April 2017

Journal of Conflict Transformation & Security

Building Human Security through Humanitarian Protection and Assistance: the Potential of the International Committee of the Red Cross

By Dr. Christy Shucksmith*

Abstract

Current academic literature neglects the relationship between human security and humanitarian protection and assistance, and does not consider engagement with the law and practice of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) as a tool to realise human security. This article examines the protection and assistance mandate of the ICRC and its expansion from humanitarian aid provision to long-term projects. Doctrinal research and primary data collected through in-depth semi-structured interviews are used to ascertain whether the ICRC contributes to the transformation of conflict-affected communities into more secure environments, with a particular focus on the Democratic Republic of Congo. Although the ICRC's mandate does not expressly provide for initiatives focused on human security, many of its actions contribute positively towards the progressive realization of secure environments during and after armed conflict.

Key words: Human security, humanitarian principles, International Committee of the Red Cross, human rights, International Humanitarian Law.

* Dr. Christy Shucksmith is a Senior Lecturer at Lincoln Law School and the co-director of the Conflict and Disasters Research Group. Her first monograph, *The International Committee of the Red Cross and its Mandate to Protect and Assist: Law and Practice*, is forthcoming from Hart Publishing.

cesran International
www.cesran.org

Journal of Conflict Transformation & Security
Vol. 6 | No. 1
April 2017

Journal of Conflict Transformation & Security

Building Human Security through Humanitarian Protection and Assistance: the Potential of the International Committee of the Red Cross

Introduction

The historical development of human-centric legal frameworks, from international humanitarian law to human rights law, shows a willingness by States to protect their own citizens and those outside of their borders. The growth in attention paid to human security is also reflective of such an approach. However, this willingness to consider human needs is often subverted by politics, military action, conflict, and lack of resources. This research assesses humanitarian protection and assistance initiatives in terms of their potential to contribute to the establishment of human security. That potential is assumed to exist because humanitarian actors have unparalleled access to individuals and communities on the ground that are living through or recovering from armed conflict. Moreover, humanitarian principles, such as neutrality, facilitate access that other actors cannot guarantee.

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has a mandate to provide humanitarian protection and assistance. In terms of protection, the provisions of the Geneva Conventions I, II, III, and IV 1949 enable the ICRC to bring humanitarian aid to victims of war, exchange messages between prisoners of war and their families, trace the fate of disappeared people, and care for the wounded and sick.[1] Humanitarian assistance tends to refer to methods that are used "to alleviate human suffering during wartime,"[2] and the stated "aim of the ICRC's assistance programmes is to preserve life and restore the dignity of individuals and communities affected by armed conflict or other situations of violence."[3] The protracted nature of many armed conflicts has necessitated the development of activities and projects that address the ongoing needs of combatants and civilians, and so the ICRC has developed its activities by moving beyond its traditional focus on the mere survival of victims of war. It now performs a more comprehensive assistance and protection role, which seeks not only to protect victims of armed conflict, but also to provide for their basic needs. Bilkovà states that "this approach corresponds to that held by the proponents of human security, in its broad definition."[4]

Noting the ICRC's expanded remit, this article seeks to explore the potential role of the organization in building human security through humanitarian protection and assistance. It will question the legal mandate that the ICRC has and the actions that it takes. It is critical to understand the unique status of the ICRC on the international stage as an organization which has relationships with the UN, States, local communities, and national societies. There is remarkably little literature available on the relationship between ICRC roles and human security, and scholars neglect to consider the synergies between humanitarianism and human security in terms of actions taken on the ground. This study therefore attempts to align the concept of human security with specific roles undertaken by the ICRC to illustrate the potential that the ICRC has to create security on the ground. The ICRC does not publicly engage with the concept of human security, nor does it explicitly operate within a human security framework, and so this author interviewed a number of ICRC delegates in Geneva in April 2014 to enquire into their theoretical and legal conclusions about the relationship between the ICRC's mandate and human security.

This article has four constituent parts. The first outlines the research methods utilized, while the second examines the protection and assistance mandate of the ICRC and provides a historical and theoretical overview of the links between humanitarianism and human security. This section looks in particular at the Geneva Conventions of 1949 (I, II, III, and IV) and the ICRC's "right of humanitarian initiative." The third section shows how the ICRC's mandate maps onto the categories of human security promulgated in the *Human Development Report 1994* (HDR).[5] Finally, interview data is used to test the theory that there is a natural nexus between humanitarian protection and assistance. The interview data is set out in an independent section because it highlights the ability of one action to impact on a number of human security areas. For example, the data collected shows synergies in ICRC practices that involve supporting early recovery, focusing on the needs of communities, entering into dialogue with all factions, and establishing links with local communities; the compound effect of these activities is that secure spaces are created both during and after conflicts.

Methods

This research examines what the "law in context" or "law in action" looks like.[6] It uses semi-structured qualitative interviews with ICRC headquarters delegates who have experience of working as field staff in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), and it uses their responses to help determine whether humanitarian protection and assistance can assist in the establishment of human security. The interviews discussed here focused on the ability of the ICRC to leverage its mandate to break new ground; they also investigated the possibility that its practices might help in establishing human security for people in conflict zones.[7] The interviews, which tested the theoretical conclusions drawn in earlier research, took the form of open questions that facilitated in-depth questioning and enabled interviewees to contribute their unique insights, as well as contextual details and real-life experiences.[8] The interviewees were culturally elite and confident about leading the discussions and imparting knowledge and anecdotes from the ICRC's headquarters and the field.[9]

In terms of recruitment, the author used the snowball sampling method, partly because of the opaque and confidential nature of the ICRC.[10] The ICRC is a habitually discreet organisation. My contacts and interviewees remained anonymous in view of the personal and professional risks they were taking in providing information; nevertheless, they freely volunteered to take part in the interviews.[11] One of the criteria for the selection of interviewees was that they should have field experience in the Democratic Republic of Congo, which was selected as a case study because the ICRC has been continually present in the DRC since 1978 and has developed its projects in accordance with changes on the ground there. The sample size of five participants allowed for sufficient data to be gathered on the relationship between the ICRC mandate and human security,[12] and the process confirmed Bauer and Gaskell's prediction that, while there may be striking differences in opinion in the first interviews, common themes will nevertheless appear and the interviewer's understanding will develop progressively.[13] This observation was accurate in terms of this author's experiences.

The protection and assistance mandate of the International Committee of the Red Cross

The ICRC started out as a neutral and independent humanitarian organization that provided medical assistance to wounded soldiers, traced families of combatants, and visited prisoners of war. After World War One, its mandate shifted to include the protection of civilians. This priority has continued to inform the practice of the ICRC over the past century or so, not least because of the proliferation of non-international armed conflicts and the exponential increase in protracted armed conflict and situations of violence during that time. In order for the ICRC to work to its full potential in these situations, it is critical that States, communities,

and individuals recognize the principle of humanity, which is in turn crucial to the concept of human security.

It is worth remembering throughout this analysis that the human-centric concepts of humanitarianism and human security are effectively synonymous in the international legal system.[14] This synonymy is reflected in the ways in which the ICRC was characterized by its president in 2012. Maurer stated that "the motivation behind our work has not changed since the final pages of Henry Dunant's groundbreaking book 'A Memory of Solferino'. What changes, however, is how the organization adapts its response to different patterns of conflict and different contexts."[15] Drawing implicitly on the discourse of human security, Maurer explained further that "the working method of the ICRC is to be close to victims, root action in response to needs rather than political agendas, to contextualize the humanitarian response and reunite assistance, protection and prevention."[16]

The Geneva Conventions, which effectively established the ICRC's mandate, were drafted at the end of World War Two at a time when the people who drafted them could not have anticipated the woeful impact that conflict would increasingly have on civilians. Since then, it has become more challenging to maintain neutrality and independence and provide humanitarian protection and assistance to those tied up in conflict; meanwhile, the needs of the populations affected by it have become more severe and protracted, particularly given the cycles of armed conflict, violence, unrest, conflict and so on, that affect many countries today. This article asks whether the emergence and development of the concept of human security, as a seemingly parallel elucidation of human-centric concerns on the international stage, enhances or damages the legal framework that guides the work of the ICRC. Is human security, as a concept championed by the UN, too fraught with political connotations to be utilized as a framework for action by the ICRC, or, on the other hand, is the ICRC, as a unique humanitarian actor, key to the legitimization of a human-centric concept that is increasingly permeating international discourse? This article explores these questions in order to assess the significance of the ICRC in the "big picture" of humanitarian protection and assistance, human security, and humanity.

The Geneva Conventions I, II, III, and IV 1949 "not only place primary legal obligations on warring parties, but legitimize the role of "impartial" humanitarian organisations, such as the ICRC, in promoting the protection of and providing relief assistance to, non-combatants."[17] The activities that the ICRC can undertake are provided for in Common Article 3, Article 9 Geneva Conventions I, II and III 1949, and Article 10 Geneva Convention IV 1949. In terms of international armed conflicts, Geneva Conventions I, II, III, and IV 1949 each state that: "The International Committee of the Red Cross or any other impartial humanitarian organisation may, subject to the consent of the Parties to the conflict concerned, undertake for the protection of wounded and sick, medical personnel and chaplains, and for their relief."

Further, the commentary to Article 9 Geneva Convention I states that "*All humanitarian activities* [emphasis added] are covered in theory, and not only those for which express provision is made. They are, however, covered subject to certain conditions with regard to the character of the organization undertaking them, their own nature and object and, lastly, the will of the Parties to the conflict."[18]

In addition, Article 81(1) Additional Protocol I 1977 states that the ICRC "may also carry out *any other humanitarian activities* [emphasis added] in favour of these victims, subject to the consent of the Parties to the conflict concerned." Under Common Article 3(2) Geneva Conventions I, II, III, and IV 1949, "an impartial humanitarian body, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, may *offer its services* [emphasis added] to the Parties to the conflict". This provision is somewhat open-ended; it therefore affords the ICRC wide

discretion to act in non-international armed conflicts (NIAC). Article 18(2) Additional Protocol II provides that:

> If the civilian population is suffering undue hardship owing to a lack of the supplies essential for its survival, such as foodstuffs and medical supplies, relief actions for the civilian population which are of an exclusively humanitarian and impartial nature and which are conducted without any adverse distinction shall be undertaken subject to the consent of the High Contracting Party concerned.

Finally, the Seville Agreement (1997) introduced the idea of a "Lead Agency" into the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement (IRCRCM). It means that the ICRC has specific areas in which it will take the lead in relief operations.[19] Under Article 5(1), the term "direct results of a conflict" specifically includes periods "beyond the cessation of hostilities and extends to situations where victims of a conflict remain in need of relief until a general restoration of peace has been achieved".

This mandate has clear connections with the human security needs identified in the *Human Development Report* (HDR) which was published by the United Nations Development Programme in 1994. Those needs are deemed to include the provision of food stuffs, healthcare for the wounded and sick, economic security, and personal and community security—all of which can be seen to fall within the ICRC's mandate to provide humanitarian protection and assistance—as well as environmental security which might also be regarded as falling within the ICRC's humanitarian purview. The HDR (1994) also declares political security to be a human need but this falls beyond the mandate of the ICRC given its principles of independence, impartiality, and confidentiality. The ICRC is very careful to distance itself internally and publicly from political matters, and, critically, it enjoys immunity from legal process, which protects it from judicial and administrative proceedings.[20] Nevertheless, beyond the HDR's needs-based list of the seven elements of human security, the report's broader framework for human security, set out in the "Common Understanding" section, offers a nuanced interpretation of human security, which the ICRC's mandate might well be extrapolated to accommodate.

Under the Geneva Conventions I, II, III, and IV 1949 and Additional Protocol I, the ICRC, as a neutral humanitarian organization, also has the mandate to carry out functions traditionally performed by protecting powers.[21] A protecting power is intended to secure the supervision and implementation of the Geneva Conventions I, II, III, and IV 1949 and their Additional Protocols. Traditionally, a protecting power was appointed by a State which was party to a conflict to safeguard their respective interests during the dispute. The ICRC can replace a contracting power and perform its functions, or it can enjoy protecting power status; in either situation, it is afforded automatic powers to carry out its activities and this puts the ICRC on the same footing as a State, with the sole distinction being that the ICRC is neutral and must work in the interests of all parties. Indeed, under Article 6 of its statutes, it is mandated to "maintain relations with government authorities and any national or international institution whose assistance it considers useful."

Organizations that undertake humanitarian action "must be concerned with the condition of man, considered solely as a human being without regard to the value which he represents as a military, political, professional or other unit. And the organization must be impartial."[22] Its activities must be purely humanitarian in character; they must be concerned with human beings as such, and it is also vital that they must not be affected by any political or military considerations.[23] These stipulations, in the first instance, give humanitarian organizations criteria for authorizing their involvement in conflict; arguably, they also provide the apparatus for organizations to secure humanitarian access as happens, for example, when the ICRC uses

its reputation for neutrality and independence to gain access to those in need. It also encourages States to cooperate in the provision of humanitarian aid. When used successfully, therefore, the provision of humanitarian protection and assistance can contribute to the economic security of people on the ground during and after conflict, perhaps ultimately leading to their freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom to live in dignity.

In addition to the right to provide humanitarian assistance, the ICRC has the right to take the humanitarian initiative. This is a much broader right than that contained in the legal provisions discussed above. Under paragraph 4(2) of the Statutes of the ICRC, "the ICRC may take *any humanitarian initiative* [emphasis added] which comes within its role as a specifically neutral and independent institution and intermediary, and may consider any question requiring examination by such an institution." This right is reiterated in the Statutes of the IRCRCM, which state that "within its role as a specifically neutral and independent institution and intermediary", it must "endeavour at all times—as a neutral institution whose humanitarian work is carried out particularly in time of international and other armed conflicts or internal strife—to ensure the protection of and assistance to military and civilian victims of such events and of their direct results."[24]

This right to humanitarian initiative is flexible and therefore practical as "no one can foretell what a future war will consist of, under what conditions it will be waged and to what needs it will give rise."[25] It is therefore right that "a door should be left open to any initiative or action, however unforeseeable today, which may provide effective help in protecting, caring for, and aiding the wounded and sick."[26] Ratner states that "this significant grant of authority, while not legally binding on States—which must consent to the ICRC's involvement—has per-mitted the ICRC to visit detainees in countries not experiencing war and work in States and on issues where human rights law, not IHL, is the governing legal frame-work."[27] The ICRC has the authority, taken from international law and agreed to by State Parties, to provide humanitarian protection, assistance, and initiative in host states.

The right to humanitarian initiative is a unique attribute of the ICRC, but the question arises as to whether this idea can legitimately be interpreted in terms that include practices that seek to provide human security. This article will now consider whether human security will become an inevitable lens or framework through which future humanitarian protection and assistance operations will be conceptualized and operationalized. Is it necessary, or indeed possible, to expand the concept of humanitarian initiative so that it can directly address human security concerns on the ground; and what would such a development mean for the principles of the ICRC and particularly for its commitment to and reputation for neutrality and independence?

The ICRC and the *Human Development Report* (1994)

The concept of human security provides a lens through which we can view humanitarian protection and assistance. The abolition of threats to security, and the establishment of the mutually reinforcing concepts of freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom to live in dignity, are critical for the security of people's livelihoods during and after conflict, disasters, and other violent situations. The United Nations (UN) has spent the past 21 years defining and refining the concept of human security and, in doing so, building on the human-centric ideals postulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948).[28]

The invocation of human security represents a normative plea for people rather than States to be placed at the centre of decisions about security. In identifying seven components of human security, including economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political security,[29] the HDR stated that the proof of security is "a child who didn't die, a

disease that did not spread, a job that wasn't cut, an ethnic tension that did not explode into violence, a dissident who was not silenced."[30] In itself, the HDR serves as evidence of a "broader normative shift leading to the strengthening of the position of individual human beings at the international scene".[31] Human security therefore joins together freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom to live in dignity through people-centred, comprehensive, context-specific and preventive strategies of security.[32] Ultimately, it is about making the vulnerabilities and needs of every person everywhere the focus of policy decisions on security.[33] The "Common Understanding Resolution" states that "human security recognises the interlinkages between peace, development and human rights, and equally considers civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights."[34]

Generally speaking, the concept of human security understands threats to people as taking either narrow or broad forms. The key threats, in narrow terms, are the use of force, armed conflicts, and perhaps mass violations of human rights. The means to protect individuals from these "narrow" threats primarily involve militaristic responses, and therefore this kind of security should be provided by the State or, if the State is unable to step in, the international community.[35] The narrow or minimalist theory of human security is enunciated most obviously in the Human Security Centre's *Human Security Report 2005*, which abbreviated the idea of human security by limiting it to the discourses of political violence that can be used by the State or any other organized political actor.[36] The Human Security Centre maps trends in political violence, which it takes to include "torture; extrajudicial, arbitrary and summary executions; the 'disappearance' of dissidents; the use of death squads; and incarceration without trial."[37] While the narrow approach focuses on violent threats, a broader view considers insecurity without distinguishing between its sources and defines safety in terms of "safety from chronic threats such as hunger, disease and repression," along with access to "protection from sudden and hurtful disruption in the patterns of daily life."[38] The ICRC is strategically placed to protect and empower people on the ground against the security threats that the HDR identified. Moreover, its mandate, albeit not explicitly, addresses the key principles of human security set out in later attempts to elucidate the concept of human security, which tend to include people-centred, comprehensive, context-specific, and prevention-oriented indicators.

The ICRC mandate explicitly provides for health, food and economic aid, and the types of community and personal security described in the HDR are also encapsulated within the protection and assistance work of the ICRC. In addition, personal, community, and political security require that people should be able to live in a society that honours their basic human rights, which include civil and political rights and economic, social, and cultural rights. To this end, human security, as set out in the framework of the HDR, shares common purposes with human rights and humanitarian protection and assistance work.

In the sections that follow, the conclusions drawn here through exploration of these common purposes will help to support the thesis that the protection and assistance mandate of the ICRC can aid in the building of human security on the ground. The remainder of the article will also address whether this extension of the ICRC's practice will compromise its principles. It should be reiterated that the ICRC should, by virtue of its fundamental principles, avoid being involved in any moves to achieve political security. This article does not explore environmental security in any depth, as it opens up a breadth of additional theories and legal frameworks which are beyond the scope of this article. Instead, the analysis here focuses on community, economic, food, health, and personal security.

Economic security refers to an assured basic income, threats to which include unemployment, temporary work, precarious employment, self-employment, and low or insecure incomes.[39] The inability to ensure economic security can be linked to the need for

education,[40] and "the right to live somewhere in security, peace and dignity."[41] The difficulties which often face individuals, families, and communities are compounded by the impact of conflicts on the environment, land, and natural resources, and on access to safe and nutritious food and water. Human security is a key component in the vocabulary, thinking, and practice of international development; in fact, poverty, socio-economic inequality, and violent conflict are closely linked.[42] As the Secretary-General noted in "We the Peoples", "every step taken towards reducing poverty and achieving broad-based economic growth is a step toward conflict prevention";[43] it is also a step towards freedom from want. Hampson et al. note further that "the economic impact of civil wars is massive and it has been borne disproportionately by the poorest countries".[44] Economic security is of paramount importance if recovery from armed conflict is to be achieved, and it entails, in its most obvious sense, employment generation and efforts to ensure livelihoods for young people and demobilized former combatants. Socio-economic development can also include the development of social services (for health, education, water, and sanitation); the rehabilitation of basic infrastructure; improvements in transportation, and the reconstruction of roads, bridges, and railways; the promotion of environmental awareness; the return and reintegration of displaced persons and refugees; and transitional justice.[45] All of these developments should be placed within broader political contexts,[46] as will become clear in the discussion of the provision of healthcare below. It is also very important that communities should reconcile, re-establish bonds, and develop community dialogue in order to assist in the establishment of community and personal security. This kind of work can result ultimately in people winning freedom from fear and want, as well as the freedom they need to live in dignity.

Since 1949, the ICRC has developed its specific mandate to include actions that aim to ensure economic security, as well as to provide health, water, and habitat security, safety from mine action, and diplomacy and communication, and it gathers these activities under the term "Early Recovery" which refers to actions designed "to meet the needs of people affected by armed conflict and other situations of violence."[47] Its work to "promote economic security aims to ensure that households and communities affected by conflict or armed violence can meet essential needs and maintain or restore sustainable livelihoods".[48] In these efforts, the ICRC relies on its "statutory right of initiative and on its assessment of the level of organization of the armed groups involved, the scale of humanitarian impact, the support it can provide to National Societies and its own added value."[49]

Just over a decade ago, the ICRC's Director of Operations, Pierre Krähenbühl, recognized the need for the ICRC to work in the "full spectrum of conflict situations" and to build the "capacity to sustain longer term commitments in chronic crises, early transitional phases or situations of violence which attract little or no attention" or are out of the spotlight.[50] In this role:

> Its activities range from emergency distributions of food and essential household items to programmes for sustainable food production and micro-economic initiatives. Needs covered include food, shelter, access to health care and education. Economic security activities are closely linked to health, water and habitat programmes. All these activities come within the ICRC's global mission to protect victims of conflict.[51]

Early recovery sits on the conflict to post-conflict continuum, or between emergency relief and development, and it "encompasses the restoration of basic services, livelihoods, shelter, governance, security and rule of law, [and] environment and social dimensions, including the reintegration of displaced populations."[52] The ICRC's "early recovery" work acknowledges the "grey area" between war and peace in the period before development activities fully begin; during this phase, the situation on the ground remains fragile. When the ICRC actively

engages in a country, which has seen "populations largely affected with loss of livelihoods," it will deploy its EcoSec Unit, which comes under the umbrella of ICRC's "assistance" activities.[53] The ICRC's early recovery operations are not intended to create a culture of dependency, rather, the "aim is to promote the resilience and self-sufficiency of affected people or communities, and to protect their dignity in a way that food or other emergency relief alone cannot."[54] The ICRC will "prepare to withdraw once the entry strategies of development organizations have been clearly set out and followed by concrete actions."[55]

The HDR stated that "Food security means that all people at all times have both physical and economic access to basic food. This requires not just enough food to go around, it requires that people have ready access to food—that they have an 'entitlement' to food, by growing it for themselves, by buying it or by taking advantage of a public food distribution system."[56] For the ICRC, "food security has to be considered primarily at the individual and household levels, since conflicts affect individuals and households before adversely affecting the whole country."[57] In situations where there are food shortages, people will channel their resources into obtaining food and other essential items, including medicines, clothes, and shelter, and the ICRC provides support for these coping mechanisms. It also continues to be involved in the distribution of food and non-food relief; it establishes public kitchens, and sets up emergency water and environmental health facilities. These roles have expanded to include activities such as agricultural, veterinary, and fishery programmes; general food distribution as a back-up until the next harvest; small-scale credit programmes, and "food-and-cash-for-work programmes."[58] The mandate to provide food complements the ongoing obligations of States under human rights law. Under Article 25(1) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, "everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food." This is reasserted in Article 11(1) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights which decrees that States "will take appropriate steps to ensure the realization of this right, recognizing to this effect the essential importance of international co-operation based on free consent."

The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) recognizes that, in the case of the right to food, the obligation is to "take the necessary action to mitigate and alleviate hunger […] even in times of natural or other disasters."[59] To this end, the minimum core that must be reached is that States must ensure their citizens are "free from hunger, aiming to prevent starvation."[60] Moreover, the right to water provides that priority should also be given to the water resources required to prevent starvation and disease, as well as water required to meet the core obligations of each of the Covenant rights.[61] Barber states that violations of the minimum core obligations as regards the right to food include "hijacking of food convoys, demands for extortion, the holding up in customs of food intended for distribution to the civilian population, or any other form of harassment or restriction imposed on international agencies engaged in food or nutrition programmes."[62]

The Geneva Conventions I, II, III, and IV 1949 provide a mandate for the ICRC to be involved in the provision of healthcare, over and above the provision of food, to those in need.[63] Threats to health security include the infectious diseases that result from poor nutrition and an unsafe environment and which pose a greater risk to the poor, women, and children than to other already less vulnerable groups. General Comment 14 explored the core obligations of States as regards the right to health, and included among them a number of requirements: a) to ensure the right of access to health facilities, goods, and services on a non-discriminatory basis, especially for vulnerable or marginalized groups; b) to ensure access to the minimum essential food which is nutritionally adequate and safe, to ensure freedom from hunger to everyone; c) to ensure access to basic shelter, housing, and sanitation, and an adequate supply of safe and potable water; d) to provide essential drugs, as from time to time defined under the WHO Action Programme on Essential Drugs; and finally, (e) to ensure equitable

distribution of all health facilities, goods, and services. A lack of available national healthcare facilities, and especially of primary care and mental health services is an issue for many post-conflict States.[64] The adequacy of such provisions will also impact on personal and community security.

When the strands of the ICRC's mandate are drawn together, it becomes clear that the mandate of protection and assistance defined within the Geneva Conventions, Additional Protocols, and Statutes, mirrors the concept of human security to a large extent. The human-centric core of each framework means that the two ideas oscillate around a central commonality, that is, the concept of humanity. The mandate to protect and assist, which is legally ascribed to the ICRC by sovereign nations through a myriad of legal agreements, is echoed in the *Human Development Report* and subsequent elucidations of the concept of human security. Critically, these overlapping ideas benefit people on the ground through assistance programs or human security projects. For the people who have lived through conflict situations and who are suffering in their aftermath, the theoretical framework around the provision of economic security, food, healthcare, water, and so on, matters little. What is important, however, is that the international community does have a human-centric framework through which to operationalize relief, aid, assistance, development, and security.

Interviews with ICRC staff on their mandate and human security

The mandate of the ICRC needs to be adaptable to the practicalities of providing humanitarian protection and assistance. The ICRC is guided by the principle of humanity, which embraces notions of survival, livelihood, and dignity, but there is a growing need for solutions to be embedded in local realities and based on actual needs, vulnerabilities, and the capacities of governments and people. There is tension between the mandate in abstraction and the practicalities of providing humanitarian protection and assistance. Human security reflects the concept of humanity and recognizes tangible threats faced by people during armed conflict. The interview questions were designed to elicit testimony from ICRC delegates on the development of ICRC activities, and they took into account the possibility that the ICRC mandate could be interpreted and implemented through a human security lens; that is to say, the questions probed for any understanding that humanitarian protection and assistance can simultaneously develop human security. Interviewees recognized that this development of ICRC activities was enough to raise questions in the international community about its competences, but the ICRC's delegates are humanitarians and their focus is on the assistance of vulnerable people rather than on any unease that assistance might cause for outside observers.[65] The situations in which the ICRC's roles are enacted are not strictly limited to armed conflict, and the involvement of the ICRC in early recovery work, for example, should help a population to get back on its feet. Practical initiatives in this area often include "increasing the availability of resources or [the] distribution of seeds directly to the community, [… so that] they can restart farming when they come back from displacement."[66] ICRC staff are

> working with associations [… to provide] basic help such as printing manuals to try and restart associations. Sometimes [ICRC teams] organize fairs in very remote areas, where [they] brings sellers from different parts to increase the level of available goods in the community. [The ICRC is] now starting to think of other forms of support, more linked to emergencies—they can be vouchers, cash transfers… to help communities cope, with the immediate effects of the conflict.[67]

The ICRC's people-centred and context-specific rationale for participating in these kinds of efforts clearly mirrors the concept of human security.

During the interviews conducted for the purpose of this research, this author asked the interviewees whether they considered changes in the role of the ICRC to be indications of "progression" within the organization, or, rather, as signs of movement away from the activities of the ICRC in relation to armed conflict that were set out in the Geneva Conventions I, II, III, and IV 1949 and the Statutes of the ICRC. In light of concerns that any such developments might compromise the principles of the ICRC, it was asked whether such changes risk the sustainability of the ICRC's principles and particularly its commitments to independence and neutrality. The interviewees carefully rebutted such suggestions, arguing instead that "needs" were the relevant consideration in any assessment of appropriate action: one interviewee stated that "I don't see that there's a risk as long as you target the right needs, and then, as long as you have identified the needs, the whole issue is how you address these needs and do you address the needs with a short-term or long-term solution."[68]

This analysis goes on to highlight the synergy between "needs" in the context of humanitarian protection and assistance, and the seven needs of human security, with particular reference to the Democratic Republic of Congo. In the DRC, the ICRC works to enable families that are affected by conflicts to meet their own basic needs.[69] From the perspective of the ICRC delegates, the fact that the situation in the DRC changes over time and from place to place is evidence of the necessity of a context-specific approach.[70] When situations are less violent, communities might try to plant and grow food in the hope that the situation will remain stable until it is ready to harvest.[71] In terms of distributing seeds or assisting with farming, for example, "every activity is based on a direct assessment of the needs of the people but also the environment and the perspectives of the people on the move who have been displaced for a long time and will probably remain displaced in a camp for a long time."[72] In the Eastern Congo, displacement is usually a short-term phenomenon: people spend three or four days in the bush before going back to assess the situation and determine whether they can return.[73] In such volatile and shifting environments, it is difficult for the ICRC to establish the kinds of activities that can benefit people who have been in a camp for months and can be predicted to remain there for a substantial amount of time.[74] The interviews showed that the ICRC has to be able to adjust to constantly changing situations.[75] An adaptable ICRC will work with local people by approaching a community and talking to individuals in order to grasp their precise needs; it will then develop a response that will include as many people as possible because they are all affected by the same situation. This kind of people-centred approach simultaneously protects and empowers people threatened on the ground.

As noted earlier, economic instability is a well-recognized root cause of conflict, and, therefore, work to address it at a context-specific level may eliminate, or at least temper, the threat it poses to human survival, livelihoods, and dignity within the human security framework. When interviewees were asked further questions about economic assistance, they were keen to explain that the initiatives undertaken by the ICRC are on a very small scale.[76] The ICRC focuses on giving families the means to survive for the next three to six months,[77] and one interviewee noted specifically that the ICRC is not involved in any large-scale economic impact projects.[78] Any initial assessment undertaken by the ICRC when staff are working within these situations will focus on determining whether a particular community would benefit from agricultural support or from the provision of food parcels.[79]

As part of its economic security mandate, the ICRC facilitates Micro-economic Initiatives (MEI) for farmers; each initiative offers "an income-generating programme that is implemented through a bottom-up approach, whereby each beneficiary is involved in identifying and designing the assistance to be received."[80] One interviewee provided an example of a project in which the ICRC helped local people to develop seeds that are resistant to diseases

prevalent in the DRC.[81] In the project's first year, the Congolese farmers involved in the primary association affiliated with it were able to draw on their history of working together, and, luckily, the seeds grew well. In the second year, however, the farmers involved in the project were more opportunistic and only wanted the economic incentives provided by the ICRC. They did not, therefore, repeat the growing of seeds that year.[82]

Similar problems arose in relation to MEIs for women who were victims of sexual violence; many asked for money to start small shops or tailoring businesses, but the women who received the money really needed it for something else, and the businesses were never started or closed very quickly. The ICRC could not provide constant financial support to the women, and the MEIs failed.[83] One interviewee argued that, while the ICRC is still keen to support economic projects that provide a kind of "social safety net", the lesson has been learnt that money for this kind of work should be provided in stages.[84]

Overall, therefore, attempts to establish economic security in the DRC involve the ICRC in a quagmire of difficulties. Traditional protection and assistance models, such as dissemination, detention, and healthcare, are coupled with economic support and initiatives to try and help people get back on their feet, but the majority of people in the DRC are still in survival mode, and this means that the ICRC has to try to sustain its work amid high levels of corruption, while being hampered by a lack of basic infrastructure. Given the difficulties involved in sustaining ICRC action in these kinds of circumstances, the initial aims of the ICRC are being amended in practice.[85]

One interviewee was keen to emphasize the importance of including local populations in economic security projects on the ground.[86] The interviewee argued that a wholly top-down approach includes so many stakeholders that the average person at community level rarely feels the benefits and, in some cases, does not even understand what is happening. The interviewee stated that "if there is not a sense of ownership within the community, then it is doomed to fail. I am pretty sure about that."[87] However, another interviewee explained that the EcoSec Unit is primarily designed to support the assistance department, and that it is the first division to scale down its work and withdraw from a situation.[88] Nevertheless, it is important, in this period of time, to help people to get their heads above the waterline, which is already good for the population.[89] The intention of the ICRC is "to be as close as possible to the field… to get its own understanding of what is going on."[90] This is only possible if the ICRC retains the capacity and logistics, as well as the staffing levels, required to continue dialogue with all actors on the ground in order that it can discover where needs are going unmet, often, at least in part, because other actors are unable to intervene. These issues affect where the ICRC works; it has purposely chosen, for example, not to be involved in Internally Displaced Person (IDP) camps because, as soon as there are settlements close to urban settings, there are a huge number of organizations willing to work there.[91]

The interviewees involved in this research identified the possibility that the ICRC might also utilize economic projects to bring communities together, thus facilitating the re-establishment or development of community security. Projects, such as these, can work towards, not only the provision of human security, but also the prevention of future recurrences of hostilities. In the Kivus, for example, for a period of two to three years, the ICRC ran vaccination and animal treatment programmes separately in two communities; one was predominantly made up of people of Rwandan heritage and the other Congolese. Through this work, an interviewee noted, the ICRC was trying to benefit the two communities and also improve their attitudes towards each other.[92] Moreover, interviewees recognized that the ICRC has to take the security of local communities into account when it makes assessments as to the kinds of support that can be made available.[93]

The ICRC is in a unique position to open a dialogue which involves both the armed groups and the authorities in a region;[94] in fact, one interviewee stated that "the protection the ICRC can provide is more thanks to the contacts we can have with the different parties [..., that is to say, with the] high-ranking military officers on both sides."[95] The establishment of a dialogue is always carried out in fully transparent ways, and the security of the beneficiaries is taken into account before assistance is provided, as the ICRC does not want to exacerbate problems on the ground.[96] In terms of security, therefore, what is interesting is that the ICRC, in starting a dialogue with armed groups or those in authority, will not necessarily talk to them about the Geneva Conventions I, II, III, and IV 1949 and their IHL obligations.[97] The ICRC is more pragmatic than this, and so its staff discuss instead the impact of the groups' activities on the living situation of the people in an area.[98] The ICRC will opt to use such humanitarian arguments when it is apparent that talking about breaching specific laws will not make the group sensitive to the people around them.[99]

Dissemination now takes a more practical form than it might have done in previous years. The humanitarian goals of the ICRC take priority over the dissemination of specific provisions, and the organization's activities have evolved accordingly. If we consider the proliferation of academic commentary on the increasing intertwinement of International Humanitarian Law and International Human Rights Law, and particularly on their shared understanding of a "human" core, it is logical that the ICRC can depend on discourses that move beyond the strict dissemination of IHL in its practice.[100]

An issue to keep in mind when considering the practicalities of the ICRC establishing a dialogue with key actors in the DRC is the sheer number of armed groups involved in conflict there; the UN has recorded 54 armed groups in the Kivus alone. These armed groups are forming and reforming or gaining representation at the political level, and the means employed by the UN to establish dialogue with these groups varies from one to the other.[101] When they are in control of particular areas, it is very easy to suggest and then to advocate that those in authority should take responsibility for providing basic services and ensuring that people can get food and water, and in these situations the ICRC is able to engage in a dialogue.[102]

The ICRC's direct links with locals are greatly enhanced by the national societies of the Red Cross which help to increase the local impact of ICRC protection and assistance work, due to their proximity to armed conflict and their knowledge of local issues that pertain to human insecurity. The ICRC works with its national societies when it is seeking to re-establish family links for people who have been displaced during military operations, for example, and this work can include repatriation, family reunification, and sometimes cross-border family reunification.[103] Interviewees frequently referred to the relationship between the ICRC and national societies and created the impression that they are relied upon, or perhaps used, more frequently than the ICRC's current website information suggests.[104] One interviewee stated that a national society's "network and number of volunteers scattered throughout the country is huge and allows [us] to reach out [to] a lot of families... When it comes to cross-border issues [the ICRC] will engage the national societies on both sides [of the conflict]."[105] It also became apparent in an ICRC interview that the UN also engages with these national societies.[106] The ICRC interacts and works with communities and individuals on the ground to try and bring protection and assistance to those in need.

Interviewees at the ICRC recognized the potential for the ICRC to contribute to human security;[107] they provided specific examples of situations in which protection activities that provided food security and physical security helped to prevent people from being attacked, and they noted that the ICRC is "trying to build an environment that is safer for the people. In that sense maybe it's something that's at the junction of the concepts."[108] The first thing the

ICRC does when it arrives in an area is to "have a discussion with the community to understand what their perception of the problem is."[109] This is to ensure that projects are not wholly designed elsewhere, which is a mistake that the ICRC and others have made in the past.[110] If an organization is offering to help a community in an area which is either suffering conflict or in the post-conflict stage, then the community will say "yes" to everything.[111]

The ICRC has to think about the long-term sustainability of projects: for example, if it agrees with a community to restart agriculture in a volatile environment, it needs to consider the likelihood that farmers will flee when fighting restarts.[112] The ICRC therefore has to engage with local people while also maintaining a broader perspective. In some cases, for example, the local community will ask the ICRC to prioritize healthcare. This will require thinking about building primary healthcare facilities, and it will involve recruitment of and salary provision for doctors and healthcare professionals, but it will also require interaction with a Ministry of Health and the provision of and collaboration in healthcare plans for entire communities.[113]

Conclusion

The UNDP concept of human security, published over twenty years ago in 1994, has undergone various studies and formulations. Human security itself does not have a legal framework, but it does now have an agreed definition. The "Common Understanding Resolution" provided an opportunity to make human security an underlying principle of international law; meanwhile, General Assembly consensus arguably made it a soft law, or perhaps evidence of *opinio juris* and State practice. Perhaps eventually the requirements to create human security will be considered customary. This could be supported by the overlaps in human security, human rights, and IHL, highlighted throughout this analysis. However, "Common Understanding Resolution" paragraph 4(h) shows that State sovereignty remains a limiting factor in the pursuit of human security. For now, at least, the publication and agreement on the "Common Understanding" of human security marks the end of the progressive realization of human security as law.

The ICRC has always recognized the centrality of human beings, and it has built upon its historical experiences with soldiers, prisoners of war, and the shipwrecked. The organization has had to increase its protection and assistance activities in light of the protracted nature of contemporary conflicts and the proliferation of non-international armed conflicts in particular. In these types of situations, the needs of the civilian populations involved are ongoing, and the threats to their security include those to food, health, and the economy. There are also threats to personal, community, political, and environmental security. Critically, the principle of humanity, which was once restricted to IHL and Red Cross work, now permeates discourse on the international stage and is reflected at the normative level in the "Common Understanding" of human security. The ICRC has continued to focus on its traditional mission while constantly adapting to new situations of armed conflict, new actors in those conflicts, and the changing needs of civilian populations. The ICRC has worked to develop the law and its activities to reflect the humanitarian needs of people on the ground., and it is well-placed to understand the dynamics behind violence and why some actors choose to ignore IHL. The ICRC's protection and assistance roles have also expanded to take economic security into account.

Each of these phases of ICRC action has extended the activities mandated to it in the Geneva Conventions I, II, III, and IV 1949 and the Statutes of the ICRC. In addition, it should be recalled that under Article 81(1) Additional Protocol I, the ICRC may also "carry out *any other humanitarian activities* in favour of these victims, subject to the consent of the Parties to the conflict concerned." Can economic security and early recovery be considered to be "*any other humanitarian activity*", or do they go beyond humanitarianism into new activities

entirely? The ICRC works “in other situations of violence”, it undertakes long-term projects beyond the cessation of hostilities, and it has clear links to the provision of economic security. In terms of its right to “humanitarian initiative”, the ICRC may be responding to the “needs” of the people on the ground, but it is walking a fine line in terms of its neutrality. At this moment in time, the ICRC appears to perform a grand balancing act between the two, but it is this aspect of its mandate which is most likely to see consent for its operations revoked by States.

Notes

1. See ICRC, Convention (I), Convention (II), Convention (III), Convention (IV), Protocol I, Protocol II, Statutes of the ICRC, 3 October 2013. The present Statutes replace the Statutes of the International Committee of the Red Cross of 21 June 1973, revised on 20 July 1998 and 8 May 2003).
2. K. West, *Agents of Altruism*, 13.
3. ICRC, "Assistance for People Affected by Armed Conflict", 2, 13.
4. Bilkovà, "Ensuring Human Security", 38.
5. UNDP, *Human Development Report*, 1994.
6. M. Salter et al., *Writing Law Dissertations*, 119, 150-53.
7. The Interview Guide is on record with the author.
8. D. Silverman, *Interpreting Qualitative Data*, 113; Byrne, "Qualitative Interviewing", 182; C. Robson, *Real World Research*, 228.
9. B. Gillham, *Case Study Research Methods*, 63-64; L. A. Dexter, *Elite and Specialized Interviewing*, 19.
10. See R. Maisel et al., *How Sampling Works*.
11. S. P. Thomas et al., *Listening to Patients*; J. W. Cresswell, *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design*; I. Seidman, *Interviewing as Qualitative Research*, 47-48.
12. Interview material will be attributed to IV1 (interview one), IV2, and so on. All interviews were conducted on a personal basis in April 2014 in Geneva.
13. M. W. Bauer et al. *Qualitative Interviewing,* 43.
14. See, in particular, ICRCRCM, "Strengthening the International Red Cross".
15. Bernard, "Interview with Peter Maurer", 2.
16. Ibid., 3.
17. Torrente, "Humanitarian Action under Attack", 205.
18. See also ICRC, "Article 9 Commentary", 12 August 1949, http://www.icrc.org/ihl/1a13044f3bbb5b8ec12563fb0066f226/bcb0d20422c82f18c12563cd00420459?OpenDocument (Accessed 19 February 2016).
19. Council of Delegates (ICRC), "The Seville Agreement", 4.3, 4.4, 5.3.1, 5.4 and 6.1.2.
20. Jeannet, "Non-disclosure of Evidence".
21. ICRC, Geneva Convention I art 10; Geneva Convention II art 10; Geneva Convention III art 10; Geneva Convention IV art 11; Additional Protocol I art 5(3)-(4).
22. ICRC, Article 9 Commentary, n.18.
23. Ibid.
24. ICRC, "Statutes of the IRCRCM", art 5(2)(d) and 5(3); Statutes of the ICRC art 4(2).
25. ICRC, Article 9 Commentary, n.18.
26. Ibid.; See Jakovlijević, "The Right to Humanitarian Assistance-Legal Aspects", 471; ICRC, "Guiding Principles on the Right to Humanitarian Assistance".
27. Ratner, "Law Promotion Beyond Law Talk", 464.
28. Eberhard et al., *Constitutional Limits to Security*, 117. Upadhyaya, "Human Security, Humanitarian Intervention", 72; Collins A. (ed.), *Contemporary Security Studies*, 91-109; Common Understanding, para 4(e).
29. UNDP, *Human Development Report 1994*; See also F. O. Hampson et al., *Madness in the Multitude*; Hubert et al. (eds.), *Human Security and the New Diplomacy*.
30. UNDP, Human Development Report 1994, 22; H. Eberhard et al. (eds.), *Constitutional Limits to Security*, 112.
31. Bilková, "Ensuring Human Security", 30-31; See also Amouyel, "What is Human Security?", 10-23.
32. See Reports of the Secretary General: "Human Security", para 69; "An Agenda for Development", paras 16-20; "In Larger Freedom", para 14; "Outcome Document", para 143; see also "In Larger Freedom", part V; "We the Peoples", para 2; "High-level Panel"; "Revised Draft Outcome Document"; Alarcón, "Draft Resolution: 2005 World Summit

Outcome", 16 September 2005, http://www.un.org/webcast/summit2005/statements.html (Accessed 19 February 2016). See also Owen, "Human Security-Conflict", 378; Mgbeoji, "The Civilised Self", 860; Benedek et al. (eds.), *Mainstreaming Human Security*, 22; Reports of the Secretary General, "Common Understanding"; "Follow up to General Assembly Resolution 64/291"; UNGA, "Follow-up to paragraph 143"; Martin and Owen, "The Second Generation of Human Security"; "Common Understanding", para 4(a).

33. D. Roberts, *Global Governance and Biopolitics*, 15.
34. Report of the Secretary General, "Common Understanding", para 4(c).
35. Paris, "Human Security", 95.
36. Human Security Centre, *Human Security Report 2005*, 17-54; D. Roberts, *Global Governance and Biopolitics*, 18.
37. Human Security Centre, "About", http://www.hscentre.org/about/ (Accessed 17 February 2017).
38. UNDP, *Human Development Report 1994*, 23.
39. This is echoed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, art 17 (right to property), 23 (right to work), 24 (right to leisure), 26 (right to education); ICESCR art 6 (right to work), 7 (just work conditions), 8 (right to form trade unions, strike), 9 (right to social security), 10 (protection of the family), 13-14 (right to education); see also General Comment 13, para 57.
40. Under ICESCR art 13(2)(a), compulsory primary education shall be free of charge for all. See also CESCR, "General Comment 11"; "General Comment 13", para 57; "DRC Report", para 35; "Cambodia Report", para 34; "Afghanistan Report", para 43.
41. CESCR, "General Comment 4", para 7.
42. F. O. Hampson et al., *Madness in the Multitude,* 150.
43. Report of the Secretary General, "We the Peoples", 45.
44. F. O. Hampson et al., *Madness in the Multitude*, 151; Report of the Secretary General, "An Agenda for Peace", paras 56-59.
45. UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support, "United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines", 18 January 2008, http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/capstone_eng.pdf (Accessed 17 January 2017); Report of the Secretary General, "Peace Building in the Immediate Aftermath of Conflict", paras 17 and 54; see also Lewarne and Snelbecker, "Economic Governance in War-Torn Economies", 5.
46. Wennmann, "Conflict Economies", 84-85.
47. ICRC, *ICRC Strategy 2011-14*, 5.
48. ICRC, "Overview of the ICRC's Work to Promote Economic Security", 29 October 2010, http://www.icrc.org/eng/what-we-do/ensuring-economic-security/overview-economic-security.htm (Accessed 19 February 2016).
49. ICRC, "Overview of Operations 2012", 9.
50. Krähenbühl, "Challenges for Humanitarian Action", 16 November 2005, http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/statement/council-of-delegates-2005-statement-161105.htm (Accessed 19 February 2016).
51. ICRC, "Ensuring Economic Security", http://www.icrc.org/eng/what-we-do/ensuring-economic-security/overview-economic-security.htm (Accessed 19 February 2016).
52. CWGER, "Guidance Note on Early Recovery", 6, April 2008, https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/Guidance%20note%20on%20Early%20Recovery.pdf (Accessed 20 February 2017).
53. ICRC, "Economic Security: In Brief", https://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/other/icrc-002-0954.pdf (Accessed 19 February 2016).
54. Kellenberger, "Overview of the ICRC's Operations in 2012", 8 December 2011, http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/report/appeals-2012-message-president-2011-12-08.htm (Accessed 19 February 2016).

55. Ibid., 6.
56. UNDP, *Human Development Report 1994*, 27.
57. ICRC, "World Food Summit: Food Security in Armed Conflicts—The ICRC's Approach and Experience", http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/misc/57jncy.htm (Accessed 19 February 2016).
58. Ibid.
59. "CESCR, General Comment 12", para 6.
60. CESCR, "General Comment 3", para 10.
61. CESCR, "General Comment 15", para 6; See also World Summit on Sustainable Development, "Plan of Implementation 2002", para 25 (c).
62. Barber, "Facilitating Humanitarian Assistance", 394.
63. Geneva Convention IV arts 14-22; Additional Protocol I arts 8 and 12-15; Additional Protocol II art 7, 8 and 11(1); See ICRC, "Health Care in Danger" http://www.icrc.org/eng/what-we-do/safeguarding-health-care/solution/2013-04-26-hcid-health-care-in-danger-project.htm (Accessed 19 February 2016); see also UDHR art 25; UNGA "International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights", art 12.
64. See CESCR, "Concluding Observations of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: Croatia", para 34; "Serbia and Montenegro", paras 33-36, 60-63; "Cambodia", paras 32-33; "Democratic Republic of Congo", para 34; "Afghanistan", 40-42; "Concluding Observations on the Second to Fourth Periodic Report of Rwanda", para 25.
65. Interview 001; interview 002; interview 003; interview 004; interview 005.
66. Interview 001.
67. Ibid.
68. Ibid.
69. ICRC, "ICRC in the DRC", http://www.icrc.org/eng/where-we-work/africa/congo-kinshasa/index.jsp (Accessed 19 February 2016).
70. Interview 003; interview 004; interview 005.
71. Interview 004.
72. Ibid.
73. Ibid.
74. Ibid.
75. Interview 001; interview 002; interview 003; interview 004; interview 005.
76. Interview 002; interview 003; interview 004.
77. Interview 004.
78. Interview 005.
79. Interview 004.
80. ICRC, *Micro-Economic Initatives*", 11, http://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/other/icrc_002_0968.pdf (Accessed 19 February 2016).
81. Interview 005.
82. Ibid.
83. Ibid.
84. Ibid.
85. interview 001.
86. Ibid.
87. Ibid.
88. Interview 005.
89. Interview 001.
90. Ibid.
91. Ibid.
92. Interview 005.
93. Interview 001.
94. Interview 001; interview 003; interview 004.

95. Interview 005.
96. Interview 003.
97. Interview 004.
98. Ibid.
99. Ibid.
100. See S. Sivakumaran, *Re-Envisioning the International Law of Armed Conflict*, 234; See also Robertson, "Humanitarian Law and Human Rights".
101. Interview 003; interview 004.
102. Interview 001.
103. Ibid.
104. Interview 002; interview 003; interview 004.
105. Interview 001.
106. Interview 002.
107. Interview 001; interview 002; interview 003; interview 004; interview 005.
108. Interview 002.
109. Interview 001.
110. Ibid.
111. Ibid.
112. Ibid.
113. Ibid.

References

Abiew, Francis Kofi, "Humanitarian Action under Fire: Reflections on the Role of NGOs in Conflict and Post-Conflict Situations", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 19, No 2, 2012, p.203- 216.

Amouyel, Alexandra, "What is Human Security?", *Revue de Sécurité Humaine/Human Security Journal*, No 1, 2006, p.10-23.

Annan, Kofi, "Secretary-General Salutes International Workshop on Human Security in Mongolia", Two-day Session in Ulaanbaatar, Press Release, (8-10 May 2000), UN Doc SG/SM/7382.

Annan, Kofi, *We the Peoples: The Role of the United Nations in the Twenty-First Century*, UN, New York, 2000.

Barber, Rebecca, "Facilitating Humanitarian Assistance in International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law", *International Review of the Red Cross*, Vol. 91, No 874, 2009, p.371-397.

Bauer, M. W. and Gaskell, G. (eds.), *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook*, London, Sage, 2000.

Benedek, W., Ketteman, M. C. and Möstl, M. (eds.), *Mainstreaming Human Security in Peace Operations and Crisis Management: Policies, Problems, Potential*, London, Routledge, 2011.

Bernard, V., "Interview with Peter Maurer", *International Review of the Red Cross,* No 94, 2012, p.1209-1221.

Bilkovà, V., "Ensuring Human Security in Armed Conflicts: The Role of Non-State Actors and its Reflection in Current International Humanitarian Law", Ryngaert, C. and Noortman, M., *Human Security and International Law: The Challenge of Non-State Actors*, Cambridge, Intersentia, 2014.

Byrne, B., "Qualitative Interviewing", Seale, C. (ed.), *Researching Society and Culture*, 2nd edn., London, Sage, 2004.

CESCR, "Concluding Observations on the Second to Fourth Periodic Report of Rwanda, adopted by the Committee at its Fiftieth Session (29 April-17 May 2013)", 10 June 2013, UN Doc E/C.12/RWA/CO/2-4.

CESCR, "Concluding Observations: Afghanistan", 7 June 2010, UN Doc E/C.12/AFG/CO/2-4.

CESCR, "Concluding Observations: Cambodia", 12 June 2009, UN Doc E/C.12/KHM/CO/1.

CESCR, "Concluding Observations: Croatia", 5 December 2001, UN Doc E/C.12/1/Add.73.

CESCR, "Concluding Observations: Democratic Republic of Congo", 16 December 2009, UN Doc E/C.12/COD/CO/4.

CESCR, "Concluding Observations: Serbia and Montenegro", 23 June 2005, UN Doc E/C.12/1/Add.108.

CESCR, "General Comment 11: Plans of Action for Primary Education", 10 May 1999, UN Doc E/C.12/1999/4.

CESCR, "General Comment 13: The Right to Education", 8 December 1999, UN Doc E/C.12/1999/10.

CESCR, "General Comment 15: The Right to Water (Arts. 11 and 12 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights)", 20 January 2003, UN Doc E/C.12/2002/11.

CESCR, "General Comment No. 4: The Right to Adequate Housing (Art. 11 (1) of the Covenant)", 13 December 1991, UN Doc E/1992/23.

Chetail, V. *Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: A Lexicon,* Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Collins, A. (ed.), *Contemporary Security Studies*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007.

Council of Delegates (ICRC), "Agreement on the Organization of the International Activities of the Components of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement—The Seville Agreement", 25-27 November 1997, (working paper).

Cresswell, J. W., *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Traditions*, California, Sage, 1998.

CWGER (United Nations Development Programme) (in cooperation with the UNDG-ECHA Working Group on Transition), "Guidance Note on Early Recovery", April 2008, https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/Guidance%20note%20on%20Early%20Recovery.pdf (Accessed 20 February 2017).

De Queseda, Ricardo Alarcón, "Draft Resolution: 2005 World Summit Outcome [Cuba Video]", 16 September 2005, http://ww.un.org/webcast/summit2005/statements.html (Accessed 19 February 2016).

Dexter, L. A., *Elite and Specialized Interviewing*, Colchester, ECPR Press Classics, 2006.

Eberhard, Harald, Lachmayer, Konrad, Ribarov, Gregor, and Thallinger, Gerhard (eds.), *Constitutional Limits to Security: Proceedings of the 4th Vienna Workshop on International Constitutional Law*, Bergasse, Facultas Verlags, 2009.

Gillham, B., *Case Study Research Methods*, London, Continuum, 2000.

Hampson, Fen Osler, Daudelin, Jean, Hay, John, Reid, Holly, and Martin, Todd, *Madness in the Multitude: Human Security and World Disorder*, Canada, Oxford University Press, 2001.

Hubert, D. and McRae, R. G. (eds.), *Human Security and the New Diplomacy: Protecting People, Promoting Peace*, Canada, McGill University Press, 2001.

Human Security Centre, *Human Security Report 2005*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005.

ICRC, "Article 9 Commentary: Convention (I) for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field", 12 August 1949, http://www.icrc.org/ihl/1a13044f3bbb5b8ec12563fb0066f226/bcb0d20422c82f18c12563cd00420459?OpenDocument (Accessed 19 February 2016).

ICRC, "Assistance for People Affected by Armed Conflict and other Situations of Violence", February 2011, https://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/publications/icrc-002-4009.pdf (Accessed 17 February 2017).

ICRC, "Draft Resolution: 2005 World Summit Outcome", 16 September 2005, http://ww.un.org/webcast/summit2005/statements.html (Accessed 19 February 2016).

ICRC, "Economic Security: In Brief", November 2013, https://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/other/icrc-002-0954.pdf (Accessed 19 February 2016).

ICRC, "Ensuring Economic Security", 29 October 2010, http://www.icrc.org/eng/what-we-do/ensuring-economic-security/overview-economic-security.htm (Accessed 19 February 2016).

ICRC, "Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field (First Geneva Convention)", 12 August 1949, 75 UNTS 31.

ICRC, "Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea (Second Geneva Convention)", 12 August 1949, 75 UNTS 85.

ICRC, "Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (Fourth Geneva Convention)", 12 August 1949, 75 UNTS 287.

ICRC, "Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (Third Geneva Convention)", 12 August 1949, 75 UNTS 135.

ICRC, "Guiding Principles on the Right to Humanitarian Assistance", *International Review of the Red Cross*, Vol. 33, No 297, 1993, p. 519-525.

ICRC, "Health Care in Danger", http://www.icrc.org/eng/what-we-do/safeguarding-health-care/solution/2013-04-26-hcid-health-care-in-danger-project.htm (Accessed 19 February 2016).

ICRC, "ICRC Annual Report 2003", June 2004, https://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/annual-report/icrc-annual-report-2003.htm (Accessed 20 February 2017).

ICRC, "ICRC in the DRC: Facts and Figures", http://www.icrc.org/eng/where-we-work/africa/congo-kinshasa/index.jsp (Accessed 19 February 2016).

ICRC, *ICRC Strategy 2011-14: Achieving Significant Results for People in Need*, ICRC, Geneva, 2010.

ICRC, "Micro-Economic Initiatives: Handbook", 2002, http://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/other/icrc_002_0968.pdf (Accessed 19 February 2016).

ICRC, "Overview of Operations 2012", November 2011, https://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/report/appeals-2012-overview-2011-12-08.htm (Accessed 17 February 2017).

ICRC, "Overview of the ICRC's Work to Promote Economic Security", 29 October 2010, http://www.icrc.org/eng/what-we-do/ensuring-economic-security/overview-economic-security.htm (Accessed 19 February 2016).

ICRC, "Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I)", 8 June 1977, 1125 UNTS 3.

ICRC, "Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II)", 8 June 1977, 1125 UNTS 609.

ICRC, "Statutes of the International Committee of the Red Cross", 3 October 2013, https://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/misc/icrc-statutes-080503.htm (Accessed 21 March 2017).

ICRC, "The ICRC's Mandate and Mission", 29 October 2010, http://www.icrc.org/eng/who-we-are/mandate/overview-icrc-mandate-mission.htm (Accessed 19 February 2016).

ICRC, "World Food Summit: Food Security in Armed Conflicts—The ICRC's Approach and Experience", http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/misc/57jncy.htm (Accessed 19 February 2016).

ICRCRCM, "Strengthening the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement Response to Growing Humanitarian Needs", 32nd International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, (8-10 December 2015) EN 32IC/15/R7.

Jakovlijević, B., "The Right to Humanitarian Assistance—Legal Aspects", *International Review of the Red Cross*, Vol. 27, No 260, 1987, p.469-484.

Jeannet, Stéphane, "Non-Disclosure of Evidence before International Criminal Tribunals: Recent Developments Regarding the ICRC", *International and Comparative Law Quarterly,* Vol. 50, No 3, 2001, p.643-656.

Kellenberger, J., "Overview of the ICRC's Operations in 2012: Message from the President, Jakob Kellenberger", 8 December 2011, http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/report/appeals-2012-message-president-2011-12-08.htm (Accessed 19 February 2016).

Krähenbühl, P., "Challenges for Humanitarian Action in Situations of Armed Conflict and Internal Violence: Statement Council of Delegates of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, Seoul, Republic of Korea, 16-18 November 2005", http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/statement/council-of-delegates-2005-statement-161105.htm (Accessed 19 February 2016).

Lewarne, S. and Snelbecker, D., "Economic Governance in War-Torn Economies: Lessons Learned from the Marshall Plan to the Reconstruction of Iraq: Long Report", prepared for USAID Bureau for Policy and Program Coordination, USAID, Washington DC, 2004.

Lindblom A-K., *Non-Governmental Organizations in International Law*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Maisel, R. and Persell, C. H., *How Sampling Works*, California, Sage, 1996.

Martin, Mary and Owen, Taylor "The Second Generation of Human Security: Lessons from the UN and EU Experience", *International Affairs*, Vol. 86, No 1, 2010, p.211-224.

Mgbeoji, I., "The Civilised Self and the Barbaric Other: Imperial Delusions of Order and the Challenges of Human Security", *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No 5, 2006, p.855-869.

Owen, Taylor, "Human Security-Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition", *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 35, No 3, p.373-387.

Paris, R., "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?", *International Security*, Vol. 26, No 2, 2001, p.87-102.

Partlett, K., *The Individual and the International Legal System: Continuity and Change in International Law*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011.
Ratner S. R., "Law Promotion Beyond Law Talk: The Red Cross, Persuasion, and the Laws of War", *European Journal of International Law*, Vol. 22, No 2, 2011, p.459-506.
Report of the Secretary General, "An Agenda for Development" (6 May 1994) UN Doc A/48/938.
Report of the Secretary General, "An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peace-making and Peace-keeping" (17 June 1992) UN Doc A/47/277 -S/24111 (An Agenda for Peace).
Report of the Secretary General, "Follow up to General Assembly Resolution 64/291 on Human Security" (5 April 2012) UN Doc A/66/763.
Report of the Secretary General, "Follow-up to General Assembly Resolution 66/290 on Human Security" (23 December 2012) UN Doc A/68/685 (Common Understanding).
Report of the Secretary General, "Human Security" (8 March 2010) UN Doc A/64/701 (General Assembly Human Security Report 2010).
Report of the Secretary-General, "In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All" (21 March 2005) UN Doc A/59/2005 (In Larger Freedom).
Report of the Secretary General, "No Exit without Strategy: Security Council Decision-making and the Closure or Transition of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations" (20 April 2001) UN Doc S/2001/ 394 para 4 (No Exit Without Strategy).
Report of the Secretary General, "Peace Building in the Immediate Aftermath of Conflict" (11 June 2009) UN Doc A/63/881–S/2009/304.
Report of the Secretary General's High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, "A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility" (2 December 2004) UN Doc A/59/565, 22 (High-level Panel).
Roberts, D., *Global Governance and Biopolitics: Regulating Human Security*, London, Zed Books, 2010.
Robertson, A. H., "Humanitarian Law and Human Rights", Swinarski, C. (ed.), *Studies and Essays on International Humanitarian Law and Red Cross Principles in Honour of Jean Pictet*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1984.
Robson, C., *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1993.
Salter, M. and Mason, J., *Writing Law Dissertations: An Introduction and Guide to the Conduct of Legal Research*, London, Longman, 2007.
Seidman, I., *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences*, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1998.
Silverman, D., *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction*, 3rd edn., London, SAGE, 2006.
Sivakumaran, S., "Re-Envisioning the International Law of Armed Conflict", *European Journal of International Law*, Vol. 22, No 1, 2011, p.219-264.
Sivakumaran, S., *The Law of Non-International Armed Conflict*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012.
Thomas, S. P. and Pollio, H. R., *Listening to Patients: A Phenomenological Approach to Nursing Research and Practice*, New York, Springer, 2002.
Torrente, N de., "Humanitarian Action under Attack: Reflections on the Iraq War", *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, Vol. 17, No. 1, 2004, p. 2-30.
United Nations, "Revised Draft Outcome Document of the High-level Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly of September 2005 Submitted by the President of the General Assembly paragraph 120" (10 August 2005) UN Doc A/59/HLPM/CRP.1/Rev.2.
UNDP, *Human Development Report 1994*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1994.
UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support, "United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines", 18 January 2008, http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/capstone_eng.pdf (Accessed 17 January 2017).

UNGA, "2005 World Summit Outcome" (15 September 2005) A/60/L.1 (Outcome Document).
UNGA, "International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights", *Treaty Series 999*, 1966.
UNGA, "Follow-up to Paragraph 143 on Human Security of the 2005 World Summit Outcome" (25 October 2012) Res 66/290.
UNGA, "Preparation for and Organization of the High-level Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly" (25 April 2005) Res 59/291.
Upadhyaya, P., "Human Security, Humanitarian Intervention, and Third World Concerns", *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy*, Vol. 33, 2004-2005, p.71-91.
Wennmann A., "Conflict Economies", Chetail, V. (ed.), *Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: A Lexicon*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009.
West, K., *Agents of Altruism: The Expansion of Humanitarian NGOs in Rwanda and Afghanistan*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2001.
World Summit on Sustainable Development, "Plan of Implementation 2002" (4 September 2002) A/CONF.199/20.