

THE RIGHT TO SECURITY IN THE FACE OF GLOBAL THREATS

In the 21st century, the right to security has become a pivotal issue in the protection of fundamental human rights. Global threats such as terrorism, environmental catastrophes, pandemics, and mass migration flows have increased the tension between state security interests and the obligation to respect individual freedoms and rights.

Terrorism represents one of the most challenging threats to national and international peace. Governments often respond with urgent and severe counterterrorism legislation. However, these measures sometimes restrict civil liberties such as the right to privacy, freedom of movement, and the right to a fair trial. Fineberg (2015) highlights how international sanctions and security measures imposed in the name of fighting terrorism can bypass due process and violate basic human rights [1, p. 72].

Similarly, Williams (2005) addresses how common law nations have struggled to maintain a balance between individual freedoms and national security in the aftermath of 9/11. In some cases, courts have accepted the need for temporary restrictions; however, long-term constraints on human rights often lack adequate legal oversight and transparency [2, p. 47; 4, p. 23].

The COVID-19 pandemic brought new dimensions to the debate over security and rights. Governments worldwide adopted emergency regulations, lockdowns, and mandatory tracking systems. While these were meant to ensure public health, they also resulted in wide-scale restrictions on movement, freedom of assembly, and data privacy. Zamir (2020) argues that many emergency powers exceeded proportionality, with insufficient safeguards for restoring freedoms once the crisis was under control [5, p. 67].

Furthermore, migration triggered by environmental disasters or conflicts is increasingly framed as a security issue. As migration flows rise, states tend to prioritize border control and national stability, often at the expense of migrants' rights. The article from *E-International Relations* (2012) emphasizes the need to humanize migration policies and to remember that state sovereignty does not nullify international human rights obligations [3, p. 45].

Ultimately, a democratic and legal state must seek a sustainable and justifiable balance between national security and human rights. As highlighted by research on international law and institutions, security and rights must not be seen as mutually exclusive. Instead, they should complement each other to build resilient societies that can respond to threats without compromising liberty [2, p. 50; 5, p. 69].

The right to security must be exercised with caution, following legal standards, transparency, and proportionality. It is crucial that emergency measures be temporary, clearly defined, and subject to judicial control to avoid becoming tools for authoritarian abuse. International human rights law provides a framework within which states can act decisively and still uphold the dignity of every individual.

While global threats continue to evolve, one thing remains clear: states must not sacrifice human rights in the name of security. The examples of past and ongoing crises show that a short-term approach to national security can lead to long-term consequences for democracy and the rule of law.

According to Fineberg (2015), the lack of clear definitions in counterterrorism frameworks has led to the misuse of power, including arbitrary detention and limitations on access to legal counsel. She argues that such ambiguity allows authorities to justify excessive restrictions without accountability [1, p. 74]. This has often affected minority communities and political activists, creating new forms of discrimination under the guise of national security.

Williams (2005) provides an in-depth analysis of legislation introduced after major terror attacks. He warns that emergency powers tend to remain in force long after the immediate threat has passed. In some cases, these powers become part of normal law, blurring the lines between temporary crisis management and permanent restriction of freedoms [2, p. 49].

The E-International Relations article (2012) stresses that migration management based on fear and control rather than international cooperation and empathy leads to the marginalisation of vulnerable groups. The framing of migrants as “security threats” is not only misleading but also dangerous, as it normalizes xenophobia and undermines global human rights standards [3, p. 46].

Zamir (2020) takes a legal-philosophical perspective, reminding us that democratic states cannot be judged solely by their security policies but also by how they treat people in times of crisis. He emphasizes that even under real threats, ethical leadership must guide legal decisions. Security policies that lack transparency or independent review tend to erode trust between citizens and institutions [5, p. 68].

ResearchGate’s study (2020) also underlines the importance of checks and balances. It warns that without public oversight, intelligence agencies and law enforcement bodies may operate with little regard for privacy or procedural rights. The authors suggest that parliamentary review and public reporting mechanisms are crucial to prevent abuse of power [4, p. 26; 2, p. 50].

What’s more, some researchers have called for stronger cooperation between international bodies to ensure that emergency laws comply with human rights conventions. For instance, Zamir (2020) advocates for clearer international legal instruments that can guide states during crises without compromising fundamental freedoms [5, p. 69].

In conclusion, security should never be used as a justification for authoritarian tendencies. The real challenge lies in developing security strategies that respect the principles of justice, equality, and human dignity. Governments must remain accountable and always ensure that emergency powers do not become a permanent threat to civil society.

REFERENCES

1. Fineberg M. International Counterterrorism – National Security and Human Rights: Conflicts of Norms or Checks and Balances? – *Human Rights Law Review*. – 2015. – Vol. 15(2). – P. 70–76. Режим доступа: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2015.1027053>
2. Williams G. Balancing National Security and Human Rights: Assessing the Legal Response of Common Law Nations to the Threat of Terrorism. – *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*. – 2005. – Vol. 7(3). – P. 44–51. Режим доступа: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13876980500513335>
3. E-International Relations. Human Rights and State Security: The Conflicting Features of International Migration. – 2012. – P. 43–48. Режим доступа: <https://www.e-ir.info/2012/09/19/human-rights-and-state-security-the-conflicting-features-of-international-migration/>

4. ResearchGate. Balancing Human Rights and National Security. – 2020. – P. 21–29.

5. Zamir I. Human Rights and National Security. – Israel Law Review. – Cambridge University Press, 2020. – P. 65–70.