., Cooper, A.F., English, J. & Agarwal, Y. (eds.) *International Commissions and the Power of Ideas: Vol. 3*, pp. 180-197.
- Vincent, Raymond John (1986) *Human Rights and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walsh, Dawn, Walsh, Dawn and Finotello (2018) *Territorial Self-Government as a Conflict Management Tool*. Springer.