

- Kosovo can be seen as the displacement of the security or safety of one group of people for another. Some argued that the intervention in Kosovo was premised upon bringing insecurity to the Serbians in Kosovo, in order to remove insecurity for the Albanian Kosovars. Given the number of conflicts in which two hostile and violent factions can find security only in the insecurity of the other, the question of how to employ force to ensure the long-term security of *both* sides must be addressed. There may be a contradiction inherent in such practice.
- Kosovo can also be seen as the failure of human security as a preventative strategy. To what extent does the potential use of force by a military alliance undermine the preventative side of human security? This question needs to be considered in light of human security becoming, as one participant said, a new '*raison d'être*' for NATO in a post-Cold War world, and the implications for the UN.
- The practice of human security to date has been focused on military activities and issues (forcible intervention, small arms, mines, etc.); further, as one participant suggested, the UN Security Council resolution passed with respect to Kosovo was framed, in part, in the 'old' language of bringing a traditional peace to Kosovo, and there was little mention of human security.⁶ The successful implementation of human security may be hindered by a continuing emphasis on military notions of peace and security.
- Considering the precedent created by NATO in sidestepping the UN Security Council, the question is raised of how other, potentially arbitrary and misguided interventions into states, in the name of 'democracy' and 'human rights', can be avoided if the principle of non-intervention is eroded, and the safety check of the Security Council is ignored. On the other hand, if Security Council members have veto power, how will any forcible humanitarian intervention be approved by its members?
- One critical issue is the role of the United States in the use of force. Given only the US has the power and ability to undertake large scale military interventions, the issue of US unilateralism and human security should be analyzed both as a problem and a solution.

It was also acknowledged that human security is not synonymous with forcible intervention, as some critics seem to think. Rather forcible humanitarian intervention is but one extreme point on the human security spectrum of possible actions.

⁶ While this resolution does, at one point, speak of the 'humanitarian tragedy taking place in Kosovo', it states first and foremost, 'Bearing in mind the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security', and further, 'Determining that the situation in the region continues to constitute a threat to international peace and security...'. UN Security Council Resolution 1244, June 10, 1999. (S/Res/1244)