

MPRA

Munich Personal RePEc Archive

Human security: Concept and practice

Sudha Venu Menon

ICFAI Business School, Ahmedabad

31. March 2007

Online at <http://mpa.ub.uni-muenchen.de/2478/>
MPRA Paper No. 2478, posted 2. April 2007

HUMAN SECURITY: CONCEPT AND PRACTICE

SUDHA MENON

INTRODUCTION

“Today’s wealth revolution will unlock countless opportunities and new life trajectories, not only for creative business entrepreneurs, but for social, cultural and educational entrepreneurs as well. It will open fresh possibilities for slashing poverty both at home and at a global level. But it will accompany this invitation to a glowing future with a warning: Risks are not merely multiplying, but escalating. The future is not for the faint-hearted.”

Alvin Toffler in Revolutionary Wealth [2006]¹

In the era of multiplying and escalating risks, both at national and international level, security of individual –popularly known as human security- from pervasive threats and fears become an area of intellectual discourse and policy debate. This is especially significant after the end of cold war, emergence of multi-polarity and proliferation of global terrorism. However, there is no established concept of human security in mainstream social science debates across the world. In the absence of a theory of human security, there exist few quantitative indicators and hence few data base on human security. More recently political theorists tried to develop a concept of human security based on the concept of human development and human rights. Yet, social science theory has not yet come forward with a comprehensive view of what exactly constitute human security. The matter is further complicated by the process of globalization and the high social costs associated with it.

Against this context, this article attempts to analyze the concept of human security and its implication in a global context threatened by multiple forces of fear and insecurity. Introductory section gives historical background of human security and its recent interpretations through institutional interventions. The institutional mechanisms include UNDP report of 1994, International Commission on intervention and state sovereignty etc. Section two analyzes theoretical contributions of Amartya Sen, Emma Rothschild, Thomas, King and Murray, Kanti Bajpai, Hampton, and Leaning in popularizing the concept of human security. Section three defines human security from different dimensions and highlights the relevance of broader and inclusive concept of human security in the post cold war era. Section four analyzes positive and negative approaches towards human security in application level. Positive human security is analyzed on the basis of initiatives of Canada, Norway and Japan towards Human Security centric governance and its impact on economic and social security. Negative Approach is evaluated in the context of USA and EU policy in Middle East and other countries.

¹ Alvin Toffler and Heidi Toffler, Revolutionary Wealth, New York, 2006.

SECTION ONE

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN SECURITY

Security is not a new concept in social science. In fact, security is the essential ingredient of our international system around which nation states originated and sustained. But modern concept of human security identifies the inherent weakness of this traditional security paradigm which basically focuses on security of the state instead of security of individual. The dominant concept of security, traditionally, was state centric, extending support and legitimacy to instruments of states and upholding the principle of state sovereignty. Plato's *Ideal state*, Aristotle's *Statesman*, Hobbs 'concept of *Leviathan*, Machiavelli's *Prince* and above all Marxian concept of *Dictatorship of the proletariat* highlight the ultimate goal or end of state as security and protection of individual and community, even though they have different views about the means to attain this goal. But neither of these theories gave an independent identity and existence to human security nor did they develop conceptual framework on human security. Instead security was conceived as an integral part of national security which put emphasis on military centric solutions to security related issues. Even though the UN system was established to protect security of the people, the UN principle for security was initially focused on ways in which the structures and practices of the modern state might address threats to its sovereignty².

In this context it is important to examine the origin and various stages of development of human security both as a concept and tool for implementation. Since human security lacks conceptual clarity and an exclusive paradigm for intellectual discourse, it is difficult to analyze the historical development of the concept with precision and clarity. Human security does not have specific borderlines. Anything which affects the security of individual and collective existence may come under human security. Naturally, the scope of the concept is full of ambiguity. To overcome this limitation, the present paper tries to limit the scope of the concept into UN concept of human security and the mainstream debates around which it operates. Because it was UNDP Human Development Report 1994, which, for the first time, explicitly articulated the importance of human security as tool of policy making and implementation. Simultaneously Canada, Japan and Norway proposed human security centric governance initiatives in domestic and foreign policy options. However, while analyzing the origin and development of the concept it is impertinent to go beyond the UN interpretations and recent policy debates. Concerns towards human security and an attempt to criticize traditional security centric notions appeared even during the cold war era, though it was not universally accepted and discussed. Hence, the following pages make an attempt to analyze the development of the concept and divide it into three stages- Pre-Cold War Era, Cold War era and Post Cold War era.

Human Security in Pre- Cold War Era

² Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu, The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports, UNDP, May 2006, http://hdr.undp.org/docs/nhdr/thematic_reviews/Human_Security_Guidance_Note.Pdf

As mentioned earlier, security of individual and society was not unknown in Social science in general and political theory in particular. The core stream of thought in western political theory right from Socrates to Harold Laski and Mcpherson focused on the best governance system which provides security, well being and opportunities to individual and community. In economics also welfare economists criticized classical growth centric models of growth and highlighted the need for interlinking human welfare and economics. After the decline of feudalism and emergence of nation states, primary responsibility of maintaining security was vested with state which ultimately led to linking all notions of security with territorial integrity and national sovereignty. In this classical formulation, security is about how state use force to manage threats to their territorial integrity their autonomy and their domestic political order primarily from other states. This classical national security formulation has been criticized on various grounds. It restricts the scope of security to military threats. In this view rival states may deploy other kinds of threats against each others territorial integrity and domestic political order.³

Thus in conventional security perspective security was not associated with other form of threats and fear .With the advent of Marxism and rise of trade unions demanding more share and equal distribution of resources, some states including USA initiated social security policies not as a means to protect human security but as a tactful strategy of containment of communism. Thus even in 19th century and first part of the 20th century ,the dominant concept of security was state centric privileging the instruments and agents of the state carrying forward the principles of state sovereignty as first articulated in the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648⁴.

After the First World War also the two dominant strands of foreign policy –economic development and military security – did not address the core issues which threaten the existence of human beings including growing poverty, displacement, migration, armed conflicts environmental degradation etc. Instead the period witnessed balance of power, formation of alliances and arms race focusing blindly on the conventional dimension of military security. This unilateral approach to security ultimately resulted in Second World War and the human catastrophe in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The post- World War period witnessed significant transformation of international socio political configuration. End of colonialism and the resultant emergence of newly formed independent nation states in Asia and Africa, displacement and rehabilitation of refugees, reconstruction of war affected countries etc raised the limitations of conventional military centric approach to human problems and highlighted the need for redefined strategies and policies. The UN was born into such a world emerging out of the shadows of war and hitherto unimagined destruction. It was founded on the ideals of peace justices with an international system of law and procedure that would replace military aggression and war

³ Kanti Bajpai, Human Security: Concept and Measurement, Kroc Institute Occasional papers, 19:OP:1 kroc.nd.edu/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF

⁴ Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu, The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports, UNDP, May 2006, hdr.undp.org/docs/nhdr/thematic_reviews/Human_Security_Guidance_Note.Pdf

with negotiation and collective security. Although the UN was fundamentally constructed around the concept of national sovereignty, from the very start the security of people was of equal importance. The UN Charter itself states: ‘ We people of the UN determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war which twice in our life time has brought untold sorrow to mankind...’⁵

However here also UN did not give much attention to the non-political aspects of human security and instead give emphasis on protection of state sovereignty rather than individual or community security. Threats which affect people irrespective of national borders, territorial limits, geographical location etc was least addressed. More over the functional pattern of nation states were identified in terms of pursuit of power. It was this realist approach and militaristic interpretation which determined the nature of security paradigm during the cold war period.

Human Security during Cold War Era

In the context of the above mentioned global realities and escalating threats to human existence, there was a general consensus with the international community that the the United Nations Charter did not sufficiently define the essential human rights it referenced. A universal declaration that specified the rights of individuals was felt necessary and was ultimately made through **Universal Declaration of Human Rights in December 1948**.The declaration recognizes inherent dignity and equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family. It further protects right to life, liberty and security of person, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment to name a few⁶.This ratification was indeed the first step towards making universal acceptance of certain rights and human security related issues. Although the Charter does not provide any concrete strategy for implementing the rights, it still provides a beacon light for the further development of human security.

Another event which should be mentioned while discussing the historical development of human security is efforts of international community towards **disarmament and nuclear non –proliferation**. NPT of 1968, Anti Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972 etc led to establishing certain universally acceptable norms and regulations to curb thee threats associated with weapons of mass destruction. Unlike the traditional notions the step towards disarmament gives more emphasis on human security rather than state sovereignty. This altered concept was essential especially in the context of Vietnam War, Cuban crisis and the increasing propensity to use force and aggression as a means to protect national security. Thus we may say that international disarmament initiatives, partly, deviate from traditional security paradigm and conceive human security connotations.

⁵ Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu, The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports, UNDP, May 2006, http://hdr.undp.org/docs/nhdr/thematic_reviews/Human_Security_Guidance_Note.Pdf

⁶ <http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>

As already mentioned above, rise of new countries in Africa Asia and Latin America resulted in emergence of new set of problems like extreme poverty, population , under-nutrition, industrial backwardness, civil war , ethnic conflicts, epidemics etc. Traditional framework of state and national security was not adequate enough to address these post colonial social and economic issues effectively. Even though developed countries extended their financial aid and intervention to tackle the problems of under developed countries, it did not succeed well because their methodology was growth centric rather than development centric. In this context, a group of **development theorists** including Samir Amin, Gunder Frank and Franz Fennen, put forward alternative approaches to development, focusing on equal distribution of resources and income. This new paradigm in development economics interlinked security of individual with proper share in resource allocation which ultimately enlarged the scope of human security. As Kanti Bajpai rightly commented *'the genealogy of the idea of human security can be related to if not traced back to the growing dissatisfaction with prevailing notions of development and security in the 60s, 70s and 80s. Economics undoubtedly led the way with its critiques of the dominant models of economic development beginning in the 60s'*.⁷

In the 70s, another attempt was made to address the core questions of human security through the **World Order Models Project [WOMP]** which give importance to normative challenges to existing system of state centric security regime. The central feature of the normative challenge that is proposed rests on an acceptance of human solidarity and all its implications, especially a shared responsibility to seek equity and dignity for every person on the planet without regard to matters of national identity or territorial boundary. WOMP requires a structural relevance based on the four value positions of peace, economic equity, social and political justice, and ecological balance⁸.

Since 1970s the literature on human centric governance and development policies began to enrich social science research and practice. These group of scholars and various international commissions played vital role in conceptualizing human security both at theoretical and application level. First among these intellectual efforts was made from the **Club of Rome Group** founded in 1968 by Aurelio Peccei, an Italian industrialist, and Alexander King, a Scottish scientist. It raised considerable public attention with its report *Limits to Growth*, which has sold 30 million copies in in more than 30 translations, making it the best selling environmental book in world history⁹. In this book they identified certain issues which may affect the survival of the world itself irrespective of national boundaries and cultural specificities. The book used the **World3 model** to simulate the consequence of interactions between the Earth's and human systems. The **World3** model was a computer simulation of interactions between population, industrial growth, food production and limits in the ecosystems of the Earth. Five variables were examined in the original model, on the assumption that exponential growth accurately

⁷ Kanti Bajpai, Human Security: Concept and Measurement, Kroc Institute Occasional papers, 19:OP:1 kroc.nd.edu/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF

⁸ Dr Neville Yeomans, On Global Reform and International Normative Model Areas (Inma)feb 2007. <http://www.laceweb.org.au/gri.htm>

⁹http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Club_of_Rome

described their patterns of increase. These variables are: world population, industrialization, pollution, food production and resource depletion. The authors intended to explore the possibility of a sustainable feedback pattern which would be achieved by altering growth trends among the five variables¹⁰. The Club of Rome Reports noted that “Every person in the world faces a series of pressures and problems that require his attention and action. These problems affect him at many different levels. He may spend much of his time trying to find tomorrow’s food...He may be concerned about personal power or the power of the nation in which he lives. He may worry about a world war...or a war next week with a rival clan in his neighborhood.” In short, the group proposed that there was a complex global system influencing the individual’s life chances and that there were alternative ways of conceptualizing global development and, ultimately, global security so as to sustain and improve those life chances.¹¹ Thus Club of Rome and World 3 model popularized some crucial threats under which human beings live and thus provided solid foundation to human security dynamics in domestic and international public policy.

Willy Brandt Commission of 1978 and his report known as North South Report [1980] also occupies significant role in conceptualizing human security. The title of the report itself reads: *To ensure survival*. The Brand Report seeks a balance in developmental policies and demands that the countries of the South be integrated into the global economic system. The North-South Commission expects that this will bring about needed improvements in economic and social conditions in disadvantaged countries. At the same time, the rich industrial countries of the North are called upon to share their means and power with the countries of the South. The Report contains a number of proposals for the reform and transformation of the world economic system. It concludes that the introduction of such a new system would be an important contribution to the survival of humanity.¹² In his introduction to the report, Brandt wrote: “Our Report is based on what appears to be the simplest common interest: that mankind wants to survive, and one might even add has the moral obligation to survive. This not only raises traditional questions of peace and war, but also tries how to overcome world hunger, mass misery and alarming disparities between the living conditions of rich and poor¹³. Thus North South Report made the discourse on security much wider inclusive and highlight the need for incorporating the humane centric agenda in global policy framework.

Another important milestone is **Olof Palme Commission Report** on Disarmament and Security Issues. The Palme Commission issued the 1982 report, *Common Security*, which argued that both East and West have legitimate security needs. It can never be

¹⁰ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Limits_to_Growth

¹¹ Kanti Bajpai, Human Security: Concept and Measurement, Kroc Institute Occasional papers, 19:OP:1 kroc.nd.edu/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF

¹² http://www.bwbs.de/bwbs_biografie/North-South_Report_B415.html

¹³ Kanti Bajpai, Human Security: Concept and Measurement, Kroc Institute Occasional papers, 19:OP:1 kroc.nd.edu/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF

possible, the Commission said, to demand unilateral security for one block based on superior military resources. On the contrary, in a world of incomprehensibly destructive nuclear potential, every ideological offensive toward military supremacy is a threat to universal security¹⁴. Apart from his focus on disarmament and international security the report also gives importance to security threats faced by Third World countries from poverty, hunger deprivation and economic inequalities¹⁵.

The initiatives of Brandt and Palme in popularizing the concept of a common universal security and the linkages between security and disarmament was further upheld by **Iga Thorsen** in her report submitted to UN in 1982. Presenting her expert report on Disarmament and development to UN she concluded that the world can either continue to pursue the arms race with characteristic vigor or move consciously and with deliberate speed toward a more stable and balanced social and economic development within a more sustainable international economic and political order. It cannot do both¹⁶.

The above analysis presents various stages and implications of security before evolving itself into a theoretical construct of human security. It is evident that during the cold war period security was essentially state centric even though attempts were made to give an inclusive and comprehensive concept of security involving issues of environment, poverty development and disarmament. Thus the intellectual stimulation expressed through commission reports together with institutional mechanisms initiated by UN disarmament policies, strengthened the efforts towards universal security cutting across regions and races.

Another important contribution of this period is that scholars and policy makers began to recognize that even successful examples of territorial security don't necessarily ensure the security of citizens with in state. With Robert McNamara and Brandt, analysts also began to recognize environmental degradation and natural disasters such as epidemics floods earthquakes and drought as important threats to security as much as human made military disasters.¹⁷ These debates thus provided a strong platform for human security to emerge with an independent identity. The process was further encouraged by the power-shift in global politics necessitated through collapse of USSR, fall of Berlin wall and ultimately the end of cold war.

Towards Conceptualization: Human Security in the Post Cold War Era

Since the end of cold war the phrase human security increasingly has surfaced in scholarly literature, in the conversations of policy professionals and policy advocates and occasionally in popular media. The phrase itself suggests a departure from the esoteric

¹⁴ http://www.brandt21forum.info/Bio_Palme.htm

¹⁵ <http://www-ee.stanford.edu/~hellman/Breakthrough/book/chapters/nitkin.html>

¹⁶ <http://disarm.igc.org/T211097humandev.html>

¹⁷ Gary King and Christopher Murray, *Rethinking Human Security*, *Political Science Quarterly*, Volume 116, Number 4 2001-02.

jargon of the Cold War, preoccupied with state-centric issues of thermonuclear holocaust, strategic alliances and deterrence. But despite its increasing usage, the new concept rarely is defined for the lay reader and seems to carry a slippery range of alternative definitions. For some, the association of “human security” with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) either commends its value or undermines its validity, regardless of the content. For others, the phrase connotes an exciting—or troubling—consensus on security themes by a putative global intelligentsia. Policymakers in several countries have gone so far as to embrace the concept as a foundation for their national foreign policy, while US policymakers are at best ambivalent or, more commonly, skeptical¹⁸.

In the post cold war period the development of human security emerged through two different streams -Theoretical contributions from a group of scholars including Mahbub Ul Haq and Amartya Sen and institutional efforts from UNDP and Canadian government. The following paragraphs explain the role of all these elements in conceptualizing human security.

In 1991, The Stockholm Initiative on Global Security and Governance the official initiative of Swedish Government published a paper highlighting the need for securing a new concept of human security, titled as ‘*Common Responsibility in the 1990s*’. The report identified common threats to security other than military and political rivalry between nations. This wider security paradigm included failure of development policy, ecological degradation, population explosion, extreme poverty, health hazards and slows down process of democratization.¹⁹ During the same period, Oscar Arias, former President of Costa Rica and winner of Nobel Peace Prize, also started linking the concept of security with de militarization and move towards democratization. In his proposal for **Global Demilitarization Fund**, he urged countries to support the process demobilizing military personnel and integrating them into civil society for constructive development initiatives.

UNDPs 1994 Global Human Development Report was the first international document which clearly and explicitly articulated Human Security as a concept for future vision and agenda for action.²⁰ Closely associated with this idea from the beginning was **Mahbub Ul Haq** former Pakistan Finance Minister and consultant of UNDP. It is under his initiative, Human Development Index and Human Governance Index was prepared. His paper *New Imperatives of Human Security* published in 1994 gives theoretical explanation of human security and paved the way for its global acceptance. According to Haq human security underlines security of individuals and not nation state’s. He argues that “the world is entering a new era of human security in which the entire concept of

¹⁸ Dan Henk, Human Security: [Relevance and Implications](http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/05summer/henk.pdf).

¹⁹ Kanti Bajpai, Human Security: Concept and Measurement, Kroc Institute Occasional papers, 19:OP:1 kroc.nd.edu/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF

²⁰ Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu, The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports, UNDP, May 2006, hdr.undp.org/docs/nhdr/thematic_reviews/Human_Security_Guidance_Note.Pdf

security will change and change dramatically. In this new conception security will be equated with the security of individuals, not just security of their nations” or, to put it differently, security of people, not just security of territory.” Elsewhere, more normatively, he writes, “We need to fashion a new concept of human security that is reflected in the lives of our people, not in the weapons of our country.²¹” Thus in this paradigm governments should try to protect the life, security, and survival of individual and community rather than its territorial integrity. Haq also identified some major threats against human security including drugs, disease, terrorism and poverty. He further widened the concept by adding the issues of north south divide, political economy of hegemony, underdevelopment and unequal distribution of wealth as threat to human security. While discussing about the means through which human security can be achieved, Haq totally deviated from the military version to one of development. In particular he gives five radical steps to achieve human security:

- A human development conception with emphasis on equity, sustainability, and grassroots participation;
- A peace dividend to underwrite the broader agenda of human security;
- A new partnership between North and South based on “justice, not charity” which emphasizes “equitable access to global market opportunities” and economic restructuring;
- A new framework of global governance built on reform of international institutions such as the IMF, World Bank, and United Nations; and finally,
- A growing role for global civil society.²²

This initiative was ultimately culminated in the official articulation of the new concept by UNDP. UNDP published its Human Development Report in the same year which contained a separate section on human security titled *Redefining Security: The Human Dimension*. The report also echoed Haq’s connotation that security is people centric rather than state centric. The report gives a proper and clear definition security for the first time in its inception – *freedom from fear and freedom from want giving equal weight to territories and to people.*²³ In another words the documents says,

“Human security is a child who did not die, a disease that did not spread, a job that was not cut, an ethnic tension that did not explode in violence, a dissident who was not silenced. Human security is not a concern with weapons – it is a concern with human life and dignity...It is concerned with how people live and breathe in a society, how freely they exercise their many choices, how much access they have to market and social

²¹ Kanti Bajpai, Human Security: Concept and Measurement, Kroc Institute Occasional papers, 19:OP:1 kroc.nd.edu/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF

²² Kanti Bajpai, Human Security: Concept and Measurement, Kroc Institute Occasional papers, 19:OP:1 kroc.nd.edu/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF

²³ UNDP, Redefining Security, 1994, page.229. [http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/1994/en/pdf/hdr_1994_ch2.pdf]

*opportunities– and whether they live in conflict or in peace.*²⁴”The report gives components of human security including:

- Economic Security: an individual’s enjoyment of a basic income, either through gainful employment or from a social safety net
- Food security : an individual’s access to food via his or her assets, employment, or income
- Health security :an individual’s freedom from various diseases and debilitating illnesses and his or her access to health care
- Environmental security: the integrity of land, air, and water, which make human habitation possible
- Personal security: an individual’s freedom from crime and violence, especially women and children who are more vulnerable.
- Community security: cultural dignity and to inter-community peace within which an individual lives and grow
- Political security: Protection against human rights violations²⁵.

The report identifies two kinds of threats –first type is region specific localized threats which are culturally, economically and geographically limited to that particular country or region. According to the report this type includes threats to economic security, food security and health security .Second type of threat is global in nature scope and impact. It will affect other countries irrespective of national boundaries. E.g.; natural disasters, increasing international migration, drug trafficking, environmental decay epidemics etc.
26

Thus UNDP perceive a much wider aspect of security which cannot be tackled through force or military hegemony. This inclusive concept, on the other hand needs cooperation between people civil society government and international agencies and instrumentalities. The report further suggests that domestic and foreign policy of the nation states should be tuned in order to meet the various kinds of threats affecting human security.

After 1994, the concept of human security became a central theme of a number of governments through their foreign and defense policies. In particular, the Canadian, Japanese and Norwegian governments led the way in institutionalizing human security concerns in their respective foreign policies.²⁷ Among these Canada’s *Middle Power Approach* plays vital role in conceptualizing human security. In 1999 Canada organized a middle power conference with Norway and reiterated human security as a people centric

²⁴ UNDP, Redefining Security,1994, page.229[http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/1994/en/pdf/hdr_1994_ch2.pdf]

²⁵ UNDP, Redefining Security,1994, page.230

²⁶ http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/1994/en/pdf/hdr_1994_ch2.pdf

²⁷ Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu, The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports, UNDP,May 2006,hdr.undp.org/docs/nhdr/thematic_reviews/Human_Security_Guidance_Note.Pdf

new concept based on new tools and measuring rods. According to this approach human security includes security against economic deprivation an acceptable quality of life and a guarantee of fundamental human rights.²⁸ This view accepted UN notion of freedom from fear and want and added equal opportunities also with this. Thus according to them the core value of human security conception though is freedom from pervasive threats to people's right, their safety and their lives.²⁹ The Canadian perspective of human security also presents a number of threats which affect human security like internal conflict and state failure, transnational crime, nuclear proliferation, religious and ethnic discord, state repression, migration, use of land mines child abuse economic under development, unequal international trade etc.³⁰ Regarding the measures to deal with the serious concerns Canada focused on peace building peace keeping, equal trade, and economic development. To move this agenda forward, Canada would have to rely increasingly on "soft" power – "the art of disseminating information in such a way that desirable outcomes are achieved through persuasion rather than coercion." Canada and various other middle powers were ideally suited to network, build coalitions, and bring others round to understand the importance of human security. Governments, NGOs, academics, Businesses and ordinary citizens were all potential partners in this endeavor.³¹

There are other reports also which contributed much to the concept in its evolving stage. This include Report of the Commission on Global Governance of 1995, The Brahimi Report on UN Peace keeping Options[2000] and Report of the Independent international Commission on intervention and state sovereignty [2001] etc. In 2001 the Commission on Human Security was formed under Amartya Sen and Sadako Ogata [UN High Commissioner FOR Refugees]. They published the report in 2003 in which security was conceived not only for protecting people but also empowering them to fend for themselves. The Sen-Ogatta report focused on a variety of actors who were either insecure or faced the threat of insecurity. It further notes that engaging with complex relationship within the policy environment is the best way to ensure the establishment of human security³².

Recent efforts towards giving international sanctity to human security include UN high level panel report on *Threats, Challenges and Changes* published in 2004 and UN secretary General's report titled *In Larger Freedom* published in 2005. The first report explores the linkages between development and security and identifies six issues of threats: poverty and environmental degradation, interstate conflict, internal conflict civil war and genocide, weapons of mass destruction transnational organized crime, the report

²⁸ Kanti Bajpai, Human Security: Concept and Measurement, Kroc Institute Occasional papers, 19:OP:1 kroc.nd.edu/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF

²⁹ A Perspective on Human Security: Chairman's Summary," Lysoen, Norway, 20 May 1999, at website <http://www.dfait.maeci.gc.ca/foreignp/HumanSecurity/secur-e.htm>,

³⁰ Kanti Bajpai, Human Security: Concept and Measurement, Kroc Institute Occasional papers, 19:OP:1 kroc.nd.edu/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF

³¹ Kanti Bajpai, Human Security: Concept and Measurement, Kroc Institute Occasional papers, 19:OP:1 kroc.nd.edu/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF

³² Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu, The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports, UNDP, May 2006, hdr.undp.org/docs/nhdr/thematic_reviews/Human_Security_Guidance_Note.Pdf

highlight that ‘development makes ever one more secure’³³. The second report also explicitly connects security with development. It states that all people have the right to security and development.³⁴

While analyzing the development of human security from a narrow state oriented militaristic dimension to a broad people centric paradigm, it is clear that the concept is still in the process of proper theorizing. It is a universal concern and relevant to people every where with variations in degree and content. Apart from the effort of international agencies to conceptualize human security intellectuals also tried to develop theory of human security even though it is less developed compared to other concepts in social science. The following section briefly explains some of the theories of human security.

SECTION TWO

THEORITICAL CONTRIBUTION

Emma Rothschild

Emma Rothschild tries to explain the current content of human security by linking it to European political thought. In doing so she notes that the new approach to security has extended the national security concept to four directions:

1. “From the security of nations to the security of groups and individuals: it is extended *downwards* from nations to individuals
2. From the security of nations to the security of the international system, or of a supranational physical environment: it is extended *upwards*, from the nation to the biosphere. The extension, in both cases, is in the sorts of entities whose security is to be ensured.
3. Extended *horizontally*, or to the sorts of security that are in question. Different entities (such as individuals, nations, and ‘systems’) cannot be expected to be secure or insecure in the same way; the concept of security is extended, therefore, from military to political, economic, social, environmental, or ‘human’ security.
4. “Political responsibility for ensuring security (or for invigilating all these ‘concepts of security’) is itself extended: it is diffused *in all directions* from national states, including upwards to international institutions, downwards to regional or local government, and sideways to nongovernmental organizations, to

³³ Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu, The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports, UNDP, May 2006, hdr.undp.org/docs/nhdr/thematic_reviews/Human_Security_Guidance_Note.Pdf

³⁴ Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu, The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports, UNDP, May 2006, hdr.undp.org/docs/nhdr/thematic_reviews/Human_Security_Guidance_Note.Pdf

public opinion and the press, and to the abstract forces of nature or of the market.”³⁵

Rothschild highlights the need for international measures to prevent civil conflicts and argues for strengthening international instruments for better promotion of human security. In developing these proposals she raises salient issues of authority, coercion, resource generation, consensus-building, and subsidiarity. The proposal as it stands is worthy of ongoing consideration; one also hopes that similar historical analyses will be carried out in relation to other national or regional concepts.³⁶

Gary King and Christopher Murray

King and Murray, unlike Rothschild did not link human security with historical contexts and gives a more rigorous but measurable definition of human security. They criticized the existing concept of human security defined by UN as too broad to be useful as a construct for foreign policy. Their article published in *Political Science Quarterly*, states:

‘We define an individual’s human security as his or her expectation of years of life without experiencing the state of generalized poverty’³⁷

They proposed an index of human security that includes only those domains of well being that have been important enough for human beings to fight over or to put their lives or property at great risk. These domains were identified as health, education, income, political freedom, and democracy. Their index sets thresholds in each domain that are in some sense absolute; the index would identify a person as insecure if he or she fell below a threshold in *any* of the domains. Their approach does not include violence, but rather focuses on issues associated with the “freedom from want.”³⁸ In other words we can say that King and Murray linked human security with developmental dimensions rather than Conflict related issues.

Caroline Thomas

Thomas gives new dimension of human security in the context of globalization and the inequalities associated with its dynamics. Like King and Murray he also equates human security with basic material needs human dignity and democracy. According to him, *‘Human security describes a condition of existence in which basic material needs are met and in which human dignity, including meaningful participation in the life of the community, can be met. Thus, while material sufficiency lies at the core of human security, in addition the concept encompasses non-material dimensions to form a qualitative whole. Human security is oriented towards an active and substantive notion of*

³⁵ A Conceptual framework of human security, Sabina Alkire,2003. p.15
<http://www.crise.ox.ac.uk/pubs/workingpaper2.pdf>

³⁶ A Conceptual framework of human security, Sabina Alkire,2003. p.15
<http://www.crise.ox.ac.uk/pubs/workingpaper2.pdf>

³⁷ Gary King and Christopher Murray, *Rethinking Human Security*, *Political Science Quarterly*, Volume 116,Number 4 2001-02

³⁸ A Conceptual framework of human security, Sabina Alkire,2003. p.15
<http://www.crise.ox.ac.uk/pubs/workingpaper2.pdf>

*democracy, and is directly engaged with discussions of democracy at all levels, from the local to the global.*³⁹

Thus Thomas also attached great importance to eradication of poverty and providing material support as the key elements in human security.

Hampson

Echoing the above views on human security Hampson also tried to identify human security with economic needs and interests although he slightly elaborated the concept to incorporate physical safety of individual and protection of basic freedoms. According to him,

'The concept of 'security' can be defined as the absence of threat to core human values, including the most basic human value, the physical safety of the individual.' They identify other core human values as physical security, and the protection of basic liberties, economic needs and interests'.⁴⁰ More over him extends the roots of human security to sustainable development and human rights. Human security was always an underprovided public good and proper approach to human security needs active role of various actors including state, civil society and international bodies.

Leaning and Are

Leaning and Are proposed a new dimension of security after studying the low level of human security in Africa. Even though their definition and theory of human security focused on human development and capability, unlike other scholars they did not ignore psychological and non material aspects of human security. Instead they described human security as a pre condition for human development. According to them, human security is

*'An underlying condition for sustainable human development. It results from the social, psychological, economic, and political aspects of human life that in times of acute crisis or chronic deprivation protect the survival of individuals, support individual and group capacities to attain minimally adequate standards of living, and promote constructive group attachment and continuity through time'*⁴¹,

Further they propose three key measurable components of human security:

1. A Sustainable sense of home;
2. A constructive social and family networks; and
3. An acceptance of the past and a positive grasp of the future.

³⁹ A Conceptual framework of human security, Sabina Alkire,2003. p.15
<http://www.crise.ox.ac.uk/pubs/workingpaper2.pdf>

⁴⁰ A Conceptual framework of human security, Sabina Alkire,2003. p.15
<http://www.crise.ox.ac.uk/pubs/workingpaper2.pdf>

⁴¹ A Conceptual framework of human security, Sabina Alkire,2003. p.15
<http://www.crise.ox.ac.uk/pubs/workingpaper2.pdf>

It is suggested that these components can be best measured by trends in their inverse indicators (proposed measures are: social dislocation, shifts in horizontal inequality, and discount rate). Their work raises in particular the need to address cultural and psychological dimensions (which are not easy to measure), without diluting or derailing the focus and compactness of human security as a “minimal set.”⁴²

Amartya Sen

Amartya Sen presents a broad concept of human security by linking economic, developmental aspects to political and social aspects. His analysis of human security gives high social cost of unequal income distribution and highlights the need for a down turn with security along with the old slogan of growth with equity, given the fact that occasional downturns are common in market economies. Thus in achieving security under these circumstances, and in trying to guarantee secure daily living in general, we need social and economic provisions (for example, for so-called "economic safety nets" and the guaranteeing of basic education and health care), but also political participation, especially by the weak and the vulnerable, since their voice is vitally important. This requires the establishment and efficient working of democracies with regular elections and the tolerance of opposition, but also the cultivation of a culture of open public discussion. Democratic participation can directly enhance security through supporting human dignity (more on this presently), but they also help in securing the continuation of daily lives (despite downturns) and even the security of survival (through the prevention of famines).⁴³

Kanti Bajpai

Another notable contribution to the theory of human security is given by Kanti Bajpai who attempted to provide *Human Security Audit*. He argues that there are two components at the core of human security

- Direct and indirect threats to individual bodily safety and freedom
- The capacity to deal with threats namely the fostering of norms institutions and democratization in decision making process⁴⁴.

An audit of human security would consist of (i) an accounting of the growth or decline in threats and (ii) an estimate of the capabilities to meet those threats. He further says that human security audit is possible both quantitatively and qualitatively. Like HDI we may prepare Human Security Index and audit each country's success in this aspect. Second, those factors that are not susceptible to measurement can be assessed *qualitatively*. These factors are generally at the international/global level and usually more on the capabilities”

⁴² A Conceptual framework of human security, Sabina Alkire, 2003. p.15

<http://www.crise.ox.ac.uk/pubs/workingpaper2.pdf>

⁴³ Amartya Sen, *Why Human Security*, 2000.

www.humansecurity-chs.org/activities/outreach/Sen2000.pdf

⁴⁴ Kanti Bajpai, Human Security: Concept and Measurement, Kroc Institute Occasional papers, 19:OP:1

kroc.nd.edu/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF

rather than “threats” side of the security audit. Thus, a qualitative estimate, on an annual basis, of global disarmament efforts would be far more useful than a listing of the numbers of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons in existence.⁴⁵ He further says that HS Index have at least five uses

1. Developing a social early warning system
2. Focusing attention on problem areas
3. Redefining national and international policy priorities
4. Setting national and international standards
5. Generating new social scientific knowledge

On the whole we may conclude that the theoretical contributions coupled with international instrumentalities played a pivotal role in providing conceptual clarity to human security. Even though the concept still lacks certain methodological precision and tool for analysis and measurement, it has attained global acceptance and credibility not only as vision statement for countries but also as immediate policy option for survival.

SECTION THREE

DEFINITIONS AND APPROACHES

The popularization of the human security model in the 1990s marked a signal triumph for proponents of a broad understanding of security. The debate has tended to center around four key questions: Who or what should be the focus—the referent object—of security?

- Who or what threatens security?
- Who has the prerogative to provide security?
- What methods are appropriate, or inappropriate, in providing security⁴⁶

The rich ferment in ideas about security among scholars and practitioners has led to a proliferation of different approaches and models, ranging from the defense of traditional thinking to advocacy of approaches as novel as the “feminist” and “post-positivist.” The human security paradigm borrows from a number of the different new approaches, particularly those whose referent object is the individual citizen and which acknowledge security only in the absence of a wide assortment of different kinds of threats⁴⁷. The following table explains various approaches to human security based on central object, key values nature of threats and agents for implementation.

⁴⁵ Kanti Bajpai, Human Security: Concept and Measurement, Kroc Institute Occasional papers, 19:OP:1 kroc.nd.edu/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF

⁴⁶ Dan Henk, Human Security: Relevance and Implications. www.carlisle.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/05summer/henk.pdf

⁴⁷ Dan Henk, Human Security: Relevance and Implications. www.carlisle.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/05summer/henk.pdf

Thinker	Referent Object	Key Values	Nature of Threats	Agents
Kofi Annan	Individual	Economic development, social justice, environmental protection, dmocratization, disarmament, and respect for human rights and the rule of law”	Internal violence, nuclear weapons, mass destruction, repression, “gross abuses of human rights, the large-scale displacement of civilian populations, international terrorism, the AIDS pandemic, drug and arms trafficking and environmental disasters”	States, individual, nature, environment
Sadako Ogata	Individual	1. “Capacity of states and citizens to prevent and resolve conflicts through peaceful and non-violent means and, after the conflict is over, the ability to effectively carry out reconciliation efforts.” 2. “People should enjoy without discrimination all rights and obligations – including human, political, social, economic and cultural rights – that belonging to a State implies.” 3. “Social inclusion – or having equal access to the political, social and economic policy making processes, as well as to draw equal benefits from them.” 4. “Establishment of rule of law and the independence of the justice system.	Political Military Social Economic Environmental Landmines Proliferation of Small Arms Drug Trafficking Spread of HIV	Nature, environment, states, individuals, rebels, international criminals
Ramesh Thakur, United Nations University Includes structural violence	Community	Human security refers to the quality of life of the people of a society or polity” “The core element of human security is human rights.”	Anything that degrades one’s “quality of life”. Examples: demographic pressures, diminished access to or stock of resources...”	State, individuals, societal groups (dominant social structure), administrative, judicial, police, paramilitary and military structures, “nature”, environment, migration, globalization, institutional structures, international crime

UNDP	Individual	Freedom from fear, Freedom from want.	<p>Seven categories--</p> <p>Economic: poverty, homelessness</p> <p>Food: hunger</p> <p>Health: inadequate health care, diseases</p> <p>Environment: degradation, pollution, natural disasters</p> <p>Personal: physical violence, crime, traffic accidents</p> <p>Community: oppression by, disintegration of, discrimination</p> <p>Political: repression, torture, disappearance, human rights violations</p>	State, individuals, nature, societal groups
Government of Canada	Individual	Freedom from “pervasive threats to people’s rights, their safety or their lives	<p>Trafficking in Small arms, income gap between rich and poor countries, internal conflict, state failure, transnational crime, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, religious and ethnic discord, environmental degradation, population growth, ethnic conflict and migration, state repression, the widespread use of anti-personnel landmines, child abuse, economic underdevelopment, and a unstable, protectionist international trading system, violent crime, drug trade, terrorism, etc.</p> <p>Foreign policy emphasis is placed on personal, political and community based violence.</p>	States, rebels, drug and weapons traffickers, individuals
Human Security	Individuals	Freedom from pervasive threats to safety and human rights.	addresses non-traditional threats to people's security related	States, rebels

Network			to economic, food, health, and environmental factors as well as issues such as drugs, terrorism, organized crime, landmines and gender-based violence.”	
Government of Japan	Individual	Human Dignity Includes freedom from fear and freedom from want. The two values are considered to be equal.	All threats to human lives, livelihoods and dignity including poverty, environmental degradation, illicit drugs, transnational organized crime, infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS, the outflow of refugees and antipersonnel land mines	Governments, rebels, drug and weapons traffickers, individuals
Kanti Bajpai	Individual	Individual safety and freedom	Direct violence: violent death/disablement, dehumanization, drugs, discrimination and domination, international disputes, most destructive weapons. Indirect violence: deprivation, disease, natural and man-made disasters, underdevelopment, population displacement, environmental degradation ³	States, non-state actors Structural sources – from relations of power at various levels – from the family upwards to the global economy.

Source: www.gdrc.org/sustdev/husec/Comparisons.pdf

The above comparison gives a clear picture that there is no universally applicable definition to human security. But it is primarily an analytical tool that focuses on ensuring security to individual not for the state. Exploring options aimed at mitigating threats to the insecurity of individual thus becomes a central theme of policy recommendations and actions⁴⁸. To sum up we can broadly agree with UNDP that Human Security is

⁴⁸ Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu, The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports, UNDP, May 2006, hdr.undp.org/docs/nhdr/thematic_reviews/Human_Security_Guidance_Note.Pdf

- People centric
- Multidimensional
- Interconnected
- Universal

In principle human security reflects the aggregate gains after the mitigation of these threats. So it is advisable for each country to measure the pervasive threats and prepare policy in order to mitigate it. Here certain factors which are unique to a particular country, region or culture should be given importance rather accepting universal standards. For example realizing human security in Post war Iraq should include process towards democratization, ethnic cohesion, control of transnational terrorism, gender security etc. In Ethiopia and Sudan priority should be given to securing basic needs of the people, protection from regional conflicts public health and civil unrest.

SECTION FOUR

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE SECURITY IN PRACTICE

Human security is a new idea that has been a long time in the making and yet it remains a chronically underdeveloped concept. In fact the idea that human beings are important to security is an idea that is already reflected in some foreign policies, and a careful examination of the practice of certain policies can possibly offer useful insight into the resolution of certain conceptual problems. In this context we will use the policies of the Canada, Norway and Japan as positive approach to human security and US role in the Middle East as negative definitions of human security to see what theory can learn from practice.⁴⁹

Positive Human Security: Canada, Japan and Norway

The operationalization of human security by committed institutions in a way that is relevant to their contexts has naturally given rise to implementation of human security. For example Canada, Norway,⁵⁰ and Japan have incorporated human security into their foreign policy frameworks. Positive human security implies making foreign and domestic policies with an emphasis on human being and his safety rather than territorial security. **Canada** played significant role in operationalizing human security. Canada developed its foreign policy with a firm foundation on peace, development and human security. It was in the Ottawa Convention that the landmines treaty was signed – something that Lloyd Axworthy, one of the energies behind Canada’s human security focus, described as the “first major accomplishment” of the human security

⁴⁹ www.peacecenter.sciences-po.fr/journal/issue2pdf/jensen_fairlie

⁵⁰ A Conceptual framework of human security, Sabina Alkire, 2003. p.15
<http://www.crise.ox.ac.uk/pubs/workingpaper2.pdf>

agenda⁵¹. Since 2001, Canada started including special fund allocation for human security measures in its budget. Canadian conception of security basically revolves round freedom from fear and thus its efforts were mainly focused on preventing conflicts public safety and peace building operations. Canadian agenda of human security include the following:

- Protection of civilians
- Conflict prevention
- Peace operations
- Governance and accountability
- Public Safety

Canada has a special human security programme to achieve these aims. Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada (DFAIT) is working with international partners to improve the legal and physical protection of civilian populations, with particular attention to conflict prevention, the “responsibility to protect”, the safety of aid workers, the promotion of international humanitarian, human rights and refugee law, children and armed conflict, safe and unimpeded humanitarian access, landmines, internally displaced persons, refugee camp security, and the humanitarian impact of sanctions⁵². Canada joined other UN Member States in adopting the landmark resolution 57/337 (2003), which committed states to working towards the prevention of armed conflict, and laid out the roles of states, UN agencies, civil society, and the private sector in preventing armed conflict. Canada was actively involved in contributing to the negotiations, serving as one of ten countries to facilitate the process. In addition to supporting key UN resolutions on conflict prevention, Canada supports the Peace building Commission, created in 2005, which will marshal resources at the disposal of the international community to advise and propose integrated strategies for peace building⁵³. Canada’s role in peace operations has evolved over the last 50 years to meet new international challenges. As well as their ongoing participation in United Nations (UN)-led missions, Canada is increasingly playing an active role in regional or coalition missions that are mandated by the UN. Presently, Canada supports and participates in peace operations led by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the European Union (EU) and the African Union (AU).⁵⁴ More over Canada initiated Human Security Network to discuss and intervene the burning issues related to pervasive threats and fear.

Another country which gives foremost importance to human security centric governance is **Japan**. Japan promotes diplomacy with an emphasis on the perspective of “human security.” With the aim of establishing the concept of “human security” as a complement to conventional state security, Japan is now working to implement efforts based on the recommendations of the final report of the Commission on Human Security, which was released in May 2003⁵⁵. Since its establishment in the UN Secretariat by contributions

⁵¹ A Conceptual framework of human security, Sabina Alkire, 2003. p.20
<http://www.crise.ox.ac.uk/pubs/workingpaper2.pdf>

⁵² <http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/library/conflictprevention-en.asp>

⁵³ <http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/library/conflictprevention-en.asp>

⁵⁴ <http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/library/conflictprevention-en.asp>

⁵⁵ www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/2006/12.pdf

from the Japanese government in 1999, the Trust Fund for Human Security has provided funds for the aid projects of UN-related agencies. To date, Japan has contributed a cumulative total amount of approximately 29 billion yen to this fund. Following the revisions to the fund's guidelines conducted in January 2005, the mainstream projects include: projects considering a wider range of interconnected regions and areas with the participation of multiple international organizations and NGOs; and projects that intend to integrate humanitarian and development assistance through strengthening people's capacities to implement seamless assistance in the transitional period from conflict to peace. Japan will cooperate with related UN organizations and continue to proactively support such projects⁵⁶. The main inspiration and source of funding behind UN Trust Fund for Human Security comes from Japan. Under the trust fund Japan initiated several projects including the following:

1. **Non formal basic education and vocational skill training for children and youth at risk in Cambodia.** This project aimed at building capacity of street children and youth who have been excluded from the formal education system through non-formal education and vocational training.
2. **Improving Human Security through Provision of Drinking Water Complying with the WHO Recommendation for Arsenic-Bangladesh.** The project aims at raising awareness of arsenic related health hazards, providing medical support, and installing arsenic removal units in pilot communities. The project increased awareness among the targeted people and communities regarding risk of arsenic through sensitization activities and improved the access to arsenic safe water by installation of arsenic removal units.
3. **Assistance for Supporting Chernobyl-Affected Individuals in Ukraine.** After the nuclear accident of Chernobyl in 1986, residents in the affected areas continue to suffer from poor health and poverty. The programme aims at supporting social, economic and ecological recovery and development through improving self-governance by community development activities, supporting policy makers and improving the health of those living in the affected areas in Ukraine. To improve local self governance through the promotion of participatory community development, more than 200 community organizations have been formed and each organization establishes a local development plan⁵⁷.
4. **Strengthening human security through sustainable human development in Northwestern Tanzania.** This project focuses on assisting refugees from neighbouring countries and host communities in Northwestern Tanzania to address the various threats towards people in the targeted communities, such as weak local governance, illicit small arms and light weapons, food insecurity, economic uncertainty and the danger of HIV/ AIDS infection. Moreover, the project aims at capacity building through providing non-formal education to marginalized youth. In January 2007, a big public arms destruction event took place in Kigoma, Northwestern Tanzania. 2000 guns were collected to burn in

⁵⁶ www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/2006/12.pdf

⁵⁷ www.mofa.go.jp/

public and spectators from the regional government, police, local communities and school children were gathered to see the event.⁵⁸

Norway's approach to human security is another example of positive human security. Norway is active partner of human security network. Since 1990 Norway played vital role in prevention of threats and ensuring peace and reconciliation. Norway has supported peace efforts in Srilanka, Philippines and Indonesia. In Africa it has involved in Poverty eradication and ethnic cohesion in Ethiopia, Eritrea and Somalia. Moreover it played well known role in Middle East peace process through the Oslo Channel and still playing a role in the region now as Chair of AHLC, the donor group for Palestinians which bring together major donors⁵⁹. Norway's participation in peace process takes many forms. It ranges from official facilitation of negotiations as in Sri Lanka and Phillipines, to sponsoring a back channel for secret negotiations as in Middle East, to being part of an international coalition, as in Ethiopia, Somalia and Colombia, and to humanitarian assistance in Sudan⁶⁰.

To sum up Canada, Japan and Norway tried to reflect human security not only as a policy guideline but as a main tool to formulate and implement domestic as well as foreign policy. In these countries it is evident that both foreign and domestic policies are well integrated and reinforce each other to secure domestic as well as international human security.

Negative Human Security

Negative human security has the following implications:

1. the failure of incorporating human security concerns in policy making
2. any policy which creates a condition of pervasive threats
3. any policy impact which lead to human insecurity or survival.

Thus negative human security includes military invasion, human rights violation, environmental degradation, state sponsored terrorism, state-drug mafia nexus, state funding for ethnic violence and military aid to developing countries. For example if military is engaged only in peace keeping and humanitarian intervention, we can call it positive security. At the same time when military supports arms race and conflict, it becomes negative security. There are number of examples for negative human security. US foreign policy, even though it proclaims commitments to world peace and security, stands as an example of negative human security. US foreign policy still gives paramount importance to traditional state centric concept of human security and always tried to protect the interest of narrow domestic interest and hegemony while intervening in peace process. US attitude to war victims especially from Middle East is vehemently

⁵⁸ www.mofa.go.jp/

⁵⁹ <http://www.eu-norway.org/news/newsarchives/peacefacilitator.htm>

⁶⁰ <http://www.eu-norway.org/news/newsarchives/peacefacilitator.htm>

criticized by Amnesty International. Amnesty International and others have reported that the United States is believed to have transferred, "rendered" or "disappeared" more than one hundred detainees in the war on terror to countries that the report cites for torture or ill-treatment of detainees. Dozens are still missing today, and may be at risk of torture. Amnesty International's analysis reveals that the United States, in the context of the war on terror, has been silent on human rights abuses committed by many of its new-found friends. In the Balochistan province of Pakistan, for example, Amnesty International has documented torture, possible extrajudicial executions and other unlawful killings and disappearances. In January, Amnesty International issued an urgent action on behalf of Baloch political leader Akhtar Mengal, currently being held incommunicado in solitary confinement in Karachi without access to needed medical care. The administration has thus far failed to take any effective public action on his case. Amnesty International's analysis reveals that the United States, in the context of the war on terror, has been silent on human rights abuses committed by many of its new-found friends. The administration has thus far failed to take any effective public action on his case⁶¹. In Iraq also US army was responsible for human rights violation and abuse of Iraqi people. US Policy towards nuclear non proliferation is also far from rational analysis of existing situations and focuses on securing its own hegemony rather than the survival of humanity. In his article titled *International Terrorism: Image and Reality*, Noam Chomsky, world famous linguist and critique, argues:

“The US had forged new paths in international terrorism. Some states employ individual terrorists and criminals to carry out violent acts abroad. But the US went further, not only constructing a semi-private international terrorist network but also an array of client and mercenary states -- Taiwan, South Korea, Israel, Saudi Arabia, and others -- to finance and implement its terrorist operations. This advance in international terrorism was revealed during the period of maximal anguish over the plague, but did not enter into the discussion and debate”⁶².

There is evidence that the Bush Administration, in liaison with Israel and NATO, is planning the launching of a nuclear war against Iran, ironically, in retaliation for Tehran's nuclear weapons program. The US-Israeli military operation is said to be in "an advanced state of readiness. If such a plan were to be launched, the war would escalate and eventually engulf the entire Middle-East Central Asian region. The war could extend beyond the region, as some analysts have suggested, ultimately leading into a World War III scenario. The US-led naval deployment (involving a massive deployment of military hardware) is taking place in two distinct theaters: the Persian Gulf and the Eastern Mediterranean. The militarization of the Eastern Mediterranean is broadly under the jurisdiction of NATO in liaison with Israel. Directed against Syria, it is conducted under the façade of a UN "peace-keeping" mission. In this context, the Israeli led war on

⁶¹ <http://www.amnestyusa.org/regions/americas/document.do?id>

⁶² <http://www.chomsky.info/articles/199112--02.htm>

Lebanon, which was conducive to countless atrocities and the destruction of an entire country, must be viewed as a stage of the broader US sponsored military road-map.⁶³

Thus international studies and evidence clearly shows that US foreign policy in its spirit is not yet ready to imbibe human security centric governance at the international level. So US policy can not be taken as positive as it radiates negative signals to global peace keeping and disarmament efforts.

CONCLUSION

The above debate on theoretical as well as applied dimensions of human security makes it clear that the concept is still evolving and yet to develop as a full fledged policy option for most of the countries. There exist structural, cultural and regional constraints for several countries to incorporate human security framework in policy process. Some countries complain that human security does not have specific boundaries; therefore it is difficult to assess risks to security. The crucial question here is how to frame human security to suit the interest of state, non state actors, civil society and individual. The approach has immense potential to mitigate global poverty, environmental hazards, check the spread of diseases and engage in peace building measures. For the very reason that human security framework presents a significant departure from previous security framework, major gains could be realized through policy initiatives. The methodology makes it possible to achieve multiple objectives through holistic engagements of one policy area. In present era of globalization, multinational trade and integration, attaining human security requires combined effort of government, civil society organizations, corporate and international institutions. As Albert Einstein Predicted years ago, *“We shall require a substantially new manner of thinking if mankind is to survive.”*⁶⁴

REFERENCE

1. Alvin Toffler and Heidi Toffler, Revolutionary Wealth, New York, 2006.
2. Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu, The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports, UNDP, May 2006. [hdr.undp.org/docs/nhdr/thematic_reviews/Human_Security_Guidance_Note.Pdf]

⁶³ Michel Chossudovsky, The Criminalization of US Foreign Policy, 2007
<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context>

⁶⁴ Human Development Report, 1994.

3. Kanti Bajpai, Human Security: Concept and Measurement, Kroc Institute Occasional papers, 19:OP:1 kroc.nd.edu/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF
4. <http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>
5. **Dr Neville Yeomans**, On Global Reform and International Normative Model Areas (Inma)feb 2007.
6. <http://www.laceweb.org.au/gri.htm>
7. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Club_of_Rome
8. http://www.bwbs.de/bwbs_biografie/North-South_Report_B415.html
9. http://www.brandt21forum.info/Bio_Palme.htm
10. <http://www-ee.stanford.edu/~hellman/Breakthrough/book/chapters/nitkin.html>
11. <http://disarm.igc.org/T211097humandev.html>
12. Gary King and Christopher Murray, Rethinking Human Security, *Political Science Quarterly*, Volume 116, Number 4 2001-02.
13. Dan Henk, Human Security: Relevance and Implications.
www.carlisle.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/05summer/henk.pdf
14. UNDP, Redefining Security, 1994, page.229.[
http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/1994/en/pdf/hdr_1994_ch2.pdf
15. A Perspective on Human Security: Chairman's Summary," Lysoen, Norway, 20 May 1999, at website
16. <http://www.dfait.maeci.gc.ca/foreignp/HumanSecurity/secur-e.htm>,
17. A Conceptual framework of human security, Sabina Alkire, 2003. p.15
<http://www.crise.ox.ac.uk/pubs/workingpaper2.pdf>
18. Amartya Sen, Why Human Security, 2000.
19. www.humansecurity-chs.org/activities/outreach/Sen2000.pdf
20. www.gdrc.org/sustdev/husec/Comparisons.pdf
21. www.peacecenter.sciences-po.fr/journal/issue2pdf/jensen_fairlie
22. <http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/library/conflictprevention-en.asp>
23. <http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/library/conflictprevention-en.asp>

24. www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/2006/12.pdf
25. <http://www.eu-norway.org/news/newsarchives/peacefacilitator.htm>
26. <http://www.amnestyusa.org/regions/americas/document.do?id>
27. <http://www.chomsky.info/articles/199112--02.htm>
28. Michel Chossudovsky, The Criminalization of US Foreign Policy, 2007
<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context>

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.