Sustainable Security: The Role of Promoting Democracy and Protecting Human Rights

Selim Kanat1, Bahadır Eser2

1Vise Chairman of Dept. of International Relations.

Suleyman Demirel University. I.I.B.F Oda no. 210

Isparta/Turkey

2Dept of Public Administration

Suleyman Demirel University. I.I.B.F Oda no. 209

Isparta/Turkey

Abstract

Today's security threats are more complex than traditional ones, such as HIV, climate change, human rights violations, anti-democratic laws and measures forced us to think about the definition and the context of security again. With the effect of these new threats, sustainable security concept emerged from a post- Cold War multi-disciplinary understanding of security. Sustainable security redefines how we think about national security in today's shifting, after Cold War era. Struggling with these new threats, especially struggling with

terrorism requires new approaches to security. The traditional understanding which predicts balancing human rights and security measures is not valid anymore. In today's security understanding promoting democracy and protecting human rights are not causes of insecurity, contrarily terrorism, which considered as the greatest threat to world security after Sept 11, wants to create a "police state" to find support their own ideology. Further more terrorism aiming to demolish democracy and human rights in society; with this, life become insecure, state become more totalitarian and terrorist acts become more reasonable. For this characteristic, terrorism called the "disease of democracies". For this reason promoting democracy and protecting human rights are the key elements of sustainable security especially in struggling terrorism

1.Traditional Approaches towards Security.

From traditional view, national security effectively can maintain only with military means. Protecting boarder lines via strong and destructive armies is typical way of ensuring security. Traditional approaches to national or international security are dominated by political realism in practical level, but also traditional approaches to security find its philosophical basis in Hobbes' minds. For Hobbes maintaining security is the basic reason of formation of the state (Hobbes, 1651, pp. 103-107). Because, state of nature is insecure and anarchical for individuals. Every men gives up his some basic freedoms, and rights which he has naturally in the state of nature, simultaneously and permanently to being secure under the rule of commonwealth (Kanat, 2011, p. 124-125). So in traditional approaches if a one want being in secure, he should give up some basic freedoms and rights which he already has. For this understanding security and freedoms are two controversial concepts which have to be balanced.

This philosophical opinions, found its modern application basis after the The Peace of Westphalia. Under the logic of Westphalia system the security of the state is "being secure of border, territory and the sovereignty of the state and for this holding the military capacity and political power of the state in the possible highest level" (Bislev, 2004, p. 282). State has a central position about security issues in traditional understanding. (Bilgin, 2002, 102). Ensuring the security of the state is the primary goal of the government. For this, some rights of the individuals can be sacrificed.

After the World War II traditional approaches toward security has adopted by political realism, and security studies began as an independent field of study, but was absorbed as a sub-field of international relations (Buzan & Hansen, 2009, p. 1). Similarly ensuring the security of the state should be the primary goal of a government. In international level, security can be maintained by military force and "balance of power" politics. Also in realist thought, balance of power is the key element of traditional approaches towards international

security during the Cold War era. Kenneth Waltz, a major contributor to neorealism underlines the importance of "balance of power" approach. He expressed in his book, "Theory of International Politics" that "if there is any distinctively political theory of international politics, balance-of-power theory is it."(Waltz, 1979, pp.13-16)

According to Morgenthau, who is regularly identified as the father of modern realism, and the precursor of neoclassical realism, within a balance of power system, a state may choose to engage in either balancing or bandwagoning behavior. (Morgenthau,1948, pp. 125-134). In a time of war, also in an anarchical structure of the relations between states, the decision to balance or to bandwagon may well determine the survival and the security of the state. For traditional view every state should behave individually to maintain own security, because in an anarchical nature, everyone is an enemy for everyone and a state or a man can't trust to another. This situation is a result of mercenary and selfish character of human nature. (Neacsu, 2009, pp. 54-56) Morgenthau points to the limitless character of humans' lust for/will to power: while man's vital needs 'are capable of satisfaction', the lust for power 'would be satisfied only if the last man became an object of his domination, there being nobody above or beside him, that is, if he became like God' (Morgenthau, 1948, p. 165). As Morgenthau maintains, 'the selfishness of man has limits; his will to power has none' (Morgenthau, 1948, p. 165)

For the anarchical structure of international relations, threats towards security are usually generated by enemy states or enemy groups like terrorist organizations or criminals in domestic level, from traditional view. Every state must be powerful and ready to being in a possible war every time. Because everyone and every state has a "will to power" (Jütersonke, 2007, p. 101). We can see this understanding in maintaining security in Cold War era. States generally maintain their security via strong armies, establishing or joining alliances and conventional-nuclear weapons in international level.

Traditional security relied on the anarchistic balance of power, a military build-up between the two superpowers, and on the absolute sovereignty of the nation state. (Owen, 2004, p. 16). Under the "balance of terror" and nuclear deterrence, states takes the security of the state as a prior issue and push some freedoms and rights like right to live in a clean environment which people have against state, in to the background. Because, during the Cold War, the issues about national security have seen as "high politics" (Waltz, 1970, p.212) and the politics which aims to improve welfare and wealth in cooperation have seen as "low politics" (Gürkaynak & Yalçıner, 2009, p. 78). But with the end of Cold War old type of security threats lose their importance in ensuring national security. World have faced new threats which endanger human life, like climate change, and this new threats can be solved in cooperation. So, states forced to expand the scope of security. Ensuring welfare and wealth, protecting human life and right became an element of national security, and also "high politics"

2.Emerge of Sustainable Security Concept.

Sustainable security redefines how we think about national security in today's shifting, after Cold War era. Also this post-Cold War debate about security has been the issue of

broadening the concept from its Cold War norms. One harbinger of this, from within neorealist International Relations, was Barry Buzan's People, States and Fear, written in the early 1980s (Booth, 1997, p. 86). Buzan emphasis that although the military-oriented approaches to the security, during the 1970's economic and environmental concerns started to rising up (Buzan, 1991, p. 4). With the finish of the Cold War era, traditional security understanding has been started to be questioned. The opportunity for a new global order, based on protecting humans rather than states, presented new hope.(Bedeski, 2007, p. X).

With the collapse of Soviet Union and Eastern Block, the old type of enemies has been collapsed simultaneously all over world. Rapid change of international system, the globalization process, the reduced threat of nuclear war between superpowers and the emerge of complex new threats such as HIV, climate change, human rights violations, anti-democratic laws and measures forced us to think about the definition and the context of security again (Mcrae, 2001, p.22.). With the effect of these new threats, we can say that sustainable security concept emerged from a post- Cold War multi-disciplinary understanding of security.

Sustainable security focuses on the interconnected, long-term causes of insecurity around the world. We can say climate change, competition over resources, marginalization of the majority world, global militarization as threats for sustainable security. Sustainable security promotes a comprehensive, systemic approach to maintain the safety of the entire world people. It also places particular attention on how the current behaviour of international actors and western governments is contributing to, rather than reducing, insecurity. The politics of the states, which has described according to national interests, creates insecurity rather than security. Sustainable security goes beyond analysis of threats to the development of a framework for new security policies.

From this perspective, sustainable security concept also refers to human security understanding as well. Because sustainability in security, can not be achieved with pushing people and their minds into the background. States can not be secure notwithstanding insecurity of its people. Also, if we think about origins of state, all we should agree that human security is the primary purpose of organizing a state in the beginning as Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau concluded (Owen, 2004, p. 16- 17). Human security offers much to this vibrant field of sustainable development. Most notably, human security—like human development—highlights the social dimension of sustainable development's three pillars: environment, economy, society (Khagram &Clarck &Raad, 2003, p. 290)

If we mention about sustainability in security we have follow the foresights of human security understanding. Human security derives from the traditional concept of security from military threats to the safety of people and communities.(Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy, 2007, p. 81, 228). Because the nature of the conflicts has been changed. During the Cold War, in conflict analyses, there was no room for people. But in recent decades, this trend has been changing. Take for example the armed conflicts of Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Afghanistan, East Timor, Macedonia, Kosovo, Bosnia, and the international terror organizations that target the western world. (Gough, 2002, p. 145)

For "Human Development Report" of United Nations human security is an extension of mere existence (survival) to well-being and dignity of human beings. 1994 Human Development Report of United Nations Development Programme can be considered milestone publication about human security and also sustainable security. Report defines security as "freedom from fear" and "freedom from want"(Human Development Report 1994). As a result of this almost everything which endangers human life and standards can be consider a threat in this understanding. For this reason there is no single definition of human security, and also there is no single and constant definition of threats to security. Today global warming and climate change can be consider as a threat, but tomorrow the greatest threat would be lack of clean water sources. But we can say that the definition varies from a narrow term of prevention of violence to a broad comprehensive view that proposes development, human rights and traditional security together. Human security argues that the core target of national security should be individual rather than state. Human security is the life-safety of individuals. In other words human security put the human in the center of security debates (Thakur, 2003, p. 347). In this context it has a human-centered view of security, that necessary for national, regional and global stability and peace in today's world.

With a general discourse, human security offers a critique of and advocates an alternative to the traditional state-based conception of security. Essentially, it argues that the proper referent for security is the individual and that state practices should reflect this rather than primarily focusing on securing borders through unilateral military action. Because the threats to human well-being are undoubtedly greater in number and scope today than when the United Nations system came into being in 1945. The scale of security challenges has ''blown out'' as a consequence of rapid population growth and the increased sophistication of communications and weapons technologies, which in turn has quickened the pace at which security threats can be transmitted within and across national boundaries (Battersby & Siracusa, 2009, p. 9)

Furthermore some threats which endanger individual security can and also should be solved in cooperation. Because, sometimes the nature of the threat requires this. For instance climate change, environmental pollution are global security problems, and all states should struggle them in cooperation. For this reason, the human security approach is said to be that the traditional conception of security is no longer appropriate or effective in the highly interconnected and interdependent modern world in which global threats such as poverty, environmental degradation, and especially terrorism supersede the traditional security threats of interstate attack and warfare.

3.New Security Threats: Terrorism and Sustainable Security

With the end of Cold War, old types of treats have lost their importance in maintenance national security. Because world was not divided any more and enemy states faced simultaneously new same treats. For example climate change began to be seen as the mother of all security problems (Brown & Hammill & McLemman, 2007, 1141). Like that; environmental pollution, failed states, international piracy become more important than

before. But as an international threat, terrorism has the biggest effect on security after the Cold War. Especially after Sept. 11 terrorism became the major threat to international security.

But actually terrorism isn't a new type of treat. This type of violence has been used for ages. We can see first samples of modern terrorism in first-century Palestine. The history of terrorism back almost 2000 years ago when the Jewish resistance group known as Sicarii-Zealots (AD 66–72) "carried out terrorist campaigns to force insurrection against the Romans in Judea.(Garrison, 2003, p. 44) The Zealot sect was one of the very first groups to practice systematic terror of which we possess a written account (Chaliand & Blin, 2007, p.55). The Zealot sect, also known in Latin as Sicarii, use terrorism to create terror in their enemies' minds. They murdered their enemies and even innocent victims to achieve their own political aims with creating terror and fear. Their acts were symbolic to give messages to public. Sicarii's can be accepted first group which use terrorism toward authority.

After Zealots, we can mention Assasins, which use violence as a weapon for their political aims too. The Assassins were an order of Nizari Ismailis, particularly those of Persia and Syria that formed around 1092. Posing a strong military threat to Sunni Saljuq authority within the Persian territories, the Nizari Ismailis captured and inhabited many mountain fortresses under the leadership of Hassan-i Sabbah (Combs & Slann, 2007, pp 47-48).

We can increase the number of pre-examples but all these are in the same side of violence: towards to authority. However the first case study of "state terror" have seen after the French Revolution, with Robespierre administration. Robespierre use terror to maintain administrative stability after the revolution. He used terror to defeat probable opposite revolution. The historical study of terrorism largely focused on the French Revolution and the reaction to it. The "Reign of Terror" and the activities of the Committee of Public Safety provided the foundation for the study of modern terrorism with the emphasis on how states engaged in "terrorism from above," "regime terrorism" and "state terrorism"(Sloan, 2008, pp.4-5). But at that time Robespierre sees terrorism as a rational and virtuous policy, and as necessity to protect revolution and state. He said that "virtue without which terror is fatal, terror without which virtue is impotent" (Herbst, 2003, p. 164).

Before the next evolution of the concept, we mention World War II and Cold War period, world have testified Nazis' and Fascists' state terrorism. Mussolini and Hitler use terrorism to suppress opposition and strengthen their authority (Kanat, 2011, p.87). Historians estimated that five- six million Jews were tortured and killed during the Hitler's administration, also named Third Reich (Laqueur & Baumel, 2001, p.xiv). After the World War II, states gathered around two super power and world dived as West and East. During the Cold War, with the effect of nuclear deterrence, super powers both fear from engaged to a possible hot war. Especially after the Cuban Missile and U2 Crisis super powers realize that a possible nuclear war could be the end of the humanity and world.

During this period, terrorism becomes a tool in struggling with enemy states which were in the opposite block. Eastern states gave support to terrorist groups which were harmful for western states. We can say that during the 1960s, opposition to the Vietnam War produced a

57

wave of "New Left" terrorism, as radical groups in Europe, Latin America and the United States, undertook campaigns of political kidnappings, assassinations and bombings in furtherance of vague Marxist-Leninist-Maoist political agendas and woolly headed demands for "social justice" (Shughart, 2006, p. 21). Also Hoffman agreed that at the height of the cold war, the majority of terrorist groups were left-wing revolutionary Marxist Leninist ideological organizations. (Hoffman, 2006, p.85) At the same time Western states condoned anti-democratic measures of their own allies in struggling with terrorist groups. Worldwide, 74% of countries that used torture on an administrative basis were U.S. client states, receiving military and other support to retain power. They concluded that the global rise in state terror was a result of U.S. foreign policy (Sluka, 1999, p.8).

With the end of Cold War, terrorism began to have seen the primary threat to international security. The last and most significant change in terrorism concept happened with the end of Cold War. This significant change creates a "new" terrorism. 1993 World Trade Center attack, Tokyo subway attacks, Oklahoma city bombing and so many incidents showed to us and also states, terrorism became a very important threat for security than ever (Weinberg& Eubank, 2006, p. 1-3).If we look the motivations behind the attacks we can easily say that ideological motivation in terrorism has mostly ended by the end of Cold War. As a result of this, terrorism became more independent and more imponderable. We can easily say that terrorism today is a worldwide phenomenon (Garrison, 2003, p. 39).

The logic of terrorist attacks have changed in the new terrorism. Formerly terrorist not aimed to kill so many people in their attacks. The symbolic characteristic of the attacks in terrorism is primary. Terrorist organizations didn't aim to kill so many innocents in their attacks. But in new terrorism, besides the symbolic characteristic, killing so many people is becoming an aim of the attacks. For example IRA (Irish Republican Army) have killed 2618 people in its attacks between the years 1969-1987, but only the Sept 11 attack there are 2823 people have died (Eriş, p. 361-362). In the new terrorism the success of the attack began to describe with the number of people who died in the attack. Besides this fact, terrorism start to use high technology in explosives, weapons and communication, information technologies. This reality makes terrorism a global, unpredictable, very close and important threat.

It's important because, it has "double effect" on sustainability of security. First, terrorism aims to take people life to achieve its own political goals. Yes it's true that the main aim of attacks is not killing people, the real aim is create terror in people' mind. But it's obvious and clear that terrorism endangers security in individual and public level both. This is the direct effect of terrorism on security. Second, terrorism has an indirect effect on security. When a terrorist campaign launched in one state, that state usually strengthened its security measures. For this states occasionally suspend and even scarify some basic rights and freedoms of citizens in struggling with terrorism. But this tendency of states generally doesn't maintain the security in public. Ironically precautions which have taken to maintain the security become the one of the source of terrorism in time. Because while the state behaving to innocent civilians as a terrorist, no one feels himself secure. This situation endangers the security in life. Because of this, one can easily liken terrorism to a double edges sword (Friedland & Merari, 1985, p. 592-595). A life bereft of democracy and filled with human

58

right violations can not be secure. Sustainability in security requires promoting democracy and protecting human rights.

4.The Role of Promoting Democracy and Protecting Human Rights.

After Sept. 11 attacks terrorism became the prior threat to world security. Almost every state and international organization start dealing with the question of how international terrorism can be stopped? For instance, United States adopt the PATRIOT Act (PATRIOT Act http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ56/pdf/PLAW-107publ56.pdf) immediately, so was Canada hastily enacted the Anti- Terrorism Act (ATA) and as an international organization NATO invoked Article 5 of the Washington Treaty for the first time in its history following the Sept.11 terrorist attacks against the United States (Brown, 2006, pp. 27-32) and almost every state around the world started to review its own domestic anti-terrorist laws and measures. But in reviewing the general tendency is reducing human rights standards for ensuring security in struggling with terrorism.

For instance the PATRIOT Act gives federal officials greater authority to track and intercept communications, both for law enforcement and foreign intelligence gathering purposes. It seeks to further close United States borders to foreign terrorists and to detain and remove those within our borders by behaving especially Middle Eastern or Muslim foreigners like potential terrorist. It creates new crimes, new penalties, and new procedural short-cuts for use against domestic and international terrorists (Doyle, 2002, p. 1) In the wake of numerous changes made in U.S. law and that of many other countries following the September 11 terrorist attack, civil libertarians, libertarians, and many others have raised concerns that the nations involved are sacrificing their liberty to enhance their safety.

Likewise Canadian Anti- Terrorism Act (ATA), deeply impacts human rights and civil liberties. After the Sept. 11 Canada choose scarifying civil liberties in the name of protecting the nation from terrorism threat. With the changes to the Canadian Evidence Act; the establishment of INSET (Integrated National Security Enforcement Teams), cross-border anti terrorism police force; the draconian provisions within the ATA, and also changes to Security of Information Act, Canada has systematically and secretively undermined core democratic national values such as human rights, civil liberties and national sovereignty (Lott, 2006, p. 2).

Examples can be increased, England, Spain even Australia and Thailand (Kocher, 2007, p. 25-42) , but the common matter is almost every state have a tendency that reducing human rights and democracy in struggling terrorism. In another words in the presence of political, ethnic, or religious strife, governments appear to be more likely to adopt broad counterterrorism policies and commit human rights abuses. (Omelicheva, 2007, p. 188) Especially Muslim communities around the world have been victims of violence and discriminately denied their rights: and governmenet have been able to justify the suppression of groups and organizations that oppose them (Kocher, p. 43). In addition to spurring a global proliferation of aggres.sive counter terrorism measures, the United States has at times

actively undermined judicial authority in nations whose court systems are just beginning to mature. In one such instance, Bosnian authorities transferred six Algerian men into U.S. custody at the request of U.S. officials, in violation of that nation's domestic law. The Bosnian police bad arrested the men, five of whom also had Bosnian citizenship, in October 2001 on suspicion that they bad links with al Qaeda. In January 2002, the Bosnian Supreme Court ordered them released for lack of evidence. But instead of releasing them, Bosnian authorities banded them over to U.S. troops serving with NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization]-led peacekeepers. Despite an injunction from the Human Rights Chamber of Bosnia and Herzegovina expressly ordering that four of the men remain in the country for further proceedings, the men were shortly thereafter transported to the detention camp at Guantanamo. (Posner, 2005, p. 222)

But it is obvious that this method of ensuring security is not sustainable. Actually this way is what terrorism wants. But one want sustainability in security, especially in struggling with terrorism, should behave in respect to human rights. We shouldn't forget that in the post-Cold War 1990s, human rights values and institutions played greater role in establishing stability in the global order and ensuring more democratic forms of political and economic participation at the local level. We can easily say those years global security have maintained through human rights. (Wilson, 2005, p. 3-6).

For sustainability in ensuring the security of individuals "fighting the symptoms" will not work, you must instead "cure the disease". Granting fundamental rights and promoting democratic principles makes society more secure. We should not forget that extremist movements always fed from corrupted democratic structures. Totalitarian and anti-democratic policies in democracies create extremist also terrorist structuring. This is why terrorism named as "the disease of the democracies". In this way security and human rights-democratic principles are not two controversial concepts which have to be balanced. Contrarily they are complementary concepts. With respecting fundamental rights and freedoms one source of nutrition would be eradicated. Terrorist organizations couldn't be found supporters to their ideas or actions any more, and with promoting democracy extremist ideas can be found a discharge area, and this aggressions be solved in peaceful manner.

REFERENCES

Battersby, P & Siracusa, J. M. (2009), Globalization and Human Security, Maryland, USA, Rowman& Littlefield Publishers.

Bedeski, R. E. (2007), Human Security and the Chinese State, New York, NY, Routledge

Bilgin, P. (2002) "Beyond Statism in Security Studies? Human Agency and Security in the Middle East", Review of International Affairs, Vol. 2, Issue. 1.

Bislev, S. (2004) "Globalization, State Transformation and Public Security", International Political Science Review, Vol. 25, No. 3, s. 282.

Booth, K. (1997) "Security and Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realist", Critical Security Studies, (Ed. Keith Krausse, Michael C. Williams), Minnesota, USA, University of Minnesota Press.

Brown, D. (2006), "The War on Terrorism would not be Possible without NATO: A Critique", Where is NATO Going?, London and New York, Eng, NY, Routledge.

Brown, O.& Hammill, A. & McLeman, (2007), P. "Climate change as the 'new' security threat: implications for Africa", International Affairs, No. 83: Blackwell Publishing

Buzan, B. & Hansen, L. (2009), New York, USA, The Evolution of International Security Studies, Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, B. (1991), People States & Fear, Colorado, USA, Lynne Rienner Publishing.

Chaliand. G., Blin, A., (2007). "Zealots and Assassins", The History of Terrorism From Antiquity to Al-Qaeda, Berlley & L.A, CA, University of California Press.

Combs, C. C & Slann, M.(2007). Encyclopedia of Terrorism, Revised Edition. New York, NY, Infobase Publishing.

Doyle, C., (2002), "The USA PATRIOT Act: A Legal Analysis", CRS Report for Congress.

Eriş, H. E. (2000), IRA(İrlanda Cumhuriyet Ordusu), Terörizm İncelemeleri Teori, Örgütler, Olaylar, Ankara, Turkey, Avrasya Stratejik Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları.

Friedland, N. & Merari, A.(1985), "The Psychological Impact of Terrorism: A Double-Edged Sword", Political Psychology,Vol. 6, No. 4.

Garrison, A. H. (2003), "Terrorism: The Nature of Its History", Criminal Justice Studies, Vol. 16(1).

Gough, M. (2002), "Human Security: The Individual in the Security Question - The Case of Bosnia", Contemporary Security Policy,Vol. 23 No.3

Gürkaynak, M. & Yalçıner, S. (2009) "Uluslararası Politikada Karşılıklı Bağımlılık ve Küreselleşme Üzerine Bir İnceleme", Uluslararası İlişkiler, Cilt 6, Sayı 23.

Herbst. P., (2003), Talking Terrorism A Dictionary of the Loaded of Political Violence, London, Eng, Greenwood Press,

Hobbes, T. (1651), Leviathan, London, Eng, Printed for Andrew Crooke.

Hoffman, B. (2006), Inside Terrorism, New York, NY, Colombian University Press.

Jütersonke, O. (2007), "The Image of Law in Politics Among Nations", Realism Reconsidered, New York, US, Oxford University Press.

Kanat. S. (2011), Transformation of Terrorism Security and NATO under the Context of Realism, Isparta, Turkey, Unpublished Phd Thesis.

Khagram, S. & Clark, W. C. & Raad, D. F. (2003), "From the Environment and Human Security to Sustainable Security and Development", Journal of Human Development, Vol. 4, No. 2.

Kocher, L., The Impact of Terrorism on Human Rights: Consequences of War on Terror, London, Eng, Unpublished MAB Thesis.

Laqueur, W. & Baumel, J. T., (2001), The Holocaust Encyclopedia, London, Eng, Yale University Press,

Lott, J. A. (2006), Anti- Terrorism in Canada: Select Impact to Civil Liberties and Human Security, Toronto, Can, Unpublished MBA Thesis

Mcrae, R. (2001). "Human Security in a Globalized World", Human Security and the New Diplomacy Protecting People, Promoting Peace, (Ed. Rob Mcrae, Don Hubert), Canada, Mcgill-Queen's University Pres.

Morgenthau, J. H.(1948), Politics Among Nations, Struggle for Power and Peace, New York, NY, Alfred A. Knopf Inc.

Neacsu, M. (2009), Hans J. Morgenthau's Theory of International Relations, London, GB, Palgrave Macmillan.

Omelicheva, M. Y. (2007), Counterterrorism and Human Rights: Explaining Differences in the Scope and Brutality of States' Responses to Terrorism, West Lafayette, IN, Unpublished PhD Thesis.

Owen, T. (2004). "Challenges and Opportunities for Defining and Measuring Human Security", Human Rights, Human Security and Disarmament, Disarmament Forum. 3.

PATRIOT Act of USA. http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ56/pdf/PLAW-107publ56.pdf> 22. 04. 2012.

Posner, M. (2005), "Human Rights First", Congressional Digest.

Shughart, W. F. II. (2006) "An Analytical History of Terrorism, 1945-2000", Public Choice, Vol. 128, No. ½,.

Sloan. S.,(2008). The Evolution of Terrorism as a Global Test of Wills: A Personal Assessment and Perspective, Oklohoma City, USA, MIPT Publishing.

Sluka,, J. A., editor (1999). Death Squad: The Anthropology of State Terror. University of Pennsylvania Press

Tadjbakhsh, S. & Chenoy, A. M. (2007). Human Security-Concepts and Implications, New York, NY, Routledge.

Thakur, R. (2003) "A Political World View", Contemporary Security Policy, Vol. 24, No. 1.

United Nations Human Development Report 1994, <http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr1994/chapters/> 29.04.2012

Waltz, K. N. (1970). "The Myth of National Interdependence", The International Corporation: A Symposium, Charles P. Kindelberger (Ed.), Cambridge, MIT Press,

Waltz, K. N. (1979). Theory of International Politics. New York. NY, Random House.

Weinberg, L. Eubank, W. L. (2006), The Roots of Terrorism, What is Terrorism, Reno, Nevada, Chelsea House Publishers.

Wilson, R. A. (2005), "Human Rights in the 'War on Terror'", Human Rights in the 'War on Terror', New York, NY, Cambridge University Press