
UNIT 14 HUMAN SECURITY

Structure

- 14.1 Introduction
- 14.2 Concerns for Human Security in Retrospection
- 14.3 Defining the Human Security Concerns
- 14.4 Approaches to the Study of Human Security
- 14.5 Challenges to Human Security in Practice
- 14.6 Ensuring Human Security
- 14.7 Summary
- 14.8 Exercises

14.1 INTRODUCTION

The concept of security, for long, has been interpreted narrowly: as security of territory from external aggression or as protection of national interests in foreign policy or as global security from the threat of a nuclear holocaust. It has been associated with the interests of nation-states than with those of the people. In this process, the legitimate concerns of common people and their quest for individual security in their daily lives-protection from the threat of diseases, hunger, unemployment, crime, social conflict, political repression and environmental degradation- were forgotten.

In the post Cold War period it is increasingly becoming evident that many conflicts and their causes are within nations rather than between nations. For most people, a sense of insecurity comes not so much from the traditional security concerns such as military aggression of another nation, but from the concerns about their survival, self-preservation and well being in the day-to-day context. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in its Human Development Report of 1994 first articulated this dimension of security, which has come to be known as human security. Since then, the concept of human security has attracted considerable attention in various international fora. However, while there is a broad consensus that human survival, human well being and human freedom are vital elements of human security, a clear idea as to what the concept denotes has not yet emerged. The term 'human security' has been used in many different contexts to justify certain course of action either ongoing or planned for future.

14.2 CONCERNS FOR HUMAN SECURITY IN RETROSPECTION

The content of security changes over time, depending on era and context. As far back as the 1930s, American national security thinking revolved very much around economic security, changing to an overriding concern with military security during the Cold War era. Towards the late 1960s, the idea of security as being something 'more' than military security was

put forward by Robert McNamara, the then president of the World Bank. During the 1970s and 1980s, the conceptualisation of security slowly broadened both in the developed and developing world. In Europe, the Helsinki process and the idea of comprehensive security slowly gained ground. In Africa, the Front-Line States (FLS) increasingly came to include economic and social security as part of their security agenda which initially consisted of opposing apartheid and South African military destabilisation. The FLS founded the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC, now the Southern African Development Community or the SADC) in 1980 the first example, it would seem, of a link between security and development. The essential meaning of security as freedom from threat has not changed.

Contemporary conceptualisation of security as being multidimensional and aimed at people as the main referent of security (human security) is therefore also not necessarily pointing to 'the end of security', to borrow from Fukuyama, but may change over time as era and context change.

While the term "human security" may be of recent origin, the ideas that underpin the concept are far from new. For more than a century -at least since the founding of the International Committee of the Red Cross in the 1860s -a doctrine based on the security of people has been gathering momentum. Core elements of this doctrine were formalised in the 1940s in the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Geneva Conventions.

The specific phrase "human security" is most commonly associated with the Human Development Report of 1994. Published by the UNDP, the Report was an attempt to capture the post-Cold War peace dividend and redirect the freed resources towards development agenda.

Since then, the concept of human security has increasingly centred on the human costs of violent conflict. Here, practice has led theory. Two initiatives, in particular, the campaign to ban landmines and the effort to create an International Criminal Court, have demonstrated the potential of a people-centred approach to security.

14.3 DEFINING THE HUMAN SECURITY CONCERNS

In essence, human security means safety for people from both violent and non-violent threats. It is a condition or state of being characterised by freedom from pervasive threats to people's rights, their safety, or even their lives. From a foreign policy perspective, human security is perhaps best understood as a shift in perspective or orientation. It is an alternative way of seeing the world, taking people as its point of reference, rather than focusing exclusively on the security of territory or governments. Like other security concepts – national security, economic security, and food security – it is about protection. Human security entails taking preventive measures to reduce vulnerability and minimise risk, and taking remedial action where prevention fails.

Human security has emerged as a major foreign policy concern of some industrialised nations, notably Japan and Canada. In 1998, the then Prime Minister of Japan, Keizo Obuchi, announced the institution of the Human Security Fund in the United Nations for the

purpose of bolstering coordination in this area among governments, international agencies and non-governmental organisations. Canada, in the context of human rights and humanitarian intervention issues, has placed human security above national sovereignty and condoned the imposition of sanctions or even the use of military force for humanitarian intervention in the event of egregious infringements of human rights or crimes against humanity associated with civil wars or interethnic hostilities.

At the level of the United Nations, the UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, in his Millennium Report observed that although security policy had traditionally focused on the defence of territory from external attack, it had now come to embrace "... the protection of communities and individuals from internal violence."

The idea that the primary focus of security policy should be the protection of people, rather than the political and territorial integrity of states, is central to the concept of 'human security' articulated by Kofi Annan, Sadako Ogata, Lloyd Axworthy and others. It is also one of the founding principles of the Human Security Network. However, the concept has yet to have a major impact on traditional security thinking.

Human Security Network is an interregional group of thirteen countries comprising Canada, Chile, Greece, Ireland, Jordan, Mali, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand, Austria and South Africa as an observer. It emerged from the landmines campaign and was launched in 1999. According to its perception, 'Our vision is a human world where people can live in security and dignity, free from violent threats, poverty and despair.' In essence, the Network strives to achieve freedom from fear and freedom from want. This encompasses a broad spectrum of threats, ranging from those emanating on the one hand from human conflict, natural and manmade disasters to- on the other- poverty, marginalisation, discrimination and disease. In this spirit the Human Security Network currently pursues such diverse, though in reality interlinked, subjects as human rights education, the protection of children affected by armed conflict, the control of small arms and light weapons, the universalisation of the Ottawa Convention on Anti-personnel landmines, the struggle against HIV/AIDS, issues of international humanitarian law and conflict prevention.

Human security is a logical extension of current approaches to international peace and security. The Charter of the United Nations embodies the view that security cannot be achieved by a single state in isolation. The phrase 'international peace and security' implies that the security of one state depends on the security of other states. A human security perspective builds on this logic by noting that the security of people in one part of the world depends on the security of people elsewhere. A secure and stable world order is built both from the top down and from the bottom up. The security of states, and the maintenance of international peace and security, is ultimately constructed on the foundation of people who are secure.

According to the UNDP, 'human security is a universal concern; the components of human security are inter-dependent; human security is easier to ensure through early prevention; and human security is people-centred.' The definition advanced in the report was extremely ambitious. Human security was defined as the summation of seven distinct dimensions of security: economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political. By focusing on people and highlighting non-traditional threats, the UNDP made an important contribution to post-Cold War thinking about security.

The very breadth of the UNDP approach, however, made it unwieldy as a policy instrument. Equally important, in emphasising the threats associated with underdevelopment, the Report largely ignored the continuing human insecurity resulting from violent conflict. Yet, by the UNDP's own criteria, human insecurity is greatest during war. Of the 25 countries at the bottom of the 1998 Human Development Index in 1998, more than half were suffering the direct or indirect effects of violent conflict.

The UNDP definition of human security was proposed as a key concept during the preparatory stages of the 1995 Copenhagen Summit on Social Development, which included seven distinct dimensions of security: economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political. But it was rejected during the Summit and has not been widely used thereafter because of its overarching breadth.

Adding another dimension to human security concerns, Heidi Hudson points to the threefold 'nature' of security when one attempts to study and apply it in a comprehensive way, making it inclusive of all people as referents of security. He refers to the fact that security needs to include women, and that security is inextricably linked to the security of women in Africa, if only because so much of production, whether wage-related or subsistence activities, depend on them. Broad security, for instance, economic and social security, and economic and social policies, needs to reflect a concern with women and their status, position and needs.

The second aspect of Hudson's security concern revolves around its participatory nature. Security is not only (also) for women, but women should also participate as agents of security, represented and involved in decision-making positions and other initiatives aimed at building and maintaining security. Hudson mentions the low participation of women in the peacekeeping training projects conducted by the African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD). He stressed on the need to reactivate the debate on the idea of whether quota systems for female participation is necessary to promote women as active participants in planning and working towards a secure and prosperous future Southern Africa?

The third aspect of security that flows from Hudson's work is the fact that just referring to the need for, or working on the principle of a holistic approach to security is not sufficient. Hudson uses the term 'fractional holism' which captures the idea that human security in itself is not monolithic, but that what constitutes human security may vary according to, once again, era, context and even gender. This calls for the need, in policy terms, to look anew at the application of security.

While analysing the concept of security from development perspective, Prof. Marie Mueller in particular raised the interesting and important link between development, aid, security and the idea of 'entitlement systems' in order to promote equality, notions which bring one back to Hudson's fractional holism. According to Mueller, security is in essence about equality. Perhaps it would be more correct to say that security touches, in a fundamental way, on equity rather than equality. Needs are related to expectations and concrete conditions and experiences. Not everyone needs or wants the same level of security, but security needs to be distributed equitably. Development is about choices. To be more exact it is about widening choices, and security provides the environment in which those choices are

safely exercised. The levels of security and development available and maintainable are very much dependent on place and time, or era and context. It is for this reason that the Security General Boutros-Ghali emphasised the need for development to become part of peace building in other words, to be incorporated into security thinking in areas rife with conflict.

Being a dynamic and all-inclusive, the concept of human security is feared to become redundant. It meant different things to different persons. Every one having his own reasonable ground for including his content and context of human security. Critics point to the definitional constraints that attempts to measure human security imposes on the concept. They also rightly point to potential measurement inaccuracies, and dependence on poor data.

Four measurement frameworks are worth mentioning here which tries to quantify the concept in a more scientific manner. Each one takes a particular approach to the human security agenda, ranging from the narrow 'freedom from fear' to the broader 'freedom from want' spectrum of insecurities. The four frameworks are:

- 1) Gary King's Theory of Generalised Poverty Measures: Income, Health, Political Freedom, Democracy, and Education;
- 2) Kanti Bajpai's Human Security Audit Includes an exhaustive list of 'direct' and 'indirect' threats to the individual;
- 3) The GECHS Index of Human Insecurity Centres on social, environmental, economic, and institutional domains of security, with four indicators each, culminating in what is labelled a 'Human Insecurity Index'
- 4) The Human Security Report focuses on mortality from criminal violence and armed conflict statistics.

Each human security measurement methodology evidently attempts to measure a different conception of human security. In every case, the measurement methodology, including indicator selection and aggregation -is inferred from the human security approach taken. In terms of feasibility, the broader the definition of human security used, the less feasible the methodology becomes. Accordingly, the Human Security Report methodology appears the most feasible, even though data on violence can also be unreliable.

Here it is worth pointing out, there may be a better way to measure human security than the Human Security Report's excessively narrow reliance on violence data. A broader conception of human security could be more accurately measured if mortality data from disease and natural disasters were added to the two Human Security Report indicators of deaths from 'criminal violence and armed conflict.

In order to comprehend the concept, we would like to identify the following four areas which should receive primacy in ensuring human security:

- 1) human security threatened by poverty and lack of development;

- 2) human security **threatened** by landmines, small arms and light weapons;
- 3) human security undermined by drug **trafficking** and trafficking of women and children; and
- 4) human security seriously **jeopardised** through human rights violation.

These facets of human security have socio-economic and political dimensions and could be helpful in having integrated policy formulations about the subject.

14.4 APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF HUMAN SECURITY

To further address the topic as an academic exercise, it would be desirable to have a view of the concept in its theoretical perspective in the international arena. The realist paradigm, which **remains** the dominant discourse in mainstream security studies, still sees armed conflict as arising from the pursuit of power by sovereign states, with conflict prevention being primarily a function of traditional diplomacy and/or successful military deterrence. Peace, from this perspective, is best preserved by preparing for war.

Against this eschewed theoretical presumption about the world security, there are two main contemporary theories of international relations in which the concepts of human security **could** be placed. At **one** end of the continuum is an approach, based on a neo-realist theoretical framework, which maintains a **continued** emphasis on the primacy of the state within a broadened conceptualisation of (human) security. Some call this approach the 'new security thinking'. At the other end of the security discourse is the postmodernist or 'critical human security' approach that is rooted within the pluralist theory of international politics. This approach is based on a set of assumptions that essentially attempt to dislodge the state as the primary referent of security, while placing greater emphasis on the interdependency and **transnationalisation** of non-state actors.

Barry Buzan has advocated the neo-realist or 'structuralist' approach to human security in his seminal work *'People, States and Fear'*. Buzan argued that the 'straitjacket' militaristic approach to security that dominated the discourse during the Cold War was 'simple-minded' and led to the underdevelopment of the concept. He subsequently broadened it to include political, economic, social and **environmental** threats, in addition to those that are militaristic. Although Buzan examines security from the three perspectives of the international system, the state, and the **individual**, he concludes that the most important and effective provider of security should remain the **sovereign** state. His analysis provides the most extensive contemporary examination available of human security from a state-combined **perspective** (as originally proposed in a similar form by Clausewitz, the eminent writer on War in the 19th century).

The 'critical' or postmodernist approach to human security, reflected in the work of Ken Booth, also advocates a broadened conceptualisation of security that goes beyond a **military** determination of threats. But he and other **advocates** of the postmodernist approach stress quite explicitly that the state must be dislodged as the primary referent of (human) security, and encompass instead a wide range of non-state actors, such as individuals,

ethnic and cultural groups, regional economic blocs, multinational corporations (MNCs) and non-governmental organisations (NGOs), and just about all humankind. In expanding the concept of security horizontally and vertically, Booth argues that human security is ultimately more important than state security. To put differently, the postmodernist conceptualisation of security does not equate state security with human security. In Booth's view, states and implicitly governments must no longer be the primary referents of security because governments which are supposed to be "the guardians of 'their peoples' security", have instead become the primary source of insecurity for the many people who live under their sovereignty, rather than the armed forces of a neighbouring country. This approach challenges the very idea of a state as an effective and adequate provider of security to its people.

Despite being comprehensive, the two approaches suffer from inherent setbacks. Buzan's state-centric approach within a broadened framework of security is useful in so far as it argues that the state is a vital vehicle for the security of its citizens. However, he introduces the concepts of 'strong' and 'weak' states to show that 'the creation of strong states is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for improved individual and national security'. In other words, the existence of strong states would not, by itself, guarantee security, but weakness in states would certainly encourage and sustain insecurity for their citizens. In this regard, Buzan draws a distinction between weak and strong states on one hand, and weak and strong powers on the other. He explains that the strength of a state is determined by the degree of its socio-political cohesion, while the strength of its powers refers to the traditional distinction among states in respect of their comparative military and economic capabilities. This distinction sits very awkwardly in argument championing the state as the defender of human security, since the attainment of human security requires both a strong state and a strong power. To avoid any confusion as to the unit or referent of security, it is preferable to lump together attributes (i.e. socio-political cohesion and military and economic capability) and the characteristic distinction between weak and strong states.

Buzan acknowledges that almost all weak states are found in the South or developing world, where they find themselves trapped by historical patterns of economic development and political power which leave them underdeveloped and therefore unable to muster the economic and political resources necessary to build a stronger state. What Buzan does not make clear is how weak powers and states can become strong. Instead, he argues that integration into an 'increasingly interdependent international market economy would contribute to a mature anarchy with its promise of greater international security' (Tickner, 1995).

This would be problematic for peripheral states such as those in Africa, Asia and Latin America, which are not only trapped by chronic underdevelopment, but more crucially, are weak rendering their economic security vulnerable to market forces in an integrated or globalised world economy.

According to Richard Falk, while the new threats to security which defy boundaries cannot be solved by one state alone, the uneven development fostered by a hierarchical international system of states and a global capitalist economy has contributed to an intolerable situation. The security of the rich seems to be increasingly diminishing the security of the poor.

States in the developing South, Africa in particular, being soft and peripheral in terms of

Robert Gilpin's definition, would not find an 'integrated world economy' beneficial to either their economic development or their security. In other words, uneven development within the world's capitalist economy sets 'structural constraints' on the achievement of economic security for the poorest states and their inhabitants. In this sense, Asian, African and Latin American states are likely to experience great difficulty in becoming strong or 'hard', to form part of what Buzan calls a 'mature' anarchy. Nevertheless, Buzan has moved beyond the traditional realist fixation on security associated with military power, which makes his argument more humane and acceptable.

Whereas, the problem with the postmodernist approach is that it asserts that national sovereignty is unravelling, and that states are proving less and less capable of performing their traditional tasks. For example, Xavier Carim argues that global factors increasingly impinge on government decisions and undermine their capacity to control either external or domestic politics. He concludes that 'if state sovereignty has not actually ended, it is under severe challenge'. For Booth, the logical alternative to the modern state as the unit of analysis is the diffusion of power from states to local or regional communities so as to cater for cultural diversity. For example, the wider problems of economics could be dealt with effectively at the regional level. There can be no denying that regional integration or cooperation, as a current trend within the international system, aims not only to address the political and economic interests of member states, but also the security needs of their people.

A critical concern is whether regional security structures necessitate a redefinition of state sovereignty. Threats to human security that compel a review of the traditional conceptualisation of state sovereignty are especially noticeable at a regional level. For example, the insecurity that arises from illegal immigration has complex causes and effects, all of them relating to humanitarian issues, for example people fleeing from poverty, civil war, drought or economic decline, that must be addressed by regional mechanisms or structures. After all, 'when people face famine or war, no fence, army or government policy, will keep them from seeking even marginally better conditions'.

Therefore, regional mechanisms that are created to address such threats are ultimately the building blocks for greater regional, national and individual security. Postmodernists have very often stressed the power of non-state actors such as MNCs, NGOs and even crime syndicates to operate beyond the control of the state.

This however, should not be taken to be generally applicable to all states; nor should it be construed as meaning an end to state sovereignty. Clearly, non-state actors can more easily overpower weak states than strong states. But throughout history non-state actors have coexisted with states. At times the power of non-state actors has been predominant while at other times the power of the state has been superior. The existence of powerful non-state actors does not mean the death of a state. The power and mobility of MNCs are not only derived from advances in technology, but from the economic liberalisation process initiated by states. Martin Wolf argues that the revolutionary advance in technology 'makes globalisation feasible. but it is liberalisation that makes it happen'. As a result, the MNCs of the advanced industrialised countries are able to operate beyond the control of soft, dependent and weak peripheral states, precisely because of the rules advanced by the former to guarantee uninhibited access to the latter's economies.

For the postmodernists, the apparent lack of order in the international system should no longer dominate security policies, especially after the collapse of the Soviet Union. East-West confrontation has diminished but the world is far from stable. Advances in military technology have profoundly transformed the dynamics of the world security landscape with the beginning the new millennium. 'A new round of military expansion is in progress among major powers, notably the US with its Missile Defence System, thereby aggravating imbalances in the world military strategic configuration. This undoubtedly poses new challenges to world peace and development'.

14.5 CHALLENGES TO HUMAN SECURITY IN PRACTICE

As it is time and again pointed out, the threat perception to human security has also undergone a marked change in the changing international scenario. The diffused nature of conflicts, the rise of market-oriented society in most parts of the world and the uneven distribution of technological resources pose new challenges. These new challenges are to be addressed setting aside the traditional norms of tackling security concerns at the level of nation or state.

To further simplify the concept, refuge could be sought in the conventional categorisation of socio-economic and political challenges. Though in the long run this could lead to the oversimplification of the complex concept like human insecurities, yet our endeavour here would be to understand the gravity of the situation with which this academic exercise is confronted with.

In 1945, almost every nation on the planet made a commitment to eradicate severe poverty. Though such a goal may seem utopian, consider the progress made up till now. The United Nations Development Programme reports that in the past 50 years, poverty has fallen more than in the previous 500 years. Since 1960, child death rates in developing countries have been more than halved. Malnutrition rates have been reduced by almost a third. And the proportion of children not attending primary school has decreased from more than half to less than a quarter. Approximately three to four billion people will have enjoyed considerable improvements in their standard of living, and about four to five billion will have access to basic education and health care by the end of 20th century. These advances highlight the fact that the eradication of poverty is not a wistful hope but a veritable possibility (Arias, 1998).

The momentum in poverty eradication can, however, be maintained only if political, social, and economic institutions are guided by the goals of human development. According to Oscar Arias, in the new era, "human security—in contrast to the traditional concept of security linked to military capacity and economic power—must be the ultimate goal of our development policies. In qualitative terms, human security represents the degree to which human beings are protected from ignorance, sickness, hunger, neglect, and persecution. It is the standard that dignifies human life: It is a child who is saved, a disease that is cured, an ethnic tension that is soothed, a dissident who speaks freely, and a human spirit that has hope."

While analysing the impact of free market capitalism, he further says that it has brought about bitter-sweet results for the South. While several economic gains have been made, many individuals have also fallen casualty to this system. For instance, Latin America has the worst distribution of wealth in the world. The income gap that exists between rich and poor here is by far the widest and most profound on this planet. As Carlos Fuentes pointed out, twenty-four individuals in Mexico possess more wealth than twenty-four million of their fellow citizens. Furthermore, the richest 20 per cent of Brazil's population earn **thirty-two** times more than the poorest 20 per cent. Inequity, however, does not only affect the poor. Over the course of Latin America's history, severe income disparity has provoked a bloody and long-lived cycle of insurrections which has claimed thousands of lives.

The state of the impoverished in the developing world, despite our achievements over the past few decades, is grave, indeed and warrants immediate action in the view of the following disturbing facts:

- 40,000 children die each day from malnutrition and disease.
- Water contaminated by sewage is estimated to kill two million children every year. Only 30 per cent of the population in Delhi, India, has access to a sewage system. In Karachi, Pakistan, only 20 per cent have such access.
- Some 840 million go hungry or face food insecurity.
- a Nearly one third of the people in the least developed countries are not expected to survive to the age of 40.
- 1.7 billion people live on incomes of less than one dollar a day.
- 1.5 billion people lack access to health services.
- 1.3 billion people lack access to potable water.
- Nearly one billion people are illiterate.

Many believe that globalisation is the real magic, which will break poverty's curse upon humanity. It is true that it has helped reduce poverty in some of the largest and strongest economies—China, India, and some of the Asian tigers. Yet this impulsive process benefits only a precious few, while producing many losers among and within nations. The gap between haves and have-nots in both developing and developed nations has widened. In several industrialised countries unemployment levels have soared to levels not recorded since the 1930s and income inequality has reached figures comparable to nineteenth century levels.

Over 100 nations in the developing world show sluggish economic growth, stagnation, or even **decline**. The ratio of global trade to GDP has been falling for 44 developing countries, which together comprise more than one billion people. The least **developed** countries, accounting for 10 per cent of the world's population, share only 0.3 per cent of world trade—half their share of two decades ago. The list goes on: average tariffs on industrial country imports from the least developed countries are 30 per cent **higher** than the global average. Furthermore, **developing nations** lose about \$60 billion dollars a year from **agricultural** subsidies and barriers to textile exports in industrial countries. If industrialised nations do

not rise up in solidarity to assist their less fortunate peers, the South will be forever condemned to suffering and powerlessness.

In these circumstances, misallocation of resources between defence and development sectors further worsen human development in these countries. War, and the preparation for war which have been given high priority is one of the greatest obstacles to human progress, fostering a vicious cycle of arms build-ups, violence, and poverty.

In 1997, world military spending totalled \$740 billion dollars. If we channelled just \$40 billion dollars of that figure over the next ten years into anti-poverty programs, all of the world's population would enjoy basic social services, such as education, health care and nutrition, clean water, and sanitation. Another \$40 billion dollars over ten years would provide all people on this planet with an income above the poverty line for their country.

Since the end of the Cold War, many industrialised nations have reduced their defence budgets. As a result, those countries' arms merchants have turned to new clients in the developing world, where the majority of today's conflicts take place. The United States stands out as an extreme case. Currently, the U.S. is responsible for 45 per cent of all weapons deliveries in the world. And, in the past four years, 85 percent of U.S. arms sales have gone to non-democratic governments in the developing world. During Clinton's first term in office, his administration gave \$35.9 billion to the militaries of non-democratic governments for arms and training—an average of \$9 billion per year. This figure represents 82 percent of the \$44 billion in total U.S. military support for developing nations:

In Sub-Saharan Africa, military expenditures totalled nearly \$8 billion in 1995. This figure is simply appalling, considering that this region's population—which doubles about every twenty years—has the highest proportion of poor in the world. Sub-Saharan Africa falls well behind other developing countries on both the Human Poverty Index and the Human Development Index. Nine of the 10 countries with the lowest Human Poverty Index are in Sub-Saharan Africa; that is to say that more than 50 percent of the residents of those countries have incomes that fall below the poverty line.

In South Asia, an arms race rages between India and Pakistan, fuelled by a dispute over the Kashmir territory. India spent more than \$12 billion dollars on arms purchases from 1988 to 1992 alone—more than either Saudi Arabia or Iraq during the same period. From 1978 to 1991, Pakistan increased its defence budget seven-fold, so that defence now accounts for nearly 40 percent of all government spending. These two nations, which rank alarmingly low on the Human Development Index, spend exorbitant amounts on this unforgivable arms race, leaving their people in their own desperate race against time to merely survive.

In the last few years, two Latin American nations, Costa Rica and Panama have taken historic steps toward ending once and for all the vicious cycle of poverty and militarism. Following the restoration of democracy to Panama in 1989, as Costa Rica itself did in 1949, the two states almost abolished their armed forces.

As a result. Costa Rica and Panama now enjoy the safest border in the world. They could dedicate more resources to crucial development needs. Progress in these two nations has

demonstrated to many countries that the abolition of national armed forces can be truly a viable option.

Responsible leadership in the international community must support commitments made toward demilitarisation in the developing world. Yet in several industrialised countries, armament production is viewed as a vital source of employment and income. 'When I am criticised for being an arms dealer,' said French Minister for Armaments Hughes de l'Estoile, 'I always think that when I sign a contract I can guarantee, for instance, 10,000 jobs over three years.' The French are not alone in their reasoning - the same argument is used in almost all arms-exporting nations to justify transfers which by any ethical standard would be unthinkable.

The arms trade is most often a friend of dictators and an enemy of the people. The time has come to choose human lives over arms. Indeed, we must settle for nothing less than a comprehensive, international effort to regulate and monitor arms transfers. Current initiatives to restrict arms sales represent a first step toward the mission for peace. In this endeavour, the European Union foreign ministers agreed to the terms of **Europe's** first Code of Conduct on arms exports, which now remain to be implemented and strengthened in various key areas.

Across the Atlantic, owing to back-room dealings, a U.S. Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers failed to pass a joint House-Senate Conference Committee. Nevertheless, its strong showing—which forced the opposition to resort to underhanded tactics—was indicative of the Code's moral sway and great promise. We can no longer say business is business and turn a blind eye to the poverty and oppression caused by arms transfers. Just like slavery and the drug trade, the arms trade reaps profits tainted with blood. Here one is reminded of Mahatma **Gandhi's** seven social sins:

- 1) Politics without principles.
- 2) **Commerce** without morality.
- 3) Wealth without work.
- 4) Education without character.
- 5) Science without humanity.
- 6) Pleasure without conscience, and
- 7) Worship without sacrifice.

14.6 ENSURING HUMAN SECURITY

The following measures could be conceived for ensuring a safer world for the humanity:

First, when conditions warrant, vigorous action in defence of human security should be necessary. Ensuring human security can involve the use of coercive measures, including sanctions and **military** force, as in Bosnia and Kosovo. At the same time, the human costs

of strategies for promoting state and international security must be explicitly assessed. These kinds of security policies, such as comprehensive economic sanctions, should take into account the impact on innocent people.

Second, security policies must be integrated much more closely with strategies for promoting human rights, democracy, and development. Human rights, humanitarian and refugee law provide the normative framework on which a human security approach is based. Development strategies offer broadly based means of addressing many long-term human security challenges. One of the dividends of adopting a human security approach is that it further elaborates a people-centred foreign policy.

Third, due to the complexity of contemporary challenges to the security of people, effective interventions involve a diverse range of actors including states, multilateral organisations, and civil society groups. As the challenges to the safety of people are transnational, effective responses can only be achieved through multilateral cooperation. This is evident in the array of new international instruments developed in the last decade to address transnational organised crime, drug trafficking, terrorism, and environmental degradation. These threats link the interest of citizens in countries which enjoy a high level of human security with the interests of people in much poorer nations, who face a wider range of threats to their safety.

Fourth, effective responses will depend on greater operational coordination. For example, successful peace-support operations are multi-dimensional, and depend on the close coordination of political negotiators, peacekeepers, human rights monitors, and humanitarian aid personnel among others. Furthermore, development agencies are now engaged in promoting security sector reform, while security organisations have helped channel development assistance in post-conflict countries. Managing these overlapping mandates and objectives is one of the principal challenges for a human security agenda.

Fifth, civil society organisations are seeking greater opportunity and greater responsibility in promoting human security. In many cases, non-governmental organisations have proven to be extremely effective partners in advocating the security of people. They are also important providers of assistance and protection to those in need of greater security. At the same time, the business sector, potentially a key actor in enhancing human security could be more effectively engaged.

Sixth, human security offers a new angle of vision and a broad template for evaluating policies. It also yields a concrete set of foreign policy initiatives. These should focus systematically on the safety of people which highlights the need for more targeted attention towards key issues that are not yet adequately addressed by the international community. Current examples of such gaps include the unchecked proliferation of small arms and the inadequate protection of children in circumstances of armed conflict. Human security is enhanced by reducing people's vulnerability and by preventing the conditions which make them vulnerable in the first place. Assisting people in highly insecure situations, particularly in the midst of violent conflict, is a central objective of the human security agenda. Refugees have long been the focus of international attention. The same focus on vulnerability highlights the immediate needs of the internally displaced and demobilized combatants. At the same time, a human security agenda must go beyond humanitarian action, by addressing the sources of people's insecurity. Building human security, therefore, requires both short-term

humanitarian action and long-term strategies for building peace and promoting sustainable development.

In addition, two fundamental strategies for enhancing human security are: strengthening legal norms and building the capacity to enforce them with equal vigour. There is little point in **defining** new norms and rights, however, if societies have no capacity to enforce existing norms or to protect already recognised rights. For this reason, improving democratic governance within states is a central strategy for **advancing** human security. Strengthening norms without building the capacity to protect them only invites disillusionment with the possibility of constraining power by the rule of law. Both are essential strategies if we are to move towards a more humane world.

To sum up the three points which we consider important for future studies from the standpoint of human security of **21st** century should be kept in mind.

1) Review of International System

As already mentioned, the diversity of threats facing the world today cannot be met merely on the strength of national or intergovernmental efforts. In the final analysis, the issue is even linked to review of the set-up of the international system itself. Response to problems requires the gathering of information, the prompt and efficient mustering of human and material resources, and sure deployment and execution in the field. In each of these phases, various nongovernmental actors in ever increasing diversity such as international agencies, NGOs, and multinational corporations, are playing bigger roles and becoming indispensable players.

A system for organically coordinated action by these actors will constitute the core of the international order in the 21st century. In the construction of this **system**, it will be even more vital to position the independent individual not merely as a passive beneficiary or victim, but as an active player whose interests are to be respected.

To this end, the reinforcement of capabilities and schemes must make provisions ~~for~~ formal participation of NGOs as aggregates of such independent individuals in the policy-making process of governments and international agencies (indeed, such arrangements are already starting to be made). Another key task is to bolster the functions of the United Nations as the central organ for coordinating and supplementing the activities of such actors in coping with globalisation.

2) Construction of Intellectual Networks

The construction of such an international system for human security will entail what would amount to a truly general mobilisation of all human intellectual resources across the conventional political, **economic**, scientific and technological boundaries. For this purpose, it would be most effective to ~~construct~~ **construct** intellectual networks that are interdisciplinary and international, and enable a ~~smooth~~ **smooth** sharing and organic **utilisation** of knowledge in all fields. The effects of these networks of knowledge will go beyond ~~the realm~~ **the realm** of traditional concepts of **human** security and become the single-greatest driving force of the 21st century international order.

3) International and Political Orientation

Given its fields of concern and the process of policy-making, human security absolutely must have official blessings on an international scale as well as support and solidarity accompanied by action.

Furthermore, in light of its importance for the international order in the 21st century and its international scope, human security is the most appropriate issue for deliberation in the Group of Eight conferences and the United Nations as the supreme fora of political and economic discussion in the current international system.

Human security must also garner a broadly based understanding and support, inclusive of developing countries, in the United Nations, a universal organisation with 188 member countries. Moreover, the United Nations is probably the sole entity capable of playing a central role in coordinating the execution of measures needed for human security.

14.7 SUMMARY

In the post cold war situation and with the increase in the number and complexity of conflicts throughout the world, it is important that post-conflict situation should have built-in measures to preserve human security ensuring safety and security of the individual being. When human security is under threat anywhere, it can affect people everywhere. Threat to human security can no longer be confined within national borders and no nation can isolate itself from the rest of the world. Threats within countries could rapidly spill beyond national frontiers posing global challenges to human security. The 1994 Human Development Report very appropriately emphasises that this invisibility and indivisibility of global human security extends to the consequences of both prosperity and poverty. If prosperity is becoming global, so is poverty. The real threat to humankind in the coming decade will arise more from actions affecting human security of millions of people than from aggression by a few nations. This demands new policy responses, both nationally and internationally. While global and national security in the traditional sense has attracted our attention over the years, one wonders whether we as individuals feel safe and secure in our day-to-day lives. As we embark on a new century, it is time that we focus on human security in all its dimensions and manifestations for all people of the world.

14.8 EXERCISES

- 1) What do you understand by the concept of 'human security'? Why is there an emergent need for addressing the issue from international perspective?
- 2) Defining human security and discuss its nature and scope.
- 3) Make a critical evaluation of the approaches for human security. Are they relevant in dealing the issue in policy formulations?
- 4) What are the human security challenges posed by technological development and liberalization?
- 5) What are the insecurities facing the humanity in this age of globalisation? How they could be over powered?