Balancing Security and Ethical Considerations - Utilitarian Approaches and Deontological Considerations in Security Policy & Counterterrorism

Mikayla De Piero
300310889
API 6357
Alexandra Gheciu
April 17th, 2024

INTRODUCTION

Understanding the ethical considerations within security policy and counterterrorism strategy is critical in navigating the complex landscape of modern governance. As states try to strike a balance between safeguarding both their citizens and their values, the ethical underpinnings of certain counterterrorism approaches have come under scrutiny. This paper seeks to explore whether it is reasonable to employ utilitarian approaches to security policy and counterterrorism, aiming to preserve state security and state dignity, or whether there should be a stronger consideration of humanizing the security agenda through deontological approaches in both the critique and the formulation of such policies to preserve human rights, human dignity, and human security.

This consideration is becoming increasingly important, as there is tension between national security imperatives, and the principles of human rights and dignity. With counterterrorism policies often encroaching upon civil liberties and human rights, understanding the ethical frameworks guiding these decisions is crucial for ensuring the preservation of fundamental values in the face of evolving threats. This paper will examine the differences between human and state security, provide an explanation of each theoretical approach, and discuss the ethical concerns involved with balancing the two frameworks. The case study of the Abu Ghraib prison will also be utilized in order to demonstrate the tangible and real-world effects that demonstrate the danger of failing to find a balance between state and human security.

I. HUMAN SECURITY VS. STATE SECURITY

Before beginning the analysis of the current practices regarding security policy and counterterrorism, several definitions need to be given in order to contextualize the competing theoretical perspectives and their understanding of the issues at stake. First and foremost, there must be a concrete understanding of human rights, and the role they play in the security discourse. Human rights are rights inherent to all people regardless of nationality, sex, race, religion, etc., and more specifically, Western ideas of human rights are inherently based on the idea of universalism, and the idea that they are inalienable - except in certain cases (Monaghan, 2018). These rights are protected by international laws and treaties, most notably the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), as well as the Convention Against Torture (CAT), and the Geneva Convention - all of which are especially applicable to this paper given the focus on certain counterterrorism policies. Torture is specifically and clearly prohibited under Article 2 of the CAT, and Article 17 of the Geneva Convention states that there can be no physical or mental torture, or coercion inflicted on prisoners of war to secure any information - and those who refuse to answer may not be threatened or exposed to any unsafe treatment (Monaghan, 2018). However, just because these international protections exist does not mean that they are never derogated from.

Human rights cannot be contextualized, however, without understanding human dignity. Human dignity refers to the underlying moral value for the justification of some rights being so fundamental that they have to be enshrined as human rights (Lecture 10, 2024). Thus, the concept is foundational in creating value for human rights as legal norms (Scheinin, 2020). There is no universally agreed upon definition, and there are diverging interpretations of what human dignity means which poses difficulties, especially in the international human

rights courts system (Lecture 10, 2024). However, the differences in perspective do not prevent human dignity from maintaining its position as an underlying value amongst human rights law application and interpretation (Scheinin, 2020). References to human dignity help to provide support for the universality of human rights, and human rights have been founded upon the respect for human dignity.

Because of this, human dignity is connotated with human rights, and with a positive assumption. Dignity alone, on the other hand, has more negative connotations regarding human rights, and is often used (and has been throughout history) by populist leaders to incite emotions of unity - creating an "us versus them" mentality (Lecture 10, 2024). When a state claims to possess dignity, it can compromise the rights of real human beings in doing so - which is why references to dignity should not automatically assume that humans, and human rights, are the target (Scheinin, 2020).

Next, the concept of human security must be defined. It is typically understood as the right to security of the human/person or right to social security, which helps to humanize the security discourse (Lecture 10, 2024). Human security is typically equated with securitization, and with a negative impact on the enjoyment of human rights due to overreach by law enforcement, militaries, and intelligence authorities (Scheinin, 2020). This idea is very similar to the human dignity debate - just as references to dignity should not be automatically assumed to mean 'human dignity', security should not be assumed to mean 'human security'. Security on its own refers to national or public security, and this is where the application of 'permissible restrictions' to human rights are engaged in for the sake of 'national security' (Scheinin, 2020). This is inherently very controversial - preservation of the security of the public and the state is a legitimate goal; however, it is often used to justify the permissibility

of negatively impacting human rights, which is why there must be a balance within the field of how to improve security while infringing on human rights as little as possible upon.

To situate these concepts within the current discourse, there is an ongoing debate due to the ways in which counterterrorism policies and security measures have been both dangerous and counterproductive - making them incompatible with both human dignity and human security despite their efforts to maintain state dignity and state security. Regarding human dignity, counterterrorism policies often end up replicating the moral wrongs of terrorism, by instrumentalizing human beings and putting innocent people at risk (Lecture 10, 2024). Regarding human security, these policies have become very contradictory, as the end goal has become a skewed perception of security that disregards human rights throughout the process (Lecture 10, 2024). The idea of de-securitizing the discourse, and humanizing it instead has been proposed in the literature, by using a framework that sees humanity as the end, instead of fear or prevention - which helps to create a more holistic understanding of security (Lecture 10, 2024). This discourse also helps in providing an approach to counterterrorism that does the same. However, in order to understand how that is possible, two competing theories must be discussed.

II. UTILITARIAN APPROACHES TO SECURITY & COUNTERTERRORISM

A) What is Utilitarianism? How Does it Relate to Security & Counterterrorism Policy?

Utilitarianism is a consequentialist ethical theory that prioritizes the maximization of overall utility or wellbeing for the greatest number of people. From a utilitarian perspective, the morality of an action is determined by its consequences, with the goal of producing the greatest good for the greatest number of people, typically done through a cost-benefit analysis or moral assessment. Moral assessment of actions, motives, or rules, take into account how

much good the actions will produce, or how much bad they will avoid (Monaghan, 2018). According to consequentialists, we are morally obliged to behave in ways that produce the best consequences, and an act is morally right if the consequences/outcomes of it are more favourable than unfavourable (Monaghan, 2018). This perspective does not consider the morality of the action itself, just the morality of the outcome/consequence.

In a security context, this often means justifying measures that sacrifice individual rights or liberties if doing so leads to greater overall security or wellbeing - but typically security or wellbeing of the state, and not of human beings. From a utilitarian perspective, this also means that specific acts including torture are morally permissible if the acts' consequences are more beneficial than detrimental to the majority (Monaghan, 2018). Policymakers will look at whether the costs of the potential consequences incurred by a policy decision will produce the greatest utility or the greatest good for the greatest number of people (Butler, 2003). Again, this does not consider the costs in terms of the morality of the action, but rather of the consequences.

B) Moral Standing of Violence as Punishment

To better understand the above, there must be an understanding of punishment in the utilitarian context. Punishment, in this case counterterrorism policy, is violence - and it is purposeful violence. Utility is the most influential justification for punishment, but this type of justification for inflicting violence is immoral (Butler, 2003). Despite this, killing people or inflicting violence for political purposes is a familiar concept. Utilitarian perspectives would find that criminals should be harmed when it is in the best interest of society - typically because punishment is either believed to be a deterrent for future criminal activity, or to incapacitate current criminals (Butler, 2003).

However, there is often a double standard that occurs when thinking about terrorism and morality, and it comes into account when considering whether taking innocent lives in the pursuit of an urgent objective is accepted and warranted. The problem with this is that it is typically accepted that there is only one standard for political violence, and it is most likely condemnation in any and all cases (Butler, 2003). There will always be issues with this - using violence to combat genocide or slavery is seen as violence against the guilty, and it is seen as being justified, but enacting violence against innocents *within* these situations is where it becomes challenging. Thus, with this type of theoretical thinking, if violence as a deterrence is going to be used, there should be certainty about the outcome that is being prevented, though we know this is not always the case in practice (Butler, 2003).

Thus - if one believes that the government should be allowed to kill or torture for the greater good, that is utilitarian thinking (Butler, 2003). Examples of utilitarianism often involve laws of war, as it tends to be the one place where the sacrifice of innocent lives is justified; and in criminal law, which justifies deliberate infliction of pain upon some so long as it is for the good of the whole (Butler, 2003). There are moral assessments done in utilitarian contexts, specifically regarding counterterrorism policy - but the focus is on the morality of the consequence and not on the morality of the action. The assessment in this case often finds that excessive punishment is justified, because terrorists harm innocents, and punishment harms criminals, so there is less focus on the disproportionate pain inflicted (Butler, 2003).

C) Application to Security Policy & Counterterrorism Initiatives

All of this considered, a state has numerous counterterrorism options that it can take, but the most well-documented and highly criticized is the use of force (Monaghan, 2018). The

justification for this use of force is considered in the light of the just war tradition, *jus ad bellum* (just cause to engage in war) and *jus in bello* (just actions within war) (Monaghan, 2018). Just war theory is one of the most deeply embedded doctrines in the ways Western states legitimize going to war, and it provides a helpful way to evaluate the competing moral claims of the costs and benefits of engaging in war - the cost-benefit analysis of consequentialism helps determine that certain conditions need to be met for it to be justified.

Looking at *jus in bello* is particularly important, because it is where proportionality and discrimination are considered, and because terrorist organizations complicate the standards of *jus in bello* distinctions. Terrorist groups do not fight legitimately on behalf of a nation state, often fail to distinguish themselves as combatants, and tend to operate in civilian-dense areas (Robillard, 2021). Because of the grey areas, many argue, and have enacted policy decisions based on the fact that they believe terrorist actors and organizations fall outside the war convention, and therefore lose their right to moral restraint regarding targeting, prisoner detention, torture, etc. (Robillard, 2021).

This is a prime example of the exceptionalist mindset that often stems from a utilitarian cost-benefit analysis - in certain cases, the norms may be derogated if the supposed outcome will bring maximum utility. The main problem with this is that, while the claims for the protection of state security and state dignity may be supported, the human rights and human dignity of those affected will suffer. Further, while states are focused on maximizing the utility of *their* populations, these cost-benefit analyses must go beyond this to understand that in infringing upon other individuals' human rights, they may be inadvertently creating new security threats.

The relationship to the cost-benefit analysis is also highly dependent on the relationships policymakers have to both costs and benefits. When the benefit of the utilitarian punishment is an assumed or perceived net increase in public safety, there is less concern about the cost of excessive punishment. The burden of high-casualty military offensives that are usually conducted in these cases is also not a burden that the average citizen of the deploying state will bear: the criminal, or the terrorist in this case, has been successfully 'othered' (Butler, 2003).

Overall, the main critique of the utilitarian framework within counterterrorism and security policy is the moral permissiveness - the violation of a person's rights and/or the commissions of serious injustices for the benefit of a majority that is largely unaffected sound alarm bells about whose lives are worthy of being protected, and create a hierarchy of whose human rights and human dignity are most valued. From this perspective, if the potential consequence is further terrorist attacks or risk of terrorist attacks, the cost of injuring, killing, torturing, etc. is outweighed by the benefits to the 'greater population' (Monaghan, 2018). This also becomes a problem for torture - because it raises the question of *who* gets the final say in what is ethnically permissible, and if we accept torture as being legitimate in certain contexts, it provides a basis to routinely torture people so long as the supposed ends justify the means (Monaghan, 2018). This has huge implications for human rights, human dignity, and human security worldwide.

III. DEONTOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON COUNTERTERRORISM POLICY

A) What is Deontology? How Does it Relate to Counterterrorism Policy?

Deontology is a non-consequentialist ethical theory that emphasizes the inherent rightness or wrongness of actions, fully independent of their consequences. From a

deontological perspective, certain moral principles or duties are considered wholly inviolable, and actions are judged based on their adherence to these principles, rather than their outcomes (Monaghan, 2018). In a security context, this means prioritizing the protection of individual rights, dignity, and autonomy as intrinsic values that should not be compromised - even for the sake of promoting 'overall' security. A large part of this discussion utilizes Kantian ethics, which further focuses on moral duties through the idea of the categorical imperative. This asserts that individuals should act in a way that respects the dignity and autonomy of all persons, treating them as ends in themselves, as opposed to means to an end (Monaghan, 2018). It asserts that when something is wrong, it is *always* wrong - thus, when individuals want to make decisions, they must ask if the rule authorizing their action could be universal for all of mankind (Eyesan, 2021). If this is forgotten, and universality is disregarded, then inevitably standards that allow for certain deeply immoral practices under 'extraordinary circumstances' - i.e. torture - open the discussion to when else these actions can be applicable. Thus, deontology takes a rights-based approach, emphasizing the importance of protecting rights as the fundamental moral principles that should be upheld, regardless of consequence.

B) Human Dignity, Human Security & The Feasible Alternative

Since there is less concern about the consequence of specific policies and actions, and less debate about who is benefiting most/least, this perspective can focus on whether the policy decision is morally sound to begin with. It also raises the question of who is, and who should be allowed, or morally entitled, to make these difficult decisions, and further, if all possible alternatives to these difficult decisions have been enacted first to help negate the moral qualms (Miller, 2019). Within security and counterterrorism policy, much of the consideration of the deontological perspective seeks to remove the cost-benefit analysis of the

consequences of an action (momentarily) to focus on the morality of the action itself, and what action will be best for the promotion of human security, human dignity, and human rights, as opposed to only state security and state dignity (Robillard, 2021).

Often, this means the consideration of feasible alternatives - for example, if the supposed best option to kill or capture a particularly high-value target was by committing a large-scale, bloody, costly, and lengthy boots-on-the-ground engagement, the moral response regarding human security and dignity would be to avoid this, as it would likely have detrimental impacts on many people (Robillard, 2021). The feasible alternative would be to resort to a specific approach, focusing on just the targets instead. Beyond this, there would need to be consideration for what threshold constitutes and justifies the use of a targeted killing in the first place (Robillard, 2021). This perspective goes beyond just protecting the human security of the individuals on the ground, and their human security and dignity, as well as prioritizing state security by avoiding blowback from a highly disruptive military operation, and calls into question whether the killing of another human being can be justified in the first place.

C) Implications for Human Dignity, Human Security & Human Rights

The focus of deontological perspectives on security policy looks at basing morality on what the obligations are - i.e. is the obligation to protect *state* security or to protect *human* security? To uphold human rights and human dignity? Obligations are the biggest determinant in the moral considerations and assessments made, thus it is reasonable to implicate the deontological practice within approaches to risk management, because without taking a humanized approach, there is a high likelihood that security measures might end up being too utilitarian, and thus become counterproductive (van Baarda & Verweij, 2009).

In this case, the protection of human security, human dignity, and human rights are the primary approach, as human dignity is a core value in most international human rights approaches, which states are meant to uphold (van Baarda & Verweij, 2009). Human rights are derived from dignity, and thus approaches to policy should be informed by this - having a deep regard for the dignity and worth of an individual helps to promote these rights-based values. Further, human dignity is not just a foundation to be working from, but also something to continually aspire towards. As seen throughout the discussion on utilitarian perspectives, state dignity and security are fundamentally inconsistent with human rights, human security, and human dignity (van Baarda & Verweij, 2009). Ensuring that policies are working towards prioritizing human dignity can help to ensure there are less violations of human rights as well.

Deontological thought regarding security policy also finds that human rights should trump the pursuit of utility, because the right to life needs to be respected on the grounds of its own intrinsic worth, not on the grounds of the utilitarian consequentialist perspective. It should be critically important that policymakers are not tempted into using methods that are incompatible with values of humanity, liberty, and justice, because in doing so, and in justifying the violations of human rights in specific 'exceptional circumstances', there is an inevitable betrayal of the values and principles that policymakers and government officials claim to uphold. There are obvious temptations for governments suffering from terrorist action to fight fire with fire, and to set aside the legal safeguards (Eyesan, 2021). While states have the right to protect their citizens against terrorist activity, it should not mean that the use of indiscriminate measures becomes justified, as this undermines the fundamental values they seek to protect (Eyesan, 2021). Thus, if states are going to be taken seriously and not be seen as hypocritical, they must not fail in upholding these principles, even in the face of a threat.

IV. BALANCING SECURITY & ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

A) Ethical Decision-Making & The Legitimacy of Intervention

Given what is known about two major competing schools of thought regarding the ethics of counterterrorism policy, there must be a further discussion of what tensions exist in current security imperatives and what the ethical considerations of the policies/strategies are. Ethical decision-making is a large part of working in counterterrorism, as there will inherently always be trade-offs between moral values (Reding et al., 2013). This can mean making decisions between privacy, liberty, security, and broader human rights considerations, as discussed above. There are ways to reconcile these decisions through ethical considerations, but it is not always easy. Because terrorism is a low-frequency but high-impact situation, it makes it extraordinarily challenging to take proportional action to mitigate risks - even an infrequent threat cannot be overlooked, especially when its impact is so devastating (Reding et al., 2013). This is often why utilitarian ethics are prioritized, because there is the belief that actions employed with the goal of eliminating the risk will have the highest return in regard to wellbeing and security for society.

So, how can we decide on the morally correct approach when deciding how to proceed, especially with the need to adhere to multiple different international human rights doctrines? The idea of the 'exceptional circumstance' is the most common, but in using it so often within counterterrorism policy, it ends up becoming less exceptional, and more akin to a common rule. Counterterrorism professionals often have access to exceptional powers in many countries, such as extended detention without bail for terror suspects, which became widespread in the early 21st century (Reding et al., 2013). This issue was especially contentious regarding the use of extraordinary measures on individuals who were not

suspects, but rather had information that could relate to public safety (Reding et al., 2013).

Under this type of circumstance, the objective of safeguarding national security might

compromise basic liberties or human rights - but is this the only way to do things? It does not

have to be. Despite having the duty to protect national security and dignity, human civil

liberty - thus security and dignity - must also be protected

The tensions discussed both regarding the theoretical frameworks and differing ethical

considerations between security vs. rights could begin to see resolution if a human security

framework was adopted. This would insist on human security and human dignity, not just

security and dignity within the human rights discourse (Scheinin, 2020). This humanized

framework would also help with reviewing the proportionality of responses to risk, which is

an important part of the field (Reding et al., 2013).

C) Trade-Offs in Balancing Human vs. State Security & The Humanized Approach

Balancing between security and human rights can be a false metaphor. A human rights

approach calls for the humanization of the security discourse - therefore asking how better

security can be delivered to the population as a whole (Sheinin, 2020). This would also

include a terminological shift - the notion of *human* security needs to be introduced in order to

prove that legitimate security interests serve ordinary people, and it would reject the 'false

metaphor' by calling for an analysis of the permissibility of any restrictions on human rights

for the aim of public or national security (Sheinin, 2020). This allows for better policy

considerations and a shifted understanding of security.

Currently, much of the counterterrorism strategy utilized globally is not based on

human rights-related approaches, but there have been efforts made. For example, the 2006

United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy has four pillars - one is very paradigmatic

and promotes counterterrorism measures through law enforcement, intelligence, and military means. However, the other three focus on addressing the conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism, coordinating international capacity building, and upholding human rights and rule of law as the fundamental basis of the fight against terrorism (Scheinin, 2020). The idea among the Counter Terrorism Strategy is to address and eliminate the conditions conducive to (ie. the root conditions) of terrorism, and this is an affirmation and application of the human security approach (Scheinin, 2020).

Further, the need to humanize the discussion on security and any reference to dignity is important because the use of *human* helps to humanize the language used within these spaces, and thus the policies and decisions that are made too. This helps with achieving more clarity in discussions about terrorism, given how ambiguous it can be - the lack of definition has caused trouble. Many times, terrorism becomes a crime of association regarding who is prosecuted and convicted for terrorism vs. those who are addressed under laws related to ordinary crime for the exact same actions (Scheinin, 2020). In order to properly understand and distinguish terrorism from other forms of political violence, invoking concepts of human dignity/security can be helpful. This means that better solutions can be undertaken to address the issues.

In humanizing security, security itself can actually become stronger - instead of contributing directly to activities that threaten the state. If security measures are designed and implemented, and supported by starting with the people, because if security is implemented in ways that inherently de-prioritizes humans, it will be resisted. This will result in less protection than expected. Human security needs to be considered in each step of security

regarding counterterrorism - if the discourse can be humanized, there will be more adequate preparation, response, and recovery in the event of a terrorist attack

V. CASE STUDY

A) Concrete Counterproductive Effects - What Happened at Abu Ghraib?

A relevant case study regarding how utilitarian responses to terrorism justify extreme measures can be seen in the United States' replication of the same moral wrongs that terrorists use through the infamous Abu Ghraib incident. Abu Ghraib was a maximum security prison complex located in Iraq, used by the United States military to hold Iraqi prisoners throughout the War on Terror - many of whom were merely suspects of insurgency, or who were thought to have valuable information. What happened at Abu Ghraib, however, became one of the biggest scandals of the Iraq War when the war crimes American soldiers committed against Iraqi prisoners - including women, men, and children - were made public through a series of photographs (Kyriakidis, 2012). Prisoners were tortured, through chemical means, exposure to extreme heat/cold, beatings, rape, sexual humiliation, electro-schocking, simulated executions, and were photographed in the process. While the Bush Administration tried to claim that this was a one-off Stanford Prison Experiment-esque situation, his decisions were key informants as to how prisoners r should be treated (Kyriakidis, 2012). The US administration set the conditions for torture, cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment all throughout the 'War on Terror' in the name of national security (Kyriakidis, 2012) It was a broader pattern and a system of inhumane acts, as opposed to individual decisions.

US officials also authorized the use of torture - which is ultimately how this ended up happening. When the degradation of human dignity and human rights is legitimized in the name of state security, this type of behaviour will inevitably become a pattern (Kyriakidis,

2012). Techniques including stress positions, sensory deprivation, hooding, stripping, and the use of dogs to inspire fear were all approved by Defence Secretary Rumsfeld in December 2002. Other requested threats, including use of death threats, exposure to cold weather or water, and inducing the perception of suffocation could all be requested on a case-by-case basis if 'military necessity' was considered to demand such techniques.

Further, if military and political leadership knew about the situation in Abu Ghraib, were either the long term or imminent consequences ever taken into account? Did they think about the potential alternatives before making an incredibly immoral decision? Did the end justify the means based on effectiveness, or morality? In terms of intelligence, it was tactically and technically limited, because the prisoners were willing to reveal whatever the interrogator was keen on hearing, even if that meant fabricating the information. Additionally, the general public outside the American population found that the treatment at Abu Ghraib was absolutely not derived from military necessity (Kyriakidis, 2012)

The initial authorization of torture by the Bush administration was motivated by the expectation that enhanced interrogation techniques would provide info to prevent future terrorist attacks against the US (Lal, 2018). The idea that overriding the human rights of certain people was permissible because it would provide the greatest good for the greatest amount of (American) people. While it was obviously ineffective for the reasons stated above, it also had another effect: decreased feasibility of counterterrorism policies (Lal, 2018). The damage in terms of accruing rage and mistrust in the Arab world was incomprehensible - a comment made from an Arab newspaper on the day after the scandal said, "this is exactly why the US refused to join the International Criminal Court. US soldiers can commit these sorts of crimes in the knowledge that they won't face justice" (Kyriakidis, 2012).

Videos and images of Abu Ghraib actually ended up becoming some of the most effective tools for terrorist recruitment (Scheinin, 2020). A State Department report leaked in spring 2006 found that the torture committed against detainees at Abu Ghraib was "one of the most motivating factors for foreign jihadists to join insurgencies in Afghanistan and Iraq" (Lal, 2018). A leaked Saudi government document (2009) reported that in the days immediately following the Abu Ghraib photo release, over 250 Saudis attempted to join extremist groups overseas. Further, as the war dragged on, jihadists increasingly cited torture as their primary motivation for entering conflict.

It also prompted local communities to be less cooperative with the American military - they were not willing to trust or support the force that was detaining and torturing their people (Lal, 2018). The American military was relying on the locals for on-the-ground intelligence to effectively identify and target threats. After the Abu Ghraib photos were released, Iraqi support for the initial American military intervention to overthrow Saddam Hussein plummeted from 63% to 9%. This demonstrates how American officials catastrophically misconstrued the proclaimed end of security. Torture ended up becoming an aggravating factor for terrorist violence, making American counterterrorism objectives essentially entirely counterproductive (Lal, 2018). All that was falsely legitimized as a measure in the name of furthering security generated new and more serious threats to the security of both Americans and everybody else. Countries in the Islamic world ended up carrying the heaviest death toll from terrorism, but lives and human security were affected in all parts of the world.

This is the danger of undertaking major policy decisions based on utility, and not on the moral standing of the action itself. If exceptions for torture become the norm, then it is a slippery slope as to what is/is not accepted. When governments make decisions without the

moral considerations, it breeds the likelihood that their decisions will end up having some sort of counterproductive nature. It also de-legitimizes the soft-power and human rights-focused approaches that have stronger moral grounding. Policymakers need to have more concern for the morality of the policies and actions - without these considerations, there will undoubtedly be consequences, which the utilitarian policymaking style is so focused on. Perhaps the humanization of the security field would allow for more appropriate measures to be taken.

CONCLUSION

The exploration of ethical considerations within security and counterterrorism strategy is becoming increasingly more necessary as we navigate newly emerging threats and the intricate terrain of security policy and governance. The ethical foundations of many counterterrorism and security policy methods have begun to face scrutiny, due to the lack of adequate balance between human and state security. Thus, this paper sought to explore the current reliance on utilitarian approaches to counterterrorism measures, which have a higher focus on the wellbeing of the state, and to contrast this with the idea that there needs to be room for a more pronounced emphasis on humanizing the security agenda through deontological perspectives, with an aim to preserve human rights, dignity, and security.

As national security goals and the principles of human rights and dignity continue to intensify, this examination has become more and more pertinent. Counterterrorism approaches frequently encroach on civil liberties and human rights, laying the foundation for the necessity of understanding that such decisions still must safeguard fundamental values - even amidst evolving security challenges. Throughout the paper, the disparities between state and human security were explored through the contexts of the differing theoretical approaches, and were also illustrated within the case study of the Abu Ghraib prison, which underscored the

tangible repercussions of failing to strike the much-needed balance between state and human

security. As states continue to grapple with the dilemma at hand, there must be a more

nuanced approach, which may be possible through the humanization of security. In doing so,

the potential for stronger counterterrorism policy becomes possible, instead of continuing on

with policies that, in essence, often end up doing the exact opposite of what they set out to do.

References

Butler, P. (2002). Terrorism and Utilitarianism: Lessons from, and for, Criminal Law. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 93:1.*

Eyesan, S. (2021). An Ethical Interrogation of Terrorism and Counterterrorism. *Journal of Applied Philosophy, 19:3.*

Kyriakidis, K. (2012). Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib Revisited. *Open Democracy.*

Lal, J. (2018). How the Use of Torture Changed American Foreign Policy Realities. *Simon Fraser University.*

Miller, S. (2019). Counterterrorism and Lethal Force. *Ethics and the Contemporary World.*

Monaghan, R. (2018). Ethics and Human Rights in Counterterrorism. *Routledge Handbook of Terrorism and Counterterrorism.*

Reding, A., Van Gorp, A., Robertson, K., Walczak, A., Giacomantonio, C., Hoorens, S. (2014). Handling Ethical Problems in Counterterrorism. *Kriminologisches Repository.*

Robillard, M. (2021). Kill, Wound, or Capture: Ethics Considerations for Counter-Terrorism Operations. *Library of Congress.*

Scheinin, M. (2020). Human Dignity, Human Security, Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism. In: Paulussen, C., Scheinin, M. (eds) Human Dignity and Human Security in Times of Terrorism. *T.M.C. Asser Press.*

van Baarda, T,. A., & Verweij, D. E. M. (2009). Human Dignity in the Era of Counter-terrorism. *The Moral Dimension of Asymmetrical Warfare*, pp. 461–508.