

## Re-thinking the Human Security Concept in the Post-Independence Tanzania

**Mwinyikombo Ally\*** |ORCID: 0009-0002-8003-0930

Department of Political Science and Public Administration

The University of Dodoma, Tanzania

Email: [amwinyikombo@gmail.com](mailto:amwinyikombo@gmail.com)

**Jesper Katomero** |ORCID: 0000-0002-3584-6327

Department of Political Science and Public Administration

The University of Dodoma, Tanzania

Email: [jesperkatomero@yahoo.com](mailto:jesperkatomero@yahoo.com)

**Godfrey Sansa** |ORCID: 0009-0001-1462-9518

Department of Political Science and Public Administration

The University of Dodoma, Tanzania

Email: [godysansa@gmail.com](mailto:godysansa@gmail.com)

### Abstract

In recent decades, the concept of human security has attracted increasing attention from scholars and practitioners. While there is broad agreement on its normative goals, such as the protection and empowerment of individuals, significant disagreements persist regarding the social realities it addresses, its conceptual evolution, and the conditions under which it becomes institutionalised. Drawing on a literature review, this article examines the multiple meanings attributed to the concept of human security and its evolution in Tanzania's policy domains. It argues that, while human security gained international recognition in the 1990s, it resonates strongly with Tanzania's historical and policy experiences.

### Keywords

Security, Human Security, State Security, *Ujamaa*, Socialism

### 1. Introduction

The famous catchphrase "human security" in security studies is contradictory and vague (Alkire, 2003; Asaka, 2023) and hitherto contested (Fukuda-Parr & Messine, 2012; MacDonald, 2002). For some, it is even doubtful whether the human security concept, which emerged in 1994, is a new concept or idea, as it is often purported to be. The concept carries mixed understanding among a number of scholars, such as Bayson (2018), Gargo (2022), Inglehart & Norris (2012), King & Murray (2001), Krause (2008), Newman (2010), Paris (2001), and Singh (2016). Amongst them, some posit human security as a new concept while others refer to it as a new idea. Equally, some attribute its emergence to new threats such as disease, hunger,

illiteracy, environmental issues and internal violence, especially after the end of the Cold War in 1989, as the bottom line for its existence.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)'s Human Development Report (1994) serves as the bedrock of human security. While acknowledging it as a new concept, the report notes that it had existed in the United States since the early 20th century and that the establishment of the United Nations was based on it (UNDP, 1994).

For Newman (2010), human security seeks to contest the so-called 'high politics' that often aim to preserve state sovereignty and its interests, but at the expense of individuals, thereby causing deprivation and insecurity. This, however, is not to suggest that human security is in a tug-of-war with state security; rather, the state remains the centre stage of security, both for itself and for the people. Therefore, human security and state security complement one another (Acharya, 2011; Commission on Human Security, 2003; Mwinyikombo, 2022; Newman, 2016; Singh, 2016).

More to the point, 'Shopping list' (Newman, 2010:82) and 'Laundry list of threats' (Asaka & Oluoko-Odingo, 2023:35) are common watchwords among the polemics of the concept (Asaka, 2023, Paris, 2001) in the attempt to address the extent to which human security is dubious. Needless to recount that the broadness and vagueness (Alkire, 2003) due to its 'no stone will be left unturned' spirit that makes human security a 'catch-all' concept did not go without scrutiny. Thus, Ogata (2000) branded it as a concept "which can mean all, and nothing" while for Gargo (2022:10) "the main criticism of the concept refers to the problem of imagining what is not included in the list of human security issues at all." Similarly, according to MacDonald (2002), "An obstacle to the analysis of human security is the lack of a clear consensus as to what it is, and what it seeks to do." As such, although the concept human security has since its birth in 1994 attracted several stringent debates in vast areas, there is yet no consensus on its evolution as to whether it is a new or an old concept (Bayson, 2018; Inglehart & Norris, 2012; King & Murray, 2001; Krause, 2008; MacDonald, 2002; Newman, 2010; Paris, 2001; Singh, 2016). As a result, attempts to arrive at a common understanding of the same were hardly pursued in international platforms such as the UNDP, at the regional level, or at the level of individual countries. That is why the UNDP (1994) calls for an integrated framework to address security issues. In this regard, this article examines the multiple meanings attributed to the concept of human security and their relevance to the Tanzanian context.

## 2. Human Security: A Historical Trajectory

Human desire for security is as old as humankind itself, and human evolution is partly a struggle to address immediate environmental insecurity and secure life. Hence, historically, human life is largely defined by countermeasures to sustain their livelihood (Tuncer, 2022), only with changing security contours happening with the rise of nation-states. It is on this ground that modern states and the concept of security are often traced back to the Westphalia Peace Treaty, 1648, from when states were mandated to provide security to their people and to defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity, a move that led to what is often referred to as 'state-centric security'. In this case, the security concept was inclined to the state while less interest was vested in the people.

The idea of individual people as the referent of security is also not new (Fukuda-Parr & Messine, 2012). According to Hampson *et al.* (2002), human security stretches its roots to the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The scholars cited above reflected on the Battle of Solferino, when Henry Truman observed the suffering of combatants and non-combatants alike; hence, he devised what is now known as the Law of War (Law of Armed Conflicts or Humanitarian Law). His ultimate objective was to protect people from violence, which is presently conceived as freedom from

fear in the realm of human security. Moreover, the law provides that the harmed and injured should be provided with necessary humanitarian assistance. Apparently, the law of armed conflict is against deprivation and calls for a dignified life of individuals. In essence, it is related to human security because it is people centered. It limits state security impacts on the people caused by military aggression. This is equally accentuated by Krause (2008), who claims that human security vests responsibility to all states, though at varying degrees, to ensure the safety of their people first.

The 1990s marked a pivotal shift in contemporary security discourse. Prior to the end of the Cold War, security was overwhelmingly state-centric, focused on preserving territorial integrity and sovereignty primarily through military power (McRae & Hubert, 2001). The Cold War period and its aftermath fundamentally complicated this narrow view, particularly through the threat of nuclear weapons (Donmez, 2010), while new multidimensional threats also emerged (Cavas-İsmet, 2008), which were approached from various perspectives (Tuncer, 2022). It was during the 1990s that the state-centered paradigm in international relations was critically reanalyzed, expanding the objects of security to include political, environmental, economic, and social sectors (Kiyici, 2012). Consequently, the traditional approach began to fall out of fashion (Saleh, 2010), its scope broadened significantly, thereby necessitating the emergence of other security dimensions (Tuncer, 2022). As such, today security is known in more than the absence of conflict. Marked by this paradigm shift, the focus has deviated from the statist to people-centered security (Lawson, 2017).

In 1994, the UNDP, through its Human Development Report, adopted human security as a 'new concept'. In its entirety, it comprises seven dimensions: economic security, health security, food security, environmental security, political security, community security, and individual security (UNDP, 1994). Indeed, the Report is very precise in its letters, "A new concept of human security" (UNDP, 1994:3), whose aim is to ensure and guarantee freedom from fear and freedom from want. The former denotes a situation in which people are free from violence, whereas the latter denotes freedom from poverty. The ultimate objective for both, nonetheless, is to enable people to live a dignified life. In this way, the concept broached an entirely alternative approach to security. The priority shifted from the state to individual persons (Saleh, 2010).

The UNDP (1994) further states that security threats to people are emerging phenomena and therefore calls for a "transition from the narrow concept of national security to all-encompassing human security." This statement calls for a paradigm shift in how we understand and prioritise security, moving away from a traditional, state-focused view to a broader, people-centred one. Similarly, emerging research echoes this perspective in its discussion of national security (Fusiek, 2020; Laurent & Ndumbaro, 2023; Şengöz, 2022). National security is no longer confined to protection of the state, i.e. its borders, sovereignty, government, and institutions, but broadly understood to encompass non-military dimensions, including security against terrorism, crime minimisation, economic security, food security, energy security, environmental security, and cybersecurity.

While UNDP is often considered the genesis of human security, ideas related to it had long been articulated. In his celebrated 1941 speech, *The State of the Union*, Franklin Roosevelt, the former U.S. president, articulated the earliest conception of human security. In – contemplating the broadening of security concept he stressed on 'freedom from want' and 'freedom from fear' which later in 1994, became the elements of human security (Tavanti & Stachowicz-Stanus, 2013). Subsequently, in 1945, at the UN, the US Secretary of State pointed out two fronts on peace and security domains which are 'freedom from fear' and 'freedom from want'. Later, it was noted that the provisions of the UN Charter would not be

construed appropriately to make the world secure if its men and women did not enjoy security in their homes and jobs (Fukuda-Parr & Messine, 2012; UNDP, 1994:15). Hence, it is against the above trajectory that this paper examines the evolution of human security concept in Tanzania's policy discourses.

### **3. Conceptualising Human Security**

The concept of human security is contested (Fukuda-Parr & Messine, 2012; Johns, 2014). The UN Commission on Human Security (2003:4) defines human security as "the protection of the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedom and human fulfilment." Even though the Commission did not attempt to expound what the term 'vital core' implies, Alkire (2003) infers it to human rights or capabilities related to absolute poverty. Equally, Fukuda-Parr & Messine (2012) define vital core as elementary rights and freedoms that people enjoy. Moreover, human security is defined by McRae & Hubert (2001) as the absence of fear. Nonetheless, fear cannot be absent in absolute reality. Similarly, the UNDP (1994:23) defines human security as "safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. It means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life –whether in homes, in jobs or in communities."

There is a broad consensus among security scholars (King & Murray, 2001; Krause, 2008; Paris, 2001; Saleh, 2010) that human security has broadened the security concept beyond the preserve of the state and made the people its priority. Again, it has reversed the equation in thinking about security. The referent object of security is among the issues on which security scholars agree in the current human security landscape. Hence, human security threats have assumed a leading priority within the UNDP. However, the broadening notion is misconceived, misinterpreted or misrepresented. This is due to the resultant effect of bifurcating security instead of broadening it. If human security serves the prevailing state's interest as argued by Chandler (2008), why should it be separated from state security? This raises yet another suspicion that human security may attract insecurity rather than promoting security.

This definitional expansion is a morning call that if anything that threatens human well-being is scrutinised as human security, the concept may fall short of analytical scrutiny and hence render it useless (Deudney, 1990; Newman, 2010; Owen, 2004). According to Newman (2016), critical scholars of human security question how the concept is being adopted in policy circles nationally and internationally, including within the United Nations. Thus, it replicates and reinforces the existing security attitudes and policies. This, in the words of Bosold (2011:29), makes "the progressive essence of human security –if ever existed– being lost". This is in line with MacDonald's (2002) viewpoint that Human Security might involve a reversion to the same problems of traditional security in terms of reifying, or contributing to the legitimacy of, the state, problems which it sought in part to address.

### **4. Human Security in the Tanzanian Context**

In the Tanzanian context, the concept and practice of human security can be traced back to 1954, with the founding of the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU), and to the period after independence. In 1962, President Nyerere declared war against what he termed the 'Three Enemies' of the nation—ignorance, disease and poverty. The Arusha Declaration of 1967, which established socialism, solidified the bases of human security in policy discourses similar to the current human security doctrine. These are discussed in turn.

#### 4.1. Human Security and the Tanganyika African Union's Creed

The Tanganyika African National Union (TANU), a nationalist political party in Tanzania (Tanganyika) prior to and since independence in 1961, was committed to human dignity. According to TANU Creed 1954, every individual has a right to dignity, right to receive from society the protection of [one's] life, to receive return for his labour, to safeguard the inherent dignity of the individual in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the government's efforts to mobilise resources in order to eliminate poverty<sup>1</sup>. Since the founding of TANU in 1954, people's security was at the core. The declaration in the party constitution that ignorance, disease, and poverty were the enemies of the people (TANU Creed, 1954) is evidence that human security evolved well before 1994. By synthesising human security and TANU Creed's objective of achieving a dignified life for people, they share the same ends. In the final analysis, however, it is unsurprising that human security has returned Tanzania to an era in which socialist principles were equated with dignity and capitalist principles as evil. Similarly, the establishment of Chama Cha Mapinduzi in 1977 did not render human security redundant. Its constitution upheld the socialist principle of ensuring that people live with dignity.

Moreover, the current Constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania (1977) under Articles 3 and 9, recognises the country as a socialist whose primary objective, as provided under Article 8, is to ensure the welfare of the people. Indeed, Article 9 is precise in its articulation of the dignified life of humankind, which serves as the baseline for human security. This constitutional provision also enshrines the concern for people's development by placing it at the forefront of the fight against the three enemies (poverty, ignorance, and disease).

#### 4.2. The Post-Independence Three Enemies' Mantra

Tanzania, [then Tanganyika] acquired its independence from the British on December 9, 1961. In those early days of the independence period, the immediate interest of the independent government was to fight against 'Three Enemies' –poverty, ignorance, and disease (Kamata *et al.*, 2020; Shivji, 1993). In one of his 1962 speeches, Nyerere accentuates:

There is no an enemy who has killed a lot of people than ignorance, poverty and disease...The famine which we encountered in the yesteryear, if it is not because of our preparedness, it would have killed a lot of Tanganyikans than those killed in the Maji Maji War.<sup>2</sup>

According to Kamata *et al.*, (2020:250), "These were the new enemies, internal, not external, like colonialism. The focus now had to be shifted to these enemies." Indeed, this represents a paradigm shift in the conception of security, shifting it from the preserve of the state to people-centric security. The same was later articulated in the UNDP Human Development Report (1994). As Saleh (2010) points out, after the Cold War, the military might as a way of promoting security has fallen out of fashion. Hence, the potential enemies as of now emanate internally, which affect people more than the state. Hence, the three enemies' concept connotes economic security (poverty) or, rather, freedom from want and health security (disease). In fact, Nyerere's decision to proclaim the three enemies' strategy is in line with Hove *et al.* (2013), who posit that it is 'useless' to have a secure state without a secure citizenry. Thus, it is correct to argue that Nyerere adopted a double-tiered security approach. While he was determined to enforce border security, he was also committed to people's security.

<sup>1</sup> See the Creed at <https://www.marxists.org/subject/africa/nyerere/1967/arusha-declaration.htm>

<sup>2</sup> Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), National Assembly Official Report. First Session (Fifth Meeting) sitting from 10th December 1962 to 16th February 1963 p.3

However, prior to independence, the three enemies' concept was already enshrined in the TANU Creed. Mwandosya & Mwapachu (2023:250) echo the latter, "I will volunteer and work hard to eradicate poverty, ignorance and disease." Similarly, Nyerere's (1968:17-18) augmented the above commitment by postulating that:

We are at war. TANU is involved in war against poverty and oppression in our country. The struggle is aimed at moving the people of Tanzania (and the people of Africa as a whole) from a state of poverty to a state of prosperity.

Later, with the founding of Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM) similar position was reinstated. The CCM Constitution (1977:2), upheld the war against three enemies as it specifies, [in our translated version], "To see that the national wealth expenditures emphasise on citizens' development and especially the efforts to eradicate poverty, ignorance and disease"

To operationalise this promise, the government compelled people to work to make ends meet, as the ethos goes *Uhuru na Kazi* –Freedom and Work. For instance, *Sheria ya Nguvu Kazi* –Human Resource Deployment Law (1983) was enacted to make people work in order to promote their well-being and enhance the country's economic stability (Shivji *et al.*, 2020; Taasisi ya Uongozi na Chuo Kikuu cha Sokoine cha Kilimo, 2024). This entailed economic security. On food security, agriculture was considered the backbone of the economy and people's development. As a result, several initiatives such as *Kilimo ni Uti wa Mgongo* – Agriculture is the Backbone, *Kilimo cha Kufa na Kupona* –Agriculture as a Matter of Life and Death (1971), *Siasa ni Kilimo* –Politics is Agriculture were adopted (Kilungu, 2012; Taasisi ya Uongozi na Chuo Kikuu cha Sokoine cha Kilimo, 2024). For instance, the TANU Executive Committee Resolution held in Iringa, which in turn adopted the initiative *Siasa ni Kilimo* – Politics is Agriculture (Iringa Declaration), is very specific on food security and economic security through people's engagement in agriculture and the government's commitment to promoting it (TANU, 1972). Moreover, food security through agriculture is a cross-cutting issue that also addresses environmental and community security.

These three enemies fall within the securitisation perspective (Balzacq 2011) in the name of human security. Thus, this perception prompted the country to instantly react against these security threats. However, at that time, the concept was not on the international security agenda. During that period, Tanzania's domestic and foreign policies were characterised by socialism (Mwandosya & Mwapachu, 2022). The government under socialism was very concerned with the freedom and dignity of the people (Othman & Maina, 2006). Since then, the country has been preoccupied with improving the standard of living for the population. The focus of the government was that the best way to earn subsistence and development of the people was for them to work hard (Kamata *et al.*, 2020). Hence, the slogan: Freedom and Work, literally, *Uhuru na Kazi*, in Kiswahili (Kamata *et al.*, 2020:79; Mwandosya & Mwapachu, 2022:249–250).

#### **4.3. Human security and the Arusha Declaration**

The Arusha Declaration was adopted on 05 February 1967 as a country's political economy pathway. This set the template for Tanzanian socialism. It generated and shaped a new political and economic roadmap for the country. The main socio-political ideology was *Ujamaa* – Socialism- and its policy was based on the equality of people so as to maintain the security of the country. Its main objective was to eradicate income inequalities by making sure that all Tanzanians shared the benefits accrued from development equally (Pratt, 1999). During this period, the economy was state-controlled (Mkapa, 2019). Its tenets include: the right to a

dignified life and respect, the right to receive protection of life from society, and the right to receive a just return from labour (Nyerere, 1968).

Maliyamkono *et al.* (2022) observe that Nyerere intended to create a socialist country that adheres to the principles of equality and respect for human dignity, equal sharing of resources, and work by all and exploitation by none. However, those who cannot work due to natural exigencies should be afforded their fair share to sustain themselves and live a dignified life (Nyerere, 1967). Tanzania's socialist principles were based on equality of people in all aspects of their lives and the absence of exploitation, which entails fair distribution of resources (Nyerere, 1968). According to Shivji *et al.* (2016), socialism also means the control of the exploited class –the working people—and the economy is owned and controlled in their interests. The satisfaction of the needs of the people is among the characteristics of socialism. Its objectives are not centred solely on improving the quality of life but also on expanding the economy to support a sustainable, dignified life for the people.

Although Socialism was officially adopted in 1967, it had existed prior to that year. President Nyerere, in his speech at the National Assembly on 10 December 1962 –one day after becoming the President of Tanganyika- declared that:

The appropriate word to explain our government's objectives is 'COMMUNALISM' because communalism is a way of living and working brotherly. This is the way of working for the benefit of the entire community. Communalism is a socialist apparatus. All of us have agreed to build and maintain a socialist Tanganyika and its apparatus.<sup>3</sup>

Security in the context of the Arusha Declaration was people-centred. Thus, Nyerere (1968:5) stresses:

One of the most socialist achievements of our society was the sense of security it gave to its members...No one starved, either of food or human dignity, because he lacked personal wealth, he could depend on the wealth possessed by the community of which he was a member...Socialism is essentially distributive.

Thus, security was people-centred. In *The Purpose is Man* speech delivered on 05 August 1967, Mwalimu Julius Kambarage Nyerere emphasised how his government was 'man-centered', arguing that for Tanzania, which was implementing the Arusha Declaration, the purpose of all social, economic and political activities was expected to be for the man, the citizen and all the citizens. However, during that period, human security was not yet a fashionable concept and was even unpopular among capitalist nations, as it was equated with leftist ideologies.

Nonetheless, the paradox of Nyerere's "people-centred" doctrine was that it was state-centric, as the state was the centre of both economic production and distribution. The concept was also narrow, in that it was primarily concerned with satisfying people's needs for material existence. The state-centric model of human security can also pose a threat to people. For instance, there are concerns that states have reversed the equation from being the sole purveyors of security to their own people to become potential enemies (Buzan, 2009; Newman, 2016). Buzan (2009) argues that some of the threats emanating from the state are law-making, interpretation and enforcement. Similarly, Tanzania, even during Nyerere's regime, has

---

<sup>3</sup> Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), National Assembly Official Report. First Session (Fifth Meeting) sitting from 10th December 1962 to 16th February 1963 p.9

enacted and enforced repressive laws that curtail the spirit of human security.<sup>4</sup> Notwithstanding remarkable flaws and weaknesses embedded in repressive government legislation, the human security concept was not sidelined. As Shivji (1993) paraphrases Nyerere, if justice means anything at all, it must protect the lives of individuals.

This discussion demonstrates that human security resonates strongly with Tanzania's historical and policy experiences, even though the term has not been officially and internationally used. Tanzania's post-independence emphasis on self-reliance, social welfare, and people-centred development reflects many of the core principles embedded in the contemporary human security framework, particularly freedom from want and freedom from fear.

## 5. Conclusion

This review confirms that human security is an evolving and contested concept. Although there is broad agreement on its normative objective, the protection and empowerment of individuals, there is significant divergence regarding what constitutes threats, who defines them, and how responses should be institutionalised. For instance, while human security was central to Tanzania's social and economic policy since the early 1960s, the international community did not embrace the concept until five decades after World War II, when it was adopted in international development programmes. This article dispels the myth that UNDP is a human security invention.

The review suggests that human security provides a useful analytical lens for understanding Tanzania's development and security trajectory. Historically, Tanzania has emphasised people-centred governance through policies such as *Ujamaa*, the Arusha Declaration, and the prioritisation of social services. These approaches align closely with the human security emphasis on economic, food, health, and community security. In contemporary Tanzania, human security challenges remain multifaceted. Economic insecurity persists due to poverty, unemployment, and informal livelihoods, particularly among youth and rural populations. Food security remains threatened by climate variability and dependence on rain-fed agriculture, while health security is shaped by unequal access to healthcare and emerging public health risks. Environmental security has gained prominence as climate change intensifies droughts, floods, and land degradation, directly affecting livelihoods and settlement patterns (Boko *et al.*, 2007). All these increase vulnerabilities and pose a threat to human security in Tanzania. In line with these and other emerging challenges, future reviews may examine how the concept of human security in Tanzania has evolved beyond *Ujamaa*, particularly in the era of neoliberalism and the impact that evolution might have on national security.

## Funding

No external funding was accrued for this study.

## Disclosure Statement

The authors declare neither competing financial interests nor personal relationships which could influence the production of this work.

---

<sup>4</sup> For example, The Villagisation and *Ujamaa* Villages (Registration, Designation and Administration) Act and the Preventive Detention Act (1962) are some of Nyerere's era laws highly criticized for suppressing people's rights

## References

Acharya, A. (2011). *The Globalization of World Politics* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alkire, S. (2003). *A Conceptual Framework for Human Security*. Center for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity.

Asaka, J. (2023). *Human Security*, In: Asaka, O. & Oluoko-Odingo. A. (2023). *Human Security and Sustainable Development in East Africa*, London: Routledge, 27-40.

Balzacq, T. (2011). *Securitization Theory*, New York: Routledge.

Bayson, O. (2018). Human Security from the Critical Theory Perspective: EU and the Refugee Crisis. *Sosyal Bilimler Metinleri*, 2018/02, 16-24.

Boko, M., Niang, I., Vogel, C., Githeko, A., Medany, M., Osman-Elasha, B., Tabo, R. & Yanda, P. (2007). *Africa*. In: Parry, L. Canziani, O., Palutikof, J., Van Der Linden, P., & Hanson, C. (Eds.). *Climate Change: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bosold, D. (2011). 'Development of the human security field. A critical examination'. In: Chandler, D. & Nynek, N. (Eds), *Critical Perspectives on Human Security*, Routledge.

Buzan, B. (2009). *People, States and Fear*. UK: ECPR Press.

Cavas-İsmet, N. (2008). Change in the security concepts and perceptions after the cold war and their reflections on security strategies. [Master Dissertation] İstanbul, Bahçeşehir University.

Chandler, D. (2008). 'Human Security: The Dog that didn't Bark', *Security Dialogue*, 39/4: 427-438.

Commission on Human Security (2003). *Human Security Now*, New York: UN.

Deudney, D. (1990). 'The Case Against Linking Environmental Degradation and National Security', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 19 (3): 461-476.

Donmez, S. (2010). Transformation of security concept: The concept of alliance and NATO. [Doctoral Thesis] Ankara University, Institute of Social Sciences.

Fukuda-Parr, S., & Messineo, C. (2012). Human Security: A critical Review of the Literature, CRPD Working Paper No. 11.

Fusiek, D. (2020). Rethinking Security: The Limits of the Traditional Concept of Security in a World of Non-Traditional Threats. *HAPSc Policy Briefs Series*, 1(2), 265-272.

Gargo, S. (2022). Human Security and Responsibility to Protect – Challenges and Intersections. *Pécs Journal of International and European Law* - 2022/II, 1-19.

Hampson, F., Daudelin, J., Hay, J., Martin, T., & Reid, H. (2002). *Madness in the Multitude: Human Security and World Disorder*, Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Hove, M., Ngwerume, E. & Muchemwa, C. (2013). The Urban crisis in Sub- Saharan Africa: A threat to human security and sustainable development. *Stability*, 2(1), 7. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/sta.ap>.

Inglehart, R. & Norris, P. (2012). The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: Understanding Human Security. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 35(1): 71-96.

Johns, L. (2014). *A Critical Evaluation of the Concept of Human Security*, <https://www.e-ir.info/2014/07/05/a-critical-evaluation-of-the-concept-of-human-security/>.

Kamata, N., Yahya-Othman, S. & Shivji, I. (2020). *Julius Nyerere: A Biography* (2), Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers Ltd.

Katiba ya Chama Cha Mapinduzi (1977) Toleo la 2017, Dodoma, Makao Makuu ya CCM.

Kilungu, H. (2012). Rural-Urban migrant -challenges of Kilimo Kwanza Initiatives in the Ruaha River Basin, Iringa Region. *Tanzania Journal of Forestry and Nature Conservation*, 81(2): 106-114.

King, G. & Murray, C. (2001). Rethinking human security. *Political Science Quarterly*, 116(4): 585-610.

Kiyici, H. (2012). The Concept of Security In International Relations Theories. [Master's Dissertation], Antalya, Akdeniz University].

Krause, K. (2008). Critical Perspective on Human Security. In: Martin, M. & Owen, T (Eds.) *Routledge handbook of human security*. London: Routledge, 76-93.

Laurent, A & Ndumbaro, L (2023). Refugees Integration and National Security Risks in Tanzania: A Case of Katumba Old Settlement, *Journal of African Politics*, 3(2), 16-30.

Lawson, S. (2017). *International Relations* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.), Malden: Polity Press.

MacDonald, M. (2002). Human Security and The Construction of Security., *Global Society*, 16(3): 277-295.

Maliyamkono, T., Dimoso, P., & Mason, H. (2022) (Eds.), *Continuity with Vision: The Roadmap to Success for President Samia Suluhu Hassan*, Dar es Salaam: TEMA Publishers Co. Limited.

McRae R, & Hubert, D. (2001). *Human Security and the New Diplomacy*. McGill: Queen's University.

Mkapa, B. (2019). *My Life My Purpose*, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers Ltd.

Mwandosya, M. & Mwapachu, J. (2022). *38 Reflection on Mwalimu Julius Nyerere*, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers Ltd.

Mwinyikombo, M. (2022). National Defence College-Tanzania's Perception of Security: An Overview, in *The Security Limelight*, Dar es Salaam: National Defence College-Tanzania, September, 2022, 13-19.

Newman, E. (2010). Critical Human Security Studies. *Review of International Studies*, 36, 1, 78.

Newman, E. (2016). Reconciling Critical Aspirations with Political 'Realities'. *British Journal of Criminology*, 56 (6), 1165-1183.

Nyerere, J. (1967). *Education for Self-Reliance*. Dar es Salaam, Information Service Division.

Nyerere, J. (1968). *Ujamaa—Essays on Socialism* Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press.

Ogata, S. (2000). "Enabling people to live in security". Keynote speech at the International Symposium on Human Security (Tokyo: UN High Commissioner for Refugees).

Othman, H. & Maina, P. (2006). *Tanzania: The Withering Away of the Union*. In Yahya-Othman, S. (2014) *Yes in My Life Time*, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers Ltd.

Owen, T. (2004). Human Security-Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition, *Security Dialogue*, 35(3): 373-387.

Paris, R. (2001). Human security: Paradigm or hot air? *International Security*, 26(2), 87-102.

Pratt, (1999). Obituary: "Julius Kambarage Nyerere, 1922-1999: Reflection on the Legacy" *Southern Africa Report Archive*, 15 (1) 21.

Saleh, A. (2010). Broadening the Concept of Security: Identity and Societal Security, *Geopolitics Quarterly*, 6 Quarterly, 6, 4, 228-241.

Şengöz, M. (2022). An Examination of the National Security Paradigms Within the International Relations Discipline As On And Post-Cold War. *Mecmua*, (14), 182-198.

Shivji, I. (1993). *Intellectuals at the Hill*, Dar es Salaam: Dar es Salaam University Press.

Shivji, I., Yahya-Othman, S. & Kamata, N. (2020). *Julius Nyerere: A Biography* (3), Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers Ltd.

Singh, J. (2016). Human Security: A Theoretical Analysis. *Frontiers of Law, Political Science and Art*, 4 (3) 33-37.

Taasisi ya Uongozi na Chuo Kikuu cha Sokoine cha Kilimo, (2020). Sokoine: Maisha na Uongozi Wake, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers Ltd.

TANU (1972). *Siasa ni Kilimo*. Dar es Salaam: Government Printer.

Tavanti, M. & Stachowicz-Stanus, A. (2013). Sustainable Solutions for Human Security and Anti-Corruption: Integrating Theories and Practices. *International Journal of Sustainable Human Security* (IJSHS), 1-17.

Tuncer, O. (2022). Concepts of security from a perspective of political science. *Acta Politica Polonica nr 1/2022* (53), DOI: 10.18276/ap.2022.53-09, 127-146.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Human Development Report (1994)