Chapter-2
Theoretical Perspective on Human Security

Background

Since its unequivocal exposition in the last decade of the twentieth century, human security has virtually transfigured the entire debate on security in its good turn. This new perspective on security symbolises the changing landscape of the contemporary international security realities and offers a broad and comprehensive model to comprehend them. Human security, however, represents an effort to reconceptualise security in a fundamental manner. It is primarily an "analytical tool" which focuses on ensuring security for the *individual*, not the *state*.[1] The primary goal behind the concept of human security, therefore, is the need to restore the security of people.[2] Moreover, it refers to the premise that the prime objective of security is the safety and wellbeing of individual. According to Ramesh Thakur, human security is both "human centred" and "security oriented". It is human centred in the sense that it focuses on people both as individual and as group of individuals or communities; and it is security oriented because its emphasis is on freedom from fear.[3]

Human security goes beyond conventional paradigm of security in more ways than one.[4] For conventional paradigm, security is regarded as the protection of state's vital interests and core values from external threats. Whereas human security describes security as individual's personal protection and preservation, which materialises not just from safeguarding of the state as a political unit, but also from the protection against structural violence that often accompanies many aspects of non-territorial threats. Evidently, this perspective on security widens and deepens the instruments and threats to security.[5] In attempts to deepening, as P.H. Liotta and Taylor Owen quoting Emma Rothschild drew: "Security being brought down to the individual,

---

[1] Richard Jolly and D.B. Ray, "The Human Security Framework and Human Development Reports", *NHDR Occassional Report 5*, May 2006, UNDP, p. 5.

[2] Yukiko Nishikawa, "Human Security in South East Asia: Viable Solution or Empty Slogan?", *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 40, No. 2, 2009, p. 215.

[3] Ramesh Thakur, "A Political World View", *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 35, No. 3, 2004, p. 348.

[4] As described in the first chapter, conventional paradigm of security, Michael Sheehan holds, "represents Western metaphysics, which has constructed a state-based meaning of security that is based upon the meaning of power and violence." Contrary to this, non-conventional paradigm of security goes beyond statist approach to security (An elaborate discussion is offered in this particular chapter). Michael Sheehan, *International Security: An Analytical Survey* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005), p. 7.

[5] The concept of human security borrowed the architecture of critical security studies, which employs aspects of broadening and deepening the security agenda. Broadening the concept means inclusion of a wider range of potential threats, beginning from economic and environmental issues, and ending with human rights and migration. Deepening the agenda of security studies means moving either down to the level of individual or up to the level of international or global security, with regional and societal security as possible intermediate points.

brought up to the international system or supranational physical environment."[6] In attempt to broaden, what they argue, "focus shifted from military to include the environment, society, and economy, and finally, diffused in all directions to include local governments, international agreements, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), public opinion, forces of nature, and the financial market as sources of responsibility."[7] And, therefore, this, according to Sabina Alkaire, accounts for necessary and sufficient conditions of security: security from external threats, political repression, ethnic violence, economic and social crises, and environmental degradation.[8] In essence as said above, human security is about the protection of vital core of human lives. Thus, human security encompasses two elementary components: *freedom from fear* and *freedom from want*. Robert Owen, in a terse examination of the concept, provides an epigrammatic definition of human security as: "human security is the protection of the vital core of all human lives from critical and pervasive threats that emanate from both direct as well as structal violence."[9]

But the big question, however, that hounds the academicians and policy analysts whether it can be expressed on the line of realist exposition of security;[10] can a theoretical perspective on the concept be given; can this be a real security index for societies developing or developed, militarily potent or frail. This chapter contemplates over these issues. Keeping these issues in view, the central aim of this chapter is to examine the theoretical aspects of human security. For that, first of all a general understanding of the concept in terms of definitions has been offered. In latter parts, the chapter analyses various approaches to the concept which range from academic level, international organisation, and international commission to the state level approaches. The chapter further goes into the salient features of human security, synthesises the diverse approaches and presents critical evaluation and then comes out with its own framework on human security. Finally, the chapter evaluates the framework in the context of Pakistan.

---

[6] P. H. Liotta and Taylor Owen, "Why Human Security", *The Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations,* Winter/Spring 2006, p. 39.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Sabina Alkire, "A Conceptual Framework for Human Security", *CRISE Working Paper 2,* Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford, 2003, [Online: Web] Accessed on July 15, 2006, URL: http://www.crise.ox.ac.uk/pubs/workingpaper2.pdf, p. 7.

[9] Taylor Owen, "Challenges and Opportunities for Defining and Measuring Human Security", *Disarmament Forum,* Vol. 3, p. 15 (Emphasis added).

[10] For example, Ronald Paris raised question such as whether human security can be made a tractable theory on security as realists/neorealist did. See, Ronald Paris, "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?, *International Security,* Vol. 26, No. 2, Fall 2001, pp. 87-102.

Perspective on the Concept

To understand how the idea of human security has been shaped in ensuing years, one needs to go through its articulation at both academic and policy levels. This has been expressed in various ways. Hans Gunter Brauch, bearing in mind the contentious positions of scholars on the concept writes as:

> While many Hobbesian pessimists, neo or structural realists and the strategic studies community (Paris 2001), as well as state-centred peace researchers (Buzan 2000, 2002; Müller 2002) have rejected the human security concept, authors with Grotian or Kantian as well as liberal and constructivist perspectives and from peace research have rallied behind this concept. Some proponents are critical of a wide concept as 'freedom from want' (Krause 2004; Mack 2004) and have argued instead for "pragmatism, conceptual clarity, and analytic rigor" (Owen 2004: 375). Many authors of a forum in Security Dialogue (2004) supported a wide agenda that includes 'freedom from fear' (violence) and 'freedom from want'.[11]

Although how varied in their scope and parameter, to comprehend the concept of human security definitions given by numerous scholars and policy analysts constitute a vital step. Yet considering the fact, as Peter Uvin commented: "Defining human security clearly or consensually is impossible. It shares this essentially unfixable quality with many of the other key concepts in both personal and public life. However, it is more of a process definition, focusing on the sorts of mental and policy changes that are required, leaving open what exactly the specific aim is at any given point in time."[12] Nonetheless, under various explanations, the concept of human security has been addressed within the rubric of two fundamental components: *freedom from fear* and *freedom from want*.[13] But recently, growing activism towards it at global level, sharing with the UN has given rise to the new momentum, and introduced an additional component: *freedom from hazard impacts*. The UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, deserves the credit of emphasising this particular aspect.[14] It was invoked at the U.N. Millennium Meeting in

---

[11] Hans Gunter Brauch, "Threats, Challenges, Vulnerabilities and Risks in Environmental and Human Security", *Publication Series of UNU-EHS, No 1/2005*, United Nations University-Institute for Environment and Human Security (UNU-EHS), Bonn (Germany), 2005, p. 23.

[12] Peter Uvin, "A Field of Overlap and Interaction", *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 35, No. 3, September 2004, p. 352.

[13] Sabina Alkire, "The Vital Core that Must be Treated with the Same Gravitas as Traditional Security Threats", *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 35, No. 3, September 2004, p. 360.

[14] At the U.N. Millennium Meeting in April 2000, Annan explicitly identified three specific issues: freedom from want, freedom from fear, and freedom of future generations to sustain their lives on this planet. U. N. Secretary-General gave this statement to the General Assembly at the U.N. Millennium Meeting, 3rd April 2000. Cited in Mely Caballero-Anthony, "Human Security and Comprehensive Security in ASEAN", *The Indonesian Quarterly*, Vol. xxviii, No.4, 2000, p. 412.

April 2000, but the praise for vigorous popularisation of this specific dimension goes to United Nations University Institute for Environment and Human Security.[15]

However, the concept was, for the first time, stipulated in 1994 *Human Development Report,* an annual publication of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).[16] Since then, as Sabina Alkaire estimates that more than twenty-five definitions of human security are in circulation at academic and policy levels.[17] She mapped the entire set of definitions and came out with the conclusion at the Colloquium held at PRIO as:

> Some focus mainly on threats from wars and internal conflicts, sometimes including a focus on criminal and domestic violence; others focus on threats from preventable disease, economic hardship, or financial crisis – the threats of poverty and want; while a third group considers both types of threats – often described as 'fear' and 'want' ... as well as the processes by which people protect themselves and are protected. ... Human security shifts the focus away from the protection of the state borders to the protection of individual lives within them. Thus, the key struggle for human security is to identify priority issues without becoming dissipated.[18]

Today the most widely cited definition of human security is given by the United Nations Development Report 1994. According to the report, "human security implies for safety from chronic threats such as hunger, disease and repression. It also means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life – whether in homes, in job or in communities."[19] *Human Security Report (*2005), published by British Columbia University, Canada, defines human security as the protection of communities and individuals from internal violence.[20] While, Commission on Human Security (2003) headed by Sadako Ogata and Amartya Sen defines human security as "the protection of vital core of all human lives in a way that enhance human freedoms and human fulfillment. It means protecting fundamental freedoms that are the

[15] United Nations University, Institute for Environment and Human Security (UNU-EHS), established in December 2003, is part of the United Nations University (UNU) system, a worldwide network of Research and Training Institutes. Its mission is to advance human security through knowledge-based approaches to reducing vulnerability and environmental risks. A major conceptual and policy task for UNU-EHS is to develop a third pillar of the human security concept as 'freedom from hazard impact' and to contribute to the implementation of this goal in international, regional and local efforts contributing to capacity-building for early warning, developing vulnerability indicators and vulnerability mapping to reduce the fatalities as well as disaster frequency and magnitude in flood-prone and highly vulnerable urban areas primarily in developing countries. Detail of this facet of human security is given in Hans Gunter Brauch, n. 11, pp. 24-25.

[16] United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 1994* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994)

[17] Sabina Alkire, "Concepts of Human Security", in Lincoln Chen, et.al., (eds.), Human Insecurity in Global World (New Delhi: Viva Books Private Ltd, 2005), p. 15.

[18] Alkire's view got published in *Security Dialague*, Sepember 2004 Issue, See: Alkire, n. 13, p. 360.

[19] UNDP, n. 16, p. 24.

[20] Human Security Centre, *Human Security Report* 2005, British Columbia University, Canada [Online: web] Accessed 10 Nov. 2006 URL: http://www.humansecurityreport.info/HSR 2005. p. 2.

essence of life and protecting people from critical (severe) and pervasive (widespread) threats and situations."[21]

For scholars like George Maclean, "human security recognises that an individual's personal protection and preservation comes not just from the safeguarding of the state as a political unit, but also from access to individual welfare and quality of life."[22] Human security also denotes "protection from the structural violence that often accompanies many aspects of non-territorial security, such as violence emanating from environmental scarcity, or mass migration", writes Maclean.[23]

Anne Hammerstad defines human security as "attaining the social, environmental and economic conditions conducive to a life in freedom and dignity for the individual."[24] While Kofi Annan describes it as more than the absence of violent conflict that encompasses human rights, good governance, access to education and health care and ensuring that each individual has opportunities and choices to fulfill his or her potential.[25] In the words of Jennifer Leaning, "human security is an underlying condition for sustainable human development. It results from the social, psychological, economic and political aspects of life."[26] In the times of acute crisis or chronic deprivation, Leaning wrote, "it seeks to protect the survival of individuals. It supports individual and group capacities to attain minimally adequate standard of living, and promote constructive group attachment and continuity through time."[27] Sadako Ogata in her succinct examination of the concept writes that human security comprises several key elements:

(i) The possibility for all citizens to live in peace and security in their own borders. This implies the capacity of states and citizens to prevent and resolve conflicts through peaceful and nonviolent means and, after the conflict is over, the ability to carry out reconciliation efforts. (ii) People should enjoy without discrimination all rights and obligations – including human, political social, economic and cultural rights. (iii) Social inclusion – or having equal access to the political, social and economic policy making processes, as well as to draw equal benefits from them. (iv) Finally, the establishment of

---

[21] Commission on Human Security 2003, *Human Security Now* [Online: web] Accessed on November 4, 2006, URL: http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/final report), p. 4.

[22] George Maclean, "The Changing Concept of Human Security: Coordinating National and Multilateral Responses", [Online: web] Accessed on January 10, 2004, URL: http://www.unac.org/canada/security/maclean. html.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Anne Hammerstad, "Whose Security?", *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 31, No. 4, 2000, p. 395.

[25] Kofi Annan, "Secretary-General Salutes International Workshop on Human Security in Mongolia", Two-Day Session in Ulaanbaatar, [Online: web] Accessed on January 10, 2004, URL: http://www.un.org/news/press/docs/2000.

[26] Jennifer Leaning, "Human Security in Crisis and Transition: A Background Document of Definition and Application", Accessed on January 10, 2004, URL: http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/hper/events/hsworkshop/list_definitions.pdf, p. 2.

[27] Ibid.

rule of law and the independence of the justice system. Each individual in a society should have the same rights and obligations and be subject to the same set of rules.[28]

According to Kanti Bajpai, "human security relates to the protection of the individual's personal safety and freedom from direct and indirect threats of violence. The promotion of human development and good governance, and, when necessary, the collective use of sanctions and force are central to managing human security. States, international organisations, non-governmental organisations, and other groups in civil society in combination are vital to the prospects of human security."[29]

A similar idea of human security has been given by Caroline Thomas. Thomas maintains: "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 realised. Therefore, human security is indivisible; it cannot be pursued by or for one group at the expense of another."[30] According to Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy, "human security as an analytical tool provides an effective means for preventing the degradation of people's well being and dignity as well as diminishing the consequences of insecurities, be they man-made conflicts or natural hazards."[31]

The Government of Canada views human security as freedom from pervasive threats to people's rights, safety or lives.[32] Whilst Government of Japan defines it as "the preservation and protection of the life and dignity of individual human beings that can only be ensured only when the individual is confident of a life free of fear and free of want".[33] Finally, for Ginkel and Newman, "human security is an integrated, sustainable, comprehensive security from fear, conflict, ignorance, poverty, social and cultural deprivation.[34] Whichever ways the scholars and policy analysts define the concept, it is absolutely clear that the concept of human security is

[28] Sogato Ogata, "From State Security to Human Security", Brown University, Ogden Lecture, 26 May, 2002, [Online: web] Accessed on July 02, 2007, URL: http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/activities/outreach/ogata_ogden.pdf.
[29] Kanti Bajpai, "The Idea of Human Security", International Studies, Vol. 40, No. 3, 2003, p. 224.
[30] Caroline Thomas, et.al., (eds.), Globalization, Human Security, and the African Experience (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1999), p. 3.
[31] Shahrbanou Tadjbakhsh and Anuradha M. Chenoy, Human Security: Concepts and Implications (London: Routledge, 2007), p. 71.
[32] Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), "Freedom from Fear: Canada's Foreign Policy for Human Security", Government of Canada, [Online: Web] Accessed on June 7, 2006, URL: http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca, p. 2.
[33] Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), "Efforts towards the Realisation of a Better Global Society", Diplomatic Bluebook 1999, Government of Japan, [Online: Web] Accessed on July 17, 2006, URL: http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/1999/II-3-a.html.
[34] Hans Van Ginkel and Edward Newman, "In Quest of Human Security", Japan Review of International Affairs, Vol.14, No.1, 2000, p.79.

primarily concerned with the individuals; means the primary unit of analysis is the individual, who is meant to live in freedom from fear and freedom from want.

Approaches to Human Security:

As said above human security has been paid serious attention over the last one decade or so. Development agencies, international commissions, policy analysts and leading scholars of the world have attempted to fix the approach to deal with the concept in their own ways. Here, the division of approaches rests upon a simple criterion; in which way the development agencies, governments, academicians or independent commissions inquire the concept. From this point of view, approaches can be classified into four prominent categories. These are as follows:

- UNDP approach (as articulated in *Human Development Report1994* and other reports under the aegis of U.N.O.);

- The government level approach (as the policy programmes of Canada, Norway and Japan);

- Independent commission approach (articulated in *Human Security Now*, 2003, prepared by Commission on Human Security, *The Responsibility to Protect*, 2001 by ICISS and *Human Security Report*, 2005 prepared by British Columbia University).

- Academic level approach as expressed in various scholarly expositions.

To analyse these approaches usually a set of questions has been employed. These are: security for whom?; security of which values?; security from what threats?; and security by what means?[35] This entails that for all approaches first of all it is important to identify the security referent (s)-i.e., who is to be secured. And then to identify the scope or domain i.e., what values associated with the referent must be protected and secured; what are the types of threats, e.g., political, military, economic, socio-cultural, environmental; and understanding the nature of security problem. And, finally to identify how is security achieved? This schema can be followed in all the four major approaches.

---

[35] This schema is used frequently by many analysts, but this has been employed in great rigour by David Baldwin in his influential article "The Concept of Security," published in *Review of International Studies,* Vol. 23 (1997). For Baldwin it is important to bear in mind that security is an ambiguous concept, though perhaps not an "essentially contested". However, when dealing with the more flexible conceptualisations of national security (as discourse), Baldwin suggests that it might be useful to pose a few of the following questions, in order to pry open the particular meaning of the concept: security for whom? security from what? And how? See: David Baldwin, "The Concept of Security," *Review of International Studies,* Vol. 23, 1997, pp. 5-26.

(i) United Nations Development Programme's Approach: As stated earlier, the first major statement concerning human security appeared in the 1994 *Human Development Report.* Describing its importance Ronal Paris maintains that this work on human security remains the most widely cited and most authoritative formulation of the term.[36] The UNDP's 1994 report argues: "The concept of security has for too long been interpreted narrowly as security of territory from external aggression to global security from the threat of nuclear holocaust.....Forgotten were the legitimate concerns of ordinary people who sought security in their daily lives.....Thus human security is a concern with human life and dignity."[37] Human security is people centred. 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 opportunities, and whether they live in conflict or in peace.[38] What the report further writes – "The concept of security must thus change urgently in two basic ways: from an exclusive stress on territorial security to a much greater stress on people's security; and from security through armaments to security through sustainable human development."[39] Clearly, for the report referent object of human security is the individual.[40]

So far as *security values* of human security is concerned, the report primarily brings into focus the two components: freedom from fear and freedom from want.[41] These two values signify that human security requires safety from chronic threats that endanger the life of individuals. And, it also calls for the protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life – whether in homes, in jobs or in communities. Under these two values the report classifies seven areas to be considered as important ones for human security.[42] These are given as:

- Economic security (e.g., freedom from poverty) ;
- Food security (e.g., access to food) ;
- Health security (e.g., access to health care and protection from diseases) ;
- Environmental security (e.g., protection from such dangers as environmental pollution and depletion) ;
- Personal security (e.g., physical safety from such things as torture, war, criminal attacks, domestic violence drug use, suicide, and even traffic accidents);
- Community security (e.g., survival of traditional cultures and ethnic groups) ; and

---

[36] Ronald Paris, " Human Security : Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?", *International Security,* Vol. 26, No.2, Fall 2001, p. 90.
[37] United Nations Development Programme, n. 16. p. 22.
[38] Bajpai, n. 29, p. 202.
[39] UNDP, n. 16, p. 24.
[40] Bajpai, n. 29, p. 203.
[41] See for example: Bajpai, n. 29; Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy, n. 31.
[42] UNDP, n. 16, pp. 24-33.

- Political security (e.g., enjoyment of civil and political rights, and freedom from political oppression).

The third parameter to evaluating this approach is *security from what threats*. The report primarily emphasises that threats to human security is long, but most can be considered under above mentioned seven categories. According to the report, the nature of threats to human security is both, local as well as global. Threats are more localised in so for as they vary in magnitude and intensity for different societies or regions of the world. Some threats to human security are global in nature because of the reason that they rapidly spill beyond national frontiers and leave their widespread impact at global level. The localised threats with respect to the seven categories can be mentioned as:

- Threats to economic security emanate from the lack of productive and remunerative employment; precarious employment; and economic safety nets.
- Threats to food security arise due to the absence of access to food. This, in turn, results from various other reasons such as: inability to produce food grains; lack of public distribution system; and absence of access to assets, work and assured income.
- Threats to health security stem from infectious and parasitic diseases, diseases of the circulatory system, and lack of access to the health care.
- Threats to environmental security come out of deforestation; declining water availability ; declining arable land; various kinds of pollution; and natural disasters.
- Threats to personal security arise from violent crime; drug trafficking; and violence and abuse of children and women.
- Threats to community security emanate from collapse of culture; ethnic discrimination and strife; and genocide and ethnic cleansing.
- Threats to political security come out of government repression; systemic human rights violation; and militarisation.[43]

The report further warns that when human security is under threat anywhere, it can affect people everywhere. Famines, ethnic conflicts, social disintegration, terrorism, pollution and drug trafficking can be no longer confined within national borders. And no nation can isolate its life from the rest of the world. For instance, environmental threats: land degradation, deforestation, and the emission of greenhouse gases affect climatic conditions around the globe thus affect people living in any corner of the world.[44] Citing another instance how trade in drugs is a transnational phenomenon the report writes that this phenomenon draws millions of people, both producers and consumers into a cycle of violence and dependency impacts the masses all over the world.[45]

---

[43] Ibid, pp. 25-35.
[44] Bajpai, n. 29, p. 204.
[45] UNDP, n. 16, pp. 25-35.

Dealing with the fourth parameter *security by what means,* the report proposes possible actions towards ensuring human security. Unlike the state security, which rests upon balance of power, alliance system, it calls for enhancement of people's *capabilities* and *opportunities* through governmental policy measures. "Governments should also ensure that people enjoy basic human rights and have political choices." It prescribes "to review and redesign to prepare those institutions nationally and internationally fully for doing their part in tackling the urgent challenges of human security all within the framework of the paradigm of longer term sustainable human development."[46]

There is another report under the aegis of United Nations Organisation: The Report of the Secretary General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change entitled *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility* (2004) which goes on the line of UNDP approach.[47] The report continues to explore the linkages between development and security by focusing its debate on the changing nature of threats and challenges and, how a prevention-focused analysis may generate alternative strategies to mitigate insecurity. The report identified and engaged with key issues by developing six clusters of security threats. These included economic and social threats, including poverty, deadly infectious disease and environmental degradation; inter-state conflict; internal conflict, civil war and genocide; weapons of mass destruction; terrorism; and trans-national organised crime.[48] The report states that development has to be the first line of defence for a collective security system that takes prevention seriously. Combating poverty will not only save millions of lives but also strengthen States' capacity to combat terrorism, organized crime and proliferation. Development makes everyone more secure.[49]

(ii) The Government Level Approach: The paradigm shift in security thinking in terms of human security brought forth by UNDP report prompted the states and NGOs, apart from international commissions and academic projects, to carve out the policies compatible with it. Among the most vocal promoters of human security are the governments of Canada, Norway and Japan, who have taken the lead to add the human security into their policy programmes. Canada and Norway and other states have set up the Human Security Network (HSN), also known as the Lysøen Group.[50] Since 1996, Canada has been arguing that contemporary security challenges

[46] Ibid, p. 39.
[47] United Nations, A More Secured World—Our Shared Responsibility: The Report of the Secretary General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, 2004.
[48] Ibid, p. 2.
[49] Ibid, pp. 21-55.
[50] In the Lysøen Declaration (1998), the concept of "human security" appeared in an official agreement, negotiated between Canada and other governments. More importantly, it outlined a "partnership agenda" of nine human security issues for further bilateral collaboration. It was immediately recognized in diplomatic circles in Canada,

have changed fundamentally from those of the past; the decline in wars between states may have made states more secure, but a growing number of transnational threats coupled with dozen of brutal civil wars have made people more insecure.[51]

The policy of the Government of Canada, showing resemblance to the UNDP, argues that human security implies security for the individual. The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) of Canada in its report *Freedom from Fear: Canada's Foreign Policy for Human Security* writes: "Putting people at the centre of security policy enhances national and international security, and promotes human development and well-being."[52]

Elaborating it, Lloyd Axworthy, known as the founding father of making human security as one of the guiding principles of Canada's foreign affairs, observes that "the concept of security makes sense only if it is derived from people's security, this is what Canada's foreign policy means by human security."[53] In this way, from Canadian perspective also *the referent object* of human security is unquestionably the individual.

What is/are the *security value/s* for the Canadian approach of human security? Foreign office of Canada primarily lays emphasis on "freedom from fear." Freedom from fear involves freedom from pervasive threats to people's rights, safety or lives. In its broad terms, however, Canada has identified five basic values for advancing human security. These are: public safety; protection of civilians; conflict prevention; governance and accountability; and peace support operations.[54] "Public safety" refers to safety from the growing cross border threats to the individuals. "Protection of civilians" attributes to reduction in the human costs of armed conflict to protect the individuals from its repercussion. "Conflict prevention" refers to prevention and resolution of violent conflicts. "Governance and accountability" refers to the improvement in the accountability of public and private sector institutions. And, "peace support operations" refers to enhancement in international capacity to rescue the individuals from dangerous zone of conflicts.[55]

Norway, and beyond as a harbinger of a new international agenda. Sixth ministerial meeting of Human Security Network took place 27-29 May 2004 in Bamako, Mali. [Online : Web] Accessed on July 18, 2006, URL: http://www.humansecuritynetwork.org/events-e.php.

[51] However, Canada's Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) began the Human Security Programme to address challenges to human security, in fulfillment of a commitment made by the Government of Canada in 1999. But active perusal of the human security by Canadian government had begun in 1996.

[52] Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, n. 32, p. 2.

[53] Lloyd Axworthy, "Introduction: Human Security and the New Diplomacy: Protecting People, Promoting Peace", in Rob Mc Rae and Don Hubert, (eds.), *Human Security and The New Diplomacy: Protecting People Promoting Peace* (Montreal: Mc Gill Queens University Press, 2001), p. 13.

[54] Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), n. 32, pp. 3-16.

[55] Ibid.

In the light of above stated security values, the threats to human security undertaken by this particular approach, thus, can be explained in the following ways. (i) Threats to public safety arise from the spread of transnational crimes such as: terrorism, the trafficking in illicit drugs, and illicit trade in weapons, money laundering and related organised crimes. (ii) Armed conflicts is another kind of threats that is caused due to the lack of protective measures of civilians. Besides this, DFAIT recognises that spread of landmines and war crimes pose the threats which fall in this particular category. (iii) Civil wars which have resulted from political differences, social tensions give rise to the threats like violent conflicts within society, proliferation of small arms. (iv) The absence of fundamental rights in a society, widespread corruption, inferior security institutions are the threats which emanate from poor governance. (v) Finally, for Canada there is a kind of threats to human security which arise from inability to tackle the coflictual situation by a state in its conflict prone zone.[56]

What would be the proper means to accomplish the ends of human security? Canadian approach to deal with human security devises various ways to accomplish it. First of all it emphasises on "building international expertise and capability to counter the threats to human security." Secondly, it lays emphasis on "strengthening legal norms, increasing international capacity and building political will." Thirdly, it seeks to "foster accountability of public and private sector institutions, with particular emphasis on building an effective International Criminal Court, promoting reform of security institutions, including the military, police and the judiciary." Finally, it draws special emphasis on "bolstering international capacity to undertake peace support operations or in other terms, Canadian approach strongly advocates of humanitarian military interventions."[57]

Apart from these principled goals Canada as a part of the Lyseon Declaration impregnably shows its concerns into other areas such as: anti-personal landmines, small arms, children in armed conflicts, exploitation of children, safety of humanitarian personnel, conflict prevention, international humanitarian and human rights law, international criminal court proceedings, transnational organised crime and recourses for development.[58]

---

[56] Ibid, pp. 5-6.

[57] Ibid. pp. 4-16.

[58] However, anti-personal land mines became the concern of Canada before the Lyseon Declaration. Through Ottawa Convention, Canada sought a major breakthrough in its attempt to check the anti-personal land mines in 1996. As of April 2010, there were 156 States Parties to the Ottawa Treaty or the Mine Ban Treaty, formally the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction treaty. International Compaign to Ban Landmines, [Oneline : Web] Accessed on June 11, 2010, URL: http://www.icbl.org/index.php/icbl/Library/News-Articles.

To meet the human security challenges, Canada has pursued broad based strategies. The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) launched by Canada produced its final report *The Responsibility to Protect* in September 2001 offers a constructive new approach based on the fundamental responsibilities of sovereign states to protect their own civilians.[59] Canada has also established partnerships with international organisations, NGOs and members of the broader policy and research communities. The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Canadian Peace-building Coordinating Committee (CPCC), and the Canadian Consortium on Human Security (CCHS) lend support to DFAIT to advance the agenda of human security.[60]

Japan adopts a slightly different approach to human security than the Canadian one. The Government of Japan's initial activism towards it can be found in the speech of Japanese Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama to the 50th anniversary special session of the UN General Assembly in October 1995. He echoed his voice for human security as a new strategy for the United Nations. He reflected nothing but the keen interest of Japan in the matter of human security.[61]

In Japan's view, human security is a much broader concept. It does not intend to view human security only as freedom from fear. In this sense, Japan sets its agenda similar to the UNDP approach distinct to the Canadian approach.[62] It believes that freedom from want is no less critical than freedom from fear. Justifying its point, the Diplomatic Bluebook 2005 writes: So long as its objectives are to ensure the survival and dignity of individuals as human beings, it is necessary to go beyond thinking of human security solely in terms of protecting human life in conflict situations.[63] Thus human security, for Japan, comprehensively covers all the menaces that threaten human survival, daily life and dignity – for example, environmental degradation, violations of human rights, transnational crime, illicit drugs, refugees, poverty, anti-personal

---

[59] As a full-fledged principle, "the responsibility to protect" first of all appeared in the report produced by International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), constituted by the government of Canada and a group of major foundations. Its composition was announced to the U.N. General Assembly in September 2000 and the final report came into being in December 2001. International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), Responsibility to Protect, [Oneline : Web] Accessed on July 17, 2006, URL: http:// www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/iciss-ciise/pdf/Commission-Report.pdf.

[60] DFAIT, n. 32, pp. 14-16.

[61] Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), "Chapter-3 : Efforts to Tackle Various Global Issues to Promote Human Security", *Diplomatic Bluebook 2005,* Government of Japan, [Oneline: Web] Accessed on January 5, 2007, URL: http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/2005/ch3-c.pdf. pp. 181-196.

[62] Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy, n. 31, pp. 29-30; 34.

[63] *Diplomatic Bluebook 2005,* n. 61, p. 181.

landmines and infectious diseases such as AIDS – and strengthens efforts to confront these threats.[64]

It is to be noted here that the active perusal of this concept by Japan later got manifested in the establishment of the independent Commission on Human security which submitted its report in 2003 which apparently seems to be supportive of its view. Japan's ministry of external affairs in its latest report comes with some instrumental policies that are considered critical for human security in different part of the world. However, its focus remains largely on saving the people from critical dangers to lives.[65] Thus, the referent, security values, security threats and security means are almost similar to that of United Nations Development Programme.

Norway is also a lead state to promote the ideas of human security. Norway along with Canada held a conference in Lysøen in May 1998 that resulted in the "Canada-Norway Partnership for Action: The Lysøen Declaration"[66] The declaration stipulates the shared common values and approaches to foreign policies of the two countries particularly with regard to human security issues. Norway set its objectives through the Declaration. These are: to enhance human security, to promote human rights, to strengthen humanitarian law, to prevent conflicts, and to foster democracy and good governance.[67] The Lysøen declaration, therefore, articulates that "the fundamental values of human security are freedom from fear, freedom from want and equal opportunities but the central theme of human security was freedom from pervasive threats to people's rights, their safety or their lives."[68]

The Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA), however, in the explicit terms emphasises the fact that "human security should not be mixed up with human development. Nor should it be about natural disasters or precarious human conditions such as hunger, disease, and environmental contamination. The key criterion of human security is vulnerability to physical violence during conflict."[69] Sverre Lodgaard, a NIIA scholar, while agreeing with this absolutely clear expression on the subject that sharply contrasts with ambiguously presented definitions muddled in the vast array of threats, has maintained that "human security should be confined to freedom from fear of man-made physical violence."

---

[64] Ibid, pp. 181-196.

[65] See Commission on Human Security's Report, *Human Security Now* [Online: web] Accessed on November 4, 2006, URL: http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/final report.

[66] Michael Small, "The Human Security Network", in Rob Mc Rae and Don Hubert, (eds.), *Human Security and The New Diplomacy: Protecting People Promoting Peace* (Montreal: Mc Gill Queens University Press, 2001), p. 231.

[67] Ibid, p. 232.

[68] Bajpai 2003, n. 29, p. 205.

[69] Amitav Acharya, 'Human Security: East Vs West', *International Journal,* summer 2001, p. 447.

(iii) The Independent Commissions Approach: In fact, the idea of an independent commission for human security was mooted for the first time at the 2000 UN Millennium Summit. But it was launched in January 2001 as the Commission on Human Security. The Commission was an initiative of the Government of Japan with the help of the UN. It worked under the chairmanships of Nobel laureate Amartya Sen and former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Sadako Ogata. The Commission on Human Security submitted its report *Human Security Now* on May 1, 2003 to the UN General Secretary Kofi Annan. The Commission sought to fulfill three objectives: (i) promoting public understanding, engagement and support of human security and its underlying imperatives; (ii) developing the concept of human security as an operational tool for policy formulation and implementation; and (iii) proposing a concrete programme of action to address critical and pervasive threats to human security.[70]

Seeking the response of why do we need of human security instead of state security, the report argues that state security is not necessarily the guarantee of peoples' security. While human security provides an all-encompassing condition in which individual citizens live in freedom, peace and safety and participate fully in the process of governance.[71] They enjoy the protection of fundamental rights, have access to resources and basic necessities of life, including health and education, and inhabit an environment that is not injurious to their health and well-being. However, state security can't be replaced by human security because both are mutually dependent. And, therefore what it is required is to shift the focus from state to the individual.[72] What is meant by human security as per this report? Human security means protecting people from a range of menaces. While presenting the concept, the Commission on Human Security gives a succinct definition. For the Commission, human security is the protection of vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfillment. It means protecting fundamental freedoms that are the essence of life and protecting people from critical (severe) and pervasive (widespread) threats and situations. The report further adds human security means using processes that build on people's strengths and aspirations. It means creating political, social, environmental, economic, military and cultural systems that together give people the building blocks of survival, livelihood and dignity. Human security in its broadest sense embraces, as the report writes, far more than the absence of violent conflict. It encompasses human rights, good governance, access to education and health care and ensuring that each individual has opportunities and choices to fulfill his or her own potential.[73]

---

[70] Commission on Human Security 2003, n. 21, p. 153.
[71] Ibid, p. 3.
[72] Ibid.
[73] Ibid, p. 4.

It is important to notice that the definition given in this report is significant in one crucial respect: it focuses on the vital core of individual's survival that is critical and pervasive. It clearly sets a criterion, as Taylor Owen maintains, to judge the threshold of human security threats. The vital core is what that constitutes a minimum level of survival. While critical and pervasive threats mean threats of sever and immediate effect.[74] There are unlimited number of threats from the definitional parameter of UNDP and some others, but, the Commission's definition takes into account only those which seriously threaten the life of the individuals. Admiring the approach to define human security in a well knit manner, Owen points out that "this definition contrasts sharply from those of earlier ones in so for as it includes only those threats to security of an individual that surpass a threshold of severity." This makes the definition worth following because by drawing the boundary one can restrain from giving the infinite number of threats which usually disrupts the conceptual coherence.

However, the report practically follows the expansive list of threats but what it desires is to test them under its set formula of immediacy and severity.[75] In its own terms, the Commission has listed the threats to human security that arise from interstate conflicts; intrastate conflicts; transnational crimes, in general and terrorism, in particular; displacement of people from conflict torn regions; economic deprivation and its consequence in terms of poverty; hunger; lack of access to health amenities; lack of basic human values like education; socio-economic and cultural rights; and exploitative market system[76]

This report proposes a new framework to address the conditions and threats people face. It writes – "If human security is "people centred", then attention must be paid to the institutions of human beings and communities everywhere. By placing people at the centre, the mechanisms to address them should be centred on enhancing and redirecting policies and institutions of human rights and human development and reorienting the legal, economic and social actions to consider their objectives from the perspective of their effect on people."[77]

The report devises the ways to advance the security of people by proposing a global initiative to be mobilised to place human security at the top of local, national, regional and global agendas. It sets the goals such as: "to prevent conflict and advance human rights and development; to protect and empower people and their communities; to deepen democratic principles and practices; to promote a human security culture and framework; and to protect and

---

[74] Taylor Owen, n. 9, p. 20.
[75] Ibid.
[76] Commission on Human Security 2003, n. 21, pp. 1-144.
[77] Ibid, p. 130.

empower people and communities in order to promote a culture of human security."[78] Before accomplishing the goal of human security the Commission recommends that the tasks of advancing human security on all fronts should be started by addressing some of the basics. These basics are stipulated as: "(i) protecting people in violent conflict; (ii) protecting people from the proliferation of arms; (iii) supporting the security of people on the move; (iv) establishing human security transition funds for post-conflict situations; (v) encouraging fair trade and markets to benefit the extreme poor; (vi) providing minimum living standards everywhere; (vii) according high priority to universal access to basic health care; (viii) developing an efficient and equitable global system for patent rights; (ix) empowering all people with universal basic education, through much stronger global and national efforts; and (x) clarifying the need for a global human identity while respecting the freedom of individuals to have diverse identities and affiliations."[79]

The Commission aims at building a protective infrastructure that shields all people's lives from critical and pervasive threats. That infrastructure includes working institutions at every level of society: police systems, environmental regulations, health care networks, education systems, safety nets and workfare programmes, diplomatic engagements and early warning systems for crises or conflict. People's ability to act on their own behalf or on behalf of others is also instrumental to human security.[80]

Human Security Report 2005 produced by Human Security Centre (British Columbia University) presents a comprehensive and evidence-based portrait of global security. The report is significant in two respects: (i) it identifies and examines major trends in global political violence, asks what factors drive these trends and examines some of the consequences and; (ii) It poses major challenges to conventional wisdom of post-Cold War security environment. And it empirically proves that over the past dozen years, the global security climate has changed in dramatic, positive, but largely unheralded ways. Civil wars, genocides and international crises have all declined sharply. International wars, now only a small minority of all conflicts, have been in steady decline for a much longer period, as have military coups and the average number of people killed per conflict per year.[81] This report however goes against the post Cold War conviction and proves wrong many hypotheses regarding changing international security threats. Why then this report is useful? It is because the report like other major works implies that "to ensure the fair conditions for human security at global level managing additional resources, more appropriate mandates among nations, greater commitment to conflict prevention and

---

[78] Ibid, p. 131.
[79] Ibid, pp. 133-143.
[80] Ibid.
[81] Human Security Centre 2005, n. 20, p. 2.

peacebuilding, and greater political commitment are indispensable. It also requires a better understanding of global and regional security trends."[82]

The Academic Approach to Human Security

In academic arena activity towards human security spurred in the immediate years following the pioneer works on it by UNDP. Mahbub ul Haq is regarded as the first scholar who undertook the concept for its inquiry. Later he was followed by Keith Krause (1998 & 2000, 2006), Laura Reed and Majid Tehranian (1999), Astri Suhrke (1999), Carolin Thomas and Peter Wilkin (1999), Jorge Nef (1999), Peter Scott (1999), Jennifer Leaning & Arie (2000), Ramesh Thakur and Edward Newman (2000), Thakur (2004, 2008), Nicholas Thomas (2000), Willium T. Tow, Thakur & Hyun (2000), Kanti Bajpai (2000), Robert McRae & Don Hubert (2001), Edward Newman & Richmond (2001), Ronald Paris (2001), Grayson (2001), Peter Uvin (2001), Fen Osler Hampson & Hay (2002), , P. H. Liotta (2002), Barry Buzan (2002), Andrew Mack (2002), Thomas William & T. Tow (2002), Alkire (2003), Taylor Owen (2004, 2006, 2008), Tadjbakhsh (2004, 2007).[83]

Apart from the scholarly activities there are several projects being carried out in different universities of the world. A noteworthy activity towards human security from academic points of view is referred in terms of the colloquium organised by *Security Dialogue* and Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO) during the summer of 2004. At the colloquium well acknowledged authorities on human security from around the world placed their views. The objective of colloquium was to know the perspectives of academic community how they address human security. As a result, a unique document was prepared that gives an overview not only from theoretical points of view, but also of value positions, expressions of the ethical responsibilities of the academic in a world of insecurity.[84]

As for the academic approach, even after a close diagnosis of the views of the scholars it is difficult to present a straight-jacketed analysis. Though, all are agreed on the referent object of human security and plea to put focus on individuals or people. But there has been no agreement on the points: what are security values, what kinds of threats are there, and by what means the security is achieved. Considering the variation in views, broadly speaking, two kinds of

---

[82] Ibid, p. 12.

[83] The list of the scholars name, although, updated, is based upon the report of colloquium on human security held at Peace Research Institute, Oslo in the summer of 2004 that later published in *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 34, No. 3, September 2004.

[84] Taylor Owen, "Human Security – Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition", *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 35, No. 3, September 2004, pp. 373-387.

dichotomous interpretation emerge. Taylor Owen characterises these interpretations into broad and narrow schools of human security.[85] On the basis of this division, as a whole, the academic approach to human security can be analysed in the following ways.

Broad versus Narrow Approach to Human Security: The broad and narrow schools of human security are bifurcated on the basis of criteria undertaken in choosing the security threats.[86] The broad school of human security incorporates a long list of possible threats, from traditional security threats such as war to more development oriented threats such as health, poverty and the environment. Contrary to it, the narrow school, although still focuses on the individual and therefore incorporates many more threats than traditional security, it remains limited to violent threats such as landmines, small arms, violence and intra-state conflict. Krause, Mack, Macfarlane, Suhrke and Paris have expressed their views under the norm of narrow school of thought. They argue forcefully for the inclusion of violence as threats into this security thinking and point to the normative success of violence-based human security initiatives.[87]

Advocating the broad conceptualisation, Leaning, Alkire, Thakur, Axworthy, Bajpai, Hampson, and Winslow and Eriksen suggest that human security means something more than safety from violent threats. Owen clarifies as: "Each of them counter to the pragmatic rationale of the narrow proponents not only by citing the substantive importance of a wider range of issues (such as poverty, disease, and environmental disasters), but also by arguing that in shifting the referent of security, these issues *necessarily* fall under the human security umbrella. To them, the subsequent analytic and normative difficulties are unfortunate but unavoidable consequences of broadening the security paradigm beyond threats to the state."[88] On the basis of these contrasting interpretations, the central assumptions of the two schools can be emphasised as:

The narrow school's defence: (i) The key criterion of human security is "vulnerability to physical violence during conflict". The rationale behind it is that security concerns arise when the threat of violence is present, but not all cases of socio-economic disaster lead to violent action; hence they should not be placed under the rubric of human security. Andew Mack wrote: "If the term 'insecurity' embraces almost all forms of harm to individuals – from affronts to dignity to genocide – it loses any real descriptive power."[89]

---

[85] Ibid, pp. 375-76.

[86] Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy, n.31, p. 40.

[87] Owen, n. 84, pp. 373-387).

[88] Ibid.

[89] Andrew Mack, "A Signifier of Shared Values", *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 35, No. 3, September 2004, p. 367.

(ii) Human security is quite separate field from the more expansive and already established field of international development. Therefore, security should not be mixed up with human development. Nor should it be about "precarious human conditions" such as hunger disease, and environmental contamination.[90]

(iii) Security questions are always political in nature in the sense that they involve a degree of human agency and control. For instance, natural disasters are rarely preventable; they remain outside human control. How then can they fall under the parameters of human security?[91]

The broad school's defense: (i) The human vulnerability is both broad in nature and structurally dependent.[92] To mitigate human insecurity, it is necessary to address not only the threats, but also society's ability to counter them. Therefore, not only threats from violence but threats from socio-economic deprivation are also equally critical.

(ii) Human security and human development are mutually reinforcing. Freedom from fear and freedom from want are inextricably interlinked to each other. That is why human security at its core requires a set of vital freedoms for everyone. It cultivates ability to translate opportunities to face dire human emergencies.[93]

(iii) It is not contested whether security questions are involved with a degree of human agency or control but what is to be considered that the problems of human security are often context and structurally dependent. This means that while many of these problems are caused by governments or other political agencies, they are also rooted in political and social structures and ecological conditions. As a result, menaces to human security cannot be uprooted only by changing the behavior of various actors, although this may be a necessary condition for improvement. In addition, there are sufficient conditions for change that need to be met: the restructuring of legal and political institutions.[94]

[90] Owen, n. 84, pp. 375.

[91] Human Security Report 2005, n. 20, p. VIII.

[92] For example, Japan's main agency JICA writes that the sources of risks that threaten people are of two types: "(a) extraordinary and major threats or external shocks beyond the control of people and communities that rapidly and pervasively worsen the want and fear of people (such as conflicts and natural disasters), and (b) threats that are embedded in the daily lives of people (such as illnesses, unhygienic living conditions, and social exclusion." Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), *Poverty Reduction and Human Security,* Published by Research Group, Institute for International Cooperation, JICA, Tokyo, November 2005, [Online : Web] Accessed on July 20, 2007, URL: http://www.jica.go.jp/english/publications/ reports/study/topical/poverty_reduction/pdf/poverty_e02. pdf, Accessed on, p. XVI.

[93] UNDP, n. 16, p. 23.

[94] Owen, n. 84, pp. 376.

Salient Features of Human Security

A close analysis of various approaches dealing with the concept of human security has its own importance. However, on that basis an assessment of the concept becomes more reflective if one goes through its salient features. These features can be summarised in the following ways:

(i) **Human Security is People Centred:** This is the single point where almost all voices get assimilated into one: that is the prime concern of human security is the individual's security. The locus of attention thus rests upon making people safe from the multitude of menaces. This certainly broadens and deepens the spectrum of security threats and instruments to achieve this particular agenda keeping people or the individual into the centre stage.[95]

(ii) **Human Security is Indivisible:** The consequences of threats to human security travel the globe.[96] There are many threats which remain no longer confined to the personal, local or national but these are growing global. When security of the individual is attacked anywhere in the world all nations are likely to get affected.[97] The growing interaction of societies on a world wide scale through the process of interdependence resulted in ongoing process of globlisation has consolidated the belief further.

(iii) **The Concept of Human Security is Dynamic:** Threats to human security vary in different societies or regions. What people consider to be "vital" – what they consider to be "of the essence of life" and "crucially important" – varies across individuals and societies.[98] For instance, globlisation has accelerated the international trade which itself is supposed to have widened the range of choices in developed countries but in developing countries it has increased the level of the poverty. Again, mass migration generally takes place to eke out the livelihood, which, in turn, creates pressure on receiving countries' socio-economic dynamics by narrowing their own people's choices, and sometimes causes violent conflict.[99] There is another considerable logic which stems from the fact that any concept which deals with "people" is doubtful to be bound with objectivity. Human security becomes a subject of subjective interpretation and is thus, regarded as a dynamic concept.

---

[95] This is to be noted that all voices, advocating human security get condensed on individual's safety and well-being, no matter which way they describe and analyse the concept.

[96] UNDP, n. 16, p. 8.

[97] Ibid, p. 3.

[98] Commission of Human Security 2003, n. 21, p. 4.

[99] See for example : UNDP, *Human Develpoment Report 2009 : Overcoming Barriers : Human Mobility and Development* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).

(iv) Human Security is Complimentary to State Security: State security and human security are complimentary to each other. Human security complements state security in four respects. Its concern is the individual and the community which are the core elements of the state. Menaces to people's security include threats and conditions that have not always been classified as threats to state security. The range of actors is expanded beyond the state alone. Achieving human security includes not just protecting people but also empowering them to fend for themselves.

Human security does not supplant national security. A human security perspective asserts that the security of the state is not an end in itself. Rather, it is a means of ensuring security for its people. In this context, state security and human security are mutually supportive. Building an effective, democratic state that values its own people and protects minorities is a central strategy for promoting human security. At the same time, improving human security of its people strengthens the legitimacy, stability, and security of a state. When states are externally aggressive, internally repressive, or too weak to govern effectively, they threaten the security of people. Where human security exists as a fact rather than an aspiration, these conditions can be attributed in large measure to the effective governance of states.[100]

Therefore, human security is neither an alternative to, nor divorced from, national or state security. A beautiful answer of these is given in the report *Human Security Now*. "Human security and state security are mutually reinforcing and dependent on each other. Without human security state security cannot be attained and vice versa. Human security requires strong and stable institutions. Even today state is the most competent institution to attain human security."[101] Thus human security cannot be *mutually exclusive* rather it is *complementary* to the state security.

(v) Human Security, Human Development and Human Rights are Different at Conceptual Level but Complimentary to Each Other: Human security has often been confused with human development. Human development is a rather broad concept. It refers to a process of widening the range of people's choices. Human security refers to that condition in which people can exercise those choices safely and freely.[102] Human development, however, is concerned more with removing the various hindrances that restrain and restrict human lives and prevent its blossoming.[103] There is a symbiotic relation between human security and human

---

[100] Commission of Human Security 2003, n. 21, p. 4.
[101] Ibid, pp. 5-6.
[102] UNDP, n. 16, p. 23.
[103] Commission of Human Security 2003, n. 21, p. 8.

development.[104] The report of Commission on Human Security writes that progress in one area enhances the chances of progress in the other. But failure in one area also heightens the risk of failure in the other. For example, failed or limited human development leads to a backlog in access to power and economic opportunities can lead to violence. When people perceive threats to their immediate security, they often become less tolerant. Thus human development supplements human security by directly paying attention to the "downside risks".[105]

Human rights and human security are different concepts. While rights signify the basic legal entitlements of individuals, security involves personal safety. Rights generally depict conditions in which all people are entitled to live whereas security addresses the very survival of those people. Therefore, according to the report "Human security and human rights can, therefore, fruitfully supplement each other. On the one hand, since the human rights can be seen as a general box that has to be filled with specific demands with appropriate motivational substantiation, it is significant that human security helps to fill one particular part of this momentous box through reasoned substantiation. On the other, since human security as an important descriptive concept demand ethical force and political recognition, it is useful that this can be appropriately obtained through seeing freedoms related to human security as an important class of human rights."[106] Human security and human rights are complimentary to each other. Human security helps identify the rights at stake in a particular situation. And human rights help answer the question: How should the human security be promoted? The notion of duties and obligations compliments the recognition of the ethical and political importance.

(vi) Human Security is More Prevention, Little Cure: There has been a growing realisation that prevention of conflict is more economical and practically sound than dealing with the aftermath. In the words of Mihael E. Brown and Richard N. Rosecrane, an ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure.[107] In this sense, human security is the prevention, not the cure. Human security advocates addressing challenges "upstream" rather than "downstream" because of the reason that it is less costly and more humane to meet these threats upstream rather than downstream, early rather than late.[108] The Commission on Human Security has its own preference. It advises to empower the people. What does people's empowerment mean? According to the report, this refers to the enhancement of people's capability to act on their own

---

[104] Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy, n. 31, p. 113.
[105] Commission of Human Security 2003, n. 21, p. 8.
[106] Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy, n. 31, pp. 123-141.
[107] Micheal E. Brown and Richard N. Rosencrance, *The Cost of Conflict: Prevention and Cure in the Global Arena* (New York: Rowman & Littefield Publishers, 1997), p. 1.
[108] UNDP, n. 16, p. 22.

behalf. Empowerment enables people to develop their resilience to difficult conditions, to identify and prepare for events that could have severe and widespread consequences. All these are ways of protection from insecurity, more particularly, human insecurity. Strengthening people's ability to act on their own behalf is instrumental to human security. People empowered can demand respect for their dignity when it is violated. Thus it shows a particular characteristic of human security.[109]

A Critical Appraisal

The concept of human security has attracted criticism on various counts.[110] This has been primarily and perhaps most stringently criticised by neo-realists who, in particular, focus their attention on the disruption of the spirit of the concept of security on account of shifting its focus from state to people. By doing so, what neo-realists say, the entire concept of human security becomes incoherent and thus meaningless. While criticising the exercise of broadening the security agenda, Stephen M. Walt gives perhaps strongest statement on the traditionalist position. He views that "security studies are "about the phenomenon of war and that it can be defined as the study of the threat, use, and control of military force."[111] Those who want to widen the agenda outside this strictly military domain, he argued, "run the risk of expanding "security studies" excessively to destroy its intellectual coherence and make it more difficult to devise solutions to any of these problems."[112] Other objections are raised from policy perspective. Thus, the idea of human security is so scattered that it fails to meet its operational objective. Beside these objections, there are many who see human security as no more than merely an ideological campaign. This kind of objection stems from the fact that the agenda of human security has compatibility with neo-liberal ideals which paved the way for neo-colonial powers to pursue their own national interests at the cost of weaker states immediately after the Second World War. In the recent days human security has created fury among critics due to the controversial mechanism of humanitarian military intervention that is one means of accomplishing human security. However, for the critical enquiry, as a whole, the following prime reasons need to be elaborated.

---

[109] Commission on Human Security 2003, n. 21, p. 10.

[110] For the critical part of human security following literatures are extremely worthwhile : M. Ayoob, "Defining Security: A Subaltern Realist Perspective", in K. Krause and M. C. Williams, (eds.), *Critical Security Studies: Cases and Concepts* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997); Y. Foong-Khong, "Human Security: A Shotgun Approach to Alleviating Human Misery?", *Global Governance,* Vol. 7, 2001; Ronald Paris, "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?", *International Security,* Vol. 26, No. 2, Fall2001; and S. N. MacFarlane and Y. Foong-Khong, *Human Security and the UN: A Critical History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006).

[111] Stephen M. Walt, "The Renaissance in Security Studies", *International Studies Quarterly,* Vol. 35, No. 2, 1991, pp. 212-13.

[112] Ibid.

- The incoherent conceptual character;
- An effective campaign slogan based largely on rhetoric rather than substance;
- Proximity with neo-liberal institutionalist ideology;
- Prejudicial agenda against weaker states; and
- Humanitarian military intervention.

Human security, as critics point out, lacks a precise definition. Without a precise definition, an analytical separation of dependent and independent variables becomes impossible. "And any definition that conflates dependent and independent variables renders causal analysis virtually impossible."[113] This also applies on human security. Existing definitions of human security tend to be extraordinarily expansive and vague. Some prefer a narrow view focusing on protection from violence. Others suggest a wider scope, including rights, governance, development, the environment, and health. But they fail to give authentic reasons to favour narrow over broad conceptions of human security and vice-versa.[114] Ronal Paris maintains that "encompassing everything from physical security to psychological well-being provides academics little sense of what, exactly, is to be studied and policy makers with little guidance in the prioritisation of competing policy goals."[115] Neo-realists, therefore, primarily tend to centre their objection on the analytical weakness that results particularly from the lack of fixed conceptual boundary. Buzan has argued that "human security proliferates the concept without adding analytical value. It also drives towards a reductionist understanding of international security and reinforces a mistaken tendency to idealize security as the desired end goal."[116]

Even policy makers face the similar problems. In attempting to put these definitions of human security into practical use, policy makers feel much puzzled. For policy makers, the challenge is to move beyond all – encompassing exhortations and to focus on specific solutions to specific political issues. "This is a difficult task," as Ronald Paris maintains, "not only because of the broad sweep and definitional elasticity of most formulations of human security but also – and perhaps even more problematically – because the proponents of human security are typically reluctant to prioritise the jumble of goals and principles that make up the concept."[117]

---

[113] Andrew Mack, n. 89, p. 367.

[114] (Ibid).

[115] Ronald Paris, "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?", *International Security*, Vol. 26, No. 2, Fall 2001, p. 87.

[116] Barry Buzan, "A Reductionist, Idealistic Notion that Adds Little Analytical Value", *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 35, No. 3, September 2004, p. 370.

[117] Paris, n. 113, p. 92.

The term's ambiguity serves a particular purpose. It unites a diverse and sometimes fractious coalition of states and organisations that see an opportunity to capture some of the more substantial political interest and superior financial resources. In his fierce criticism, Ronald Paris pointed that "these actors have in effect pursued a political strategy of appropriating the term security which conveys urgency, demands public attention, and commands governmental resources. By maintaining a certain level of ambiguity in the notion of human security, moreover, the members of this coalition are able to minimise their individual differences, thereby accommodating as wide a variety of members and interest in their network as possible. The term, in short, appears to be slippery by design. Cultivated ambiguity renders human security an effective campaign slogan, but it also diminishes the concept's usefulness as an operational objective."[118]

For comparably less powerful states, in practical sense, it is not more than an honourable goal. For powerful states, this provides an effective means to harness their profits by playing duplicity with the help of rhetoric. A significant gap between the rhetoric of the human security agenda and the actual policies taken by the governments can better be demonstrated by Canadian approach in East Timor. In East Timor in September 1999, the violent outbreak of conflict between East Timorese and Indonesian forces urgently required international humanitarian support to resolve it. Despite the centrality of the human security agenda in Canadian foreign policy actions taken by the Government of Canada in East Timor in-fact exposed the gulf of making rhetoric of human security and the actual will to follow it.[119]

It is often argued that human security is compatible with a particular ideology. For many, it is a classically liberal concept.[120] Marxists view human security as a repackaging of liberal humanitarianism, with its routine failure to address underlying social causes.[121] Some tend to portray it as neo-liberal institutionalism. For them, the trajectory of globalisation and ventures of widening security agenda (human security) are unidirectional. S. D. Muni argued that the attempts to widen security agenda were driven by simultaneous development of the emergence of globalisation.[122] Globalisation aims at widening the choice of individuals while human

---

[118] Ibid, p. 95.

[119] T.S. Hataley and Kim Richard Nossal, "The Limits of the Human Security Agenda: The Case of Canadian Response to the Timor Crisis", *Global Change, Peace and Security*, Vol.16, No.1, February 2004, pp. 6-7.

[120] Melissa Curley and Nicholas Thomas, "Human Security and Public Health", *Australian Journal of International Affair*, vol. 58, no.1, 2004, p. 18.

[121] Caroline Thomas, "A Bridge Between the Interconnected Challenges Confronting the World" Security Dialogue, Vol. 35, No. 3, September 2004, p. 354.

[122] S. D. Muni, "Comprehensive Security : The South Asian Case", A Paper Presented at IDSS, Singapore, 2002, p. 4.

security aims at securing the freedom of want of individuals. Human security plays a key role in mystifying the consequences of capitalist expansion based on liberal ideology. Human security in fact masks actual interest of actors who pretends to keep upheld the some of cosmopolitan values such as survival of human being. And thus consolidate the liberal ideology. More often than not, the agenda of human security proves to be an effective means of prejudices and biases against weaker state. This agenda seems to be prejudicial against weaker states in three vital areas: strategic, developmental and ecological.

The way humanitarian military intervention has taken place in recent years has raised the hackles. Humanitarian military intervention refers to the external military intervention in a state without the approval of its authorities, to prevent widespread suffering or death among its inhabitants. From the perspective of human security, humanitarian military intervention is regarded as one of the effective means to achieve the goals of human security. Unlike state security, however, proponents of human security view that to procure cosmopolitan goals in terms of human security, force is secondary instrument. Instead, according to need and circumstances diplomatic means coupled with coercive measures are primary.[123] The coercive measures can be followed in two ways: one is by imposition of various kinds of sanctions such as political; economic; and military, and the second is military intervention. But the second measure has taken now new course in the changing context.[124] In present times it has become an incisive weapon at the hand of powerful states to exploit the vulnerabilities of developing states.[125]

Above all, one question that is most vital regarding this is under whose auspices will the humanitarian intervention take place? For human security proponents, it will do so under the auspices of international institutions: the UN or regional organisations. What would be the possible remedy if the role of international institutions were to be undermined by overwhelming capacity of a state or a coalition of states? What would likely be the course of action to prevent the abuse of humanitarian intervention by such rapacious international forces for which international legal norms and moral ethics are secondary? The case of Iraq-II has invigorated the debate for restructuring the international institutions especially the UN and to rewrite the international ethics for humanitarian military intervention.

---

[123] Bajpai, n. 29, p. 212

[124] Ibid.

[125] Priyankar Upadhyay, "Human Security, Humanitarian Intervention, and Third World Concerns", Denver Journal of International Law and Policy, Vol. 33, No, 1, pp. 71-91.

Voices in Defence of Human Security

Despite its criticism on various grounds, human security is regarded by many as a concept of considerable importance because it includes the individual as security referent considering it as the ultimate end of security. Bajpai argued as:

> Its concerns are both consequentialist and deontological. Human security's concern with personal safety and freedom is consequentialist in that it regards interstate war as frequently the end product of direct and indirect violence against the individual. It acknowledges that interstate violence may arise from international anarchy, but it regards threat to individual life and liberty as equally a cause of international violence. Human security's concern with personal safety and freedom is deontological because it affirms that individual life and liberty are values that require protection not so much because of the consequences that may flow from their non-protection, but rather these are morally worthy values that must be upheld for their own sake.[126]

In a similar assessment Edward Newman has viewed, "human security as ....an integrated matrix of all the tenets of life that give meaning to, and support, human existence."[127]

So for as neo-liberal's objection is concerned there is no doubt that human security lacks the conceptual coherence but appearance of a new formula recently to assess the severity of threats and judge what is critical and what is pervasive has cut the solace of this problem to the fair extent. Human security is not a liberal, constructivist, or critical theoretical notion that realists are obliged to oppose with all their fury and disdain. Amitav Acharya while opposing the idea of human security's proximity with a particular ideology argues that "human security challenges the academic community to transcend the so-called inter-paradigm debate. Human security is in itself a holistic paradigm; at least, it offers opportunities for creative synthesis and theoretical eclecticism."[128] What Acharya is trying to say that the concept of human security is a complex amalgamation of several dominant theories of international relations. Acharya emphasises as:

> Realism can tell us much about the material conditions at the national and systemic level that encourage or inhibit the diffusion of human security ideas and practices. It can address questions related to the impact of hegemonic power on human security, as well as the relationship between national security tools (e.g. defense spending) and the resources needed to promote human security. Liberalism and liberal institutionalism help our understanding of how human security can be promoted through interdependence, democratic transformation, and international institutions. Critical theories have already

---

[126] Bajpai, n. 29, p. 226.

[127] Edward Newman, "Security and Governance in the millennium: Observations and Syntheses, in Ramesh Thakur and Edward Newman, *New millennium, new perspectives: The United Nations, security, and governance* (New York: United Nations University Press, 2000), p. 7.

[128] Amitav Acharya, "A Holistic Paradigm", *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 35, No. 3, September 2004, p. 355.

enriched our understanding both of how states can threaten the security of the individual and of the role of global civil society in the promotion of human security. Constructivist insights are important in understanding how human security ideas are promoted by global norm entrepreneurs and how shifts in the global ideational structure can help or hinder prospects for human security."[129]

Furthermore, if human security supports the idea of humanitarian military intervention the very idea behind it is to protect the humanity wherever it is in peril by whatever way it is jeopardised and by whomsoever it is threatened. In fact, through humanitarian intervention it is intended to ensure that the inability of a state to provide the safety of its people must not paralyse the humanitarian cause. It is the responsibility of international community to provide assistance to get rid of the problems that endanger the people's survival and their well-being.

Evolving a Framework on Human Security

Having inquired at all approaches to deal with the concept of human security, one thing is absolutely clear: there may be some commonalities in each approach but there is no consensus on its domain. There has always been a debate between those who narrate the concept with some specific limitation in the domain of threats and those who follow a large spectrum of threats against human security. Seeing this as an inherent problem of the concept, to evolve a theoretical framework is a highly complex task.

A framework on the concept, first of all, requires a coherently constructed definition that covers specified subject matters. As Anatol Rappoport explains, "theory means an integral body of definitions, assumptions and general propositions covering a given subject-matter from which a comprehensive and consistent set of specific and testable hypotheses can be deduced."[130] In this respect first and foremost task should be to define the concept of human security in a more precise term.

To define human security precisely, it has to be narrowed down. Owen has rightly pronounced that narrower the definition, the easier the threat assessment and indicator selection and the more precise the final account will be.[131] As it is often felt that the arbitrary selection of threats without any logical formulation weakens the concept. Therefore, the most important task is to fix a criterion of threats selection. Once the criterion is fixed it becomes easy to identify the ways to encounter them.

---

[129] Ibid: 356.

[130] Anatol Rappoport, Various Meaning of Theory", in James N. Rosenau, ed., *International Politics and Foreign Policy* (New York: Free Press, 1961), p. 49.

[131] Owen, n. 9, p. 20.

Threats to human security should be identified on the basis of their level of severity. There should be a thoughtful consideration of how threats are actually affecting people. Before coming to any conclusion, the assessment of some of the guiding ideas is necessary here. Garry King and Christopher Murray include only "essential elements" meaning, elements that are "important enough for human beings to fight over or to put their lives at great risk."[132] Bajpai in his proposed "human security audit" also prefers to consider security as minimum probability of dangers to one's acquired values.[133]

Commission on Human Security, however, draws the limitation by putting phrases like "the protection of the vital core" and "critical and pervasive threats".[134] The vital core for an individual refers to what constitutes a minimum level of survival. Critical and pervasive threats refer to both severity and immediacy. From this point of view, out of unlimited number of possible threats, only the most serious, those that take or seriously threaten lives of individuals are included. Even after this formulation, further categorisation of sources of threats needs to be given. More clearly, the critical and pervasive threats to the vital core of individuals can be grouped into possible minimum categories. However, merit of such categorisation should be based upon their merit of securitisation.[135] This framework constitutes the threats only from *five* categories: personal; poverty; political; health; and environmental. To avoid some other categories like psychological, community, and education rests on the idea that they hardly constitute critical and pervasive threats to categorise them separately. By grouping all possible threats into five categories, human security becomes both more manageable and analytically tractable concept. Finally the concept of human security can be explained as:

> "*Human security is the protection of the vital core of all human lives from critical and pervasive threats that emanate from violence against individual's personal safety; poverty; health vulnerabilities; political fragility; and environmental degradation.*"

---

[132] King, Gary, and Christopher J. L. Murray, "Rethinking Human Security." *Political Science Quarterly* Vol. 116, No. 4, 2001, pp. 585-610.

[133] Bajpai, n. 29, pp. 227-228.

[134] Commission on Human Security, n. 21, p. 4.

[135] The concept of securitisation states that a successful securitisation has three components (steps): "existential threats, emergency actions, and effects on inter unit relations by breaking free of rules. What is important here is that for the analyst to grasp this act, the task is not to assess some objective threats that "really" endanger some object to be defended or secured; rather, it is to understand the processes of constructing a shared understanding of what is to be considered and collectively responded to as a threat (See: Buzan, Wæver and Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, p. 24). However, detailed analysis has been given in the chapter-1.

The Logic of Threats to Human Security and Means to achieve It

Threats to personal safety are perhaps the most vital concern of human security. Irrespective of level of development, threats to personal safety afflicts the societies and the states in more ways than one. This kind of threats are caused due to direct violence sometimes perpetrated by the state or regime serving the state; direct physical attack by rival state(s); criminal activities; ethno-national tension; and low intensity war. Human Security Centre in a survey reveals that criminal violence, terrorism or wars are the greatest threats to the personal security.[136]

Threats resulting from poverty endanger people's life in many ways. It deprives the people not only from adequate level of basic needs such as food, safe drinking water, primary education but also makes life insecure causing large scale migration and refugee problems as the side effects and, therefore, regional or sometimes global tension get precipitated. Interestingly, threats from poverty do not remain confined to this extent only but its indirect consequences can further be seen on the ecological system too.[137]

Political fragility is an important facet of threats to human security. One of the most important aspects of human security is that people should be able to live in a society that honours their basic rights. Unfair representative system (wherever democracy works) or in more cases lack of representative system itself; discriminatory laws and practices; subversion of political institutions and norms cause this kind of threats. Gross human rights violation is more often than not, caused due to political fragility of a state.[138]

Imperative to allocate health vulnerability a separate category lies in its severity. If we compare the death toll solely from this kind of threats, it can outweigh casualties resulting from many wars between or among states. In both developing and developed countries, the threats to health security are usually greater to the poor in the rural areas than urban areas and far greater to the children and women. Communicable and non-communicable diseases including sexually transmitted diseases (STD) are the main source of threat but spread of HIV and AIDS have caused a global panic. Health related problems are directly or indirectly related to weak socio-economic systems.[139]

The environmental threats faced by the states are a combination of the degradation of local eco-systems and that of the global system. The most acute threat in different parts of the

---

[136] *Human Security Report 2005*, n. 20, p. 51.
[137] Commission on Human Security, n. 21, pp. 73-74.
[138] Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy, n. 31, p. 238.
[139] Commission on Human Security, n. 21, pp. 95-109.

globe is likely to emerge from the crisis of renewable and non-renewable resources which can be attributed to the environment degradation.[140] Resource conflict can have vast ramifications on national and international security matrix and as a consequence it can endanger security of people. There are other aspects of environmental degradation related threats. For instance, emission of green house gases depletes ozone layers. Many more sever health problems are its direct consequence while it indirectly disturbs ecological balance and creates pervasive threats to human security.[141]

A useful framework on human security can only be completed when instruments or means to achieve it are clearly stipulated. There are a number of ways to achieve it. First of all, as Commission on Human Security maintains: "There is a need to establish interdisciplinary approaches; strengthening of large coalitions working to further human security, at the multilateral and national levels, and in particular at local level involving all actors of society; strengthening institutions, norms (legal) both at state and international level and more importantly bolstering international capacity to undertake peace support operations."[142] In accordance with the classification of threats, the following table presents the effective measures as well as the means to achieve human security (Detailed analysis of each one of five segments has been given in the chapter 3, 4, and 5).

Table-2.1: Security Threats, Measures and Enforcement Agencies

Security Threats	Possible Measures	Enforcement Agencies
Personal Security	Legal and physical protection of people in war zones, peacekeeping and conflict prevention, post conflict peace building, checking the proliferation of small arms and WMDs, disarmament, constitutional, legal and juridical protection of vulnerable sections of societies: minorities, women and children, law enforcement measures, dealing with cause and consequences and finally people empowerment.	State, civil society; NGOs; UN; International and multilateral Organizations.

---

[140] Hans Gunter Brauch, "Threats, Challenges, Vulnerabilities and Risks in Environmental and Human Security", *Publication Series of UNU-EHS, No 1/2005*, United Nations University-Institute for Environment and Human Security (UNU-EHS), Bonn (Germany), 2005, p. 20.
[141] Ibid.
[142] Commission on Human Security, n. 21, p. 131.

Security from Poverty	Pursuing the economic development measures, poverty alleviation schemes, creation of employment and condition for self-employment, improving fair resource distribution mechanism and empowering people.	State; development agencies; private enterprises, NGOs, UN; International and multilateral organizations; global economic and financial institutions.
Political Security	Ensuring representative form of government and democratic governance; and constitutional, legal and juridical protection of human rights.	State; civil society; UN; and International and regional multilateral institutions.
Health Security	Universal access to basic health care; protection against endemic diseases; and establishing a surveillance system at global level.	State; NGOs; International health institutions and UN.
Environmental Security	Dealing with the cause and consequences; sustainable environmental management devising and implementing policy option, disaster prevention management; and capacity building.	State; civil society; NGO, International and multilateral agencies.

Source: Adapted from Various Sources

Apart from these kinds of means, international community can help prevent human emergencies, wherever it occur. But how can this be done? In the human security conceptions to use force for the prevention of human emergencies is a secondary instrument. Contrary to this, The Commission on Global Governance, in its report *Our Global Neighbourhood*, asserted that "where people are subjected to massive suffering and distress.....There is a need to weigh a state's right to autonomy against its people's right to security."[143] The basic assumption hinges on the fact that "international community has legitimate right of halting human suffering and bringing an end to willfully committed atrocities

---

[143] See: The Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighbourhood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 71.

within the borders of a sovereign state."[144] However, the proponents of human security are pretty skeptical whether force can be an effective means in dealing with the multifarious threats to personal safety and freedom.[145] It is viewed that if coercion is necessary, the various kinds of sanctions are a first recourse. Force, in any case, "is to be used not for purely national purpose, but rather for the more cosmopolitan goal of managing human security threats, when it is used, it should be used collectively, preferably under the auspices of international institutions."[146]

But wherever civilians are increasingly targeted in violent conflicts, merely various kinds of sanctions by international community cannot be the effective ways; rather in many cases it vitiates the human exigencies. In the words of Don Hubert and Michael Bonser, "efforts to build a culture of conflict prevention are welcome. No approach can be more effective in reducing the human costs of war than preventing the outbreak of war in the first place."[147] Yet, Hubert and Bonser argued as: "In spite of the vigour which we bring to the challenges of effective preventive action, there will be cases where prevention does not succeed, where the spiral into violent conflict cannot be constrained. In these instances international community should be prepared to step in to protect civilians and avert a humanitarian crisis."[148]

The wrong pretext to intervene without authorisation of the world body gathered the voices to address such critical challenges as a most urgent task for the entire world community. To consider this specific issue, International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), constituted by the government of Canada and a group of major foundations produced a report entitled *The Responsibility to Protect*.[149] The report inquires the question such as in what

---

[144] Ibid.

[145] For instance, the use of force, which is often manifested in terms of humanitarian intervension has been highly controversial in recent times. After the end of the Cold War several states like Bosnia, Rwanda, Haiti, Somalia, Macedonia, and the Persian Gulf witnessed military humanitarian intervention. But, NATO's action in Kosovo sparked, for the first time, an intense debate regarding current legal and political frameworks for humanitarian military interventions. In the case of Iraq-II, military intervention espoused with the idea of humanitarian causes has raised the hackles in international arena and the demanded to give such actions international legal framework and above all acceptability of international community.

[146] Bajpai, n. 29, p. 222-223.

[147] Don Hubert and Micheal Bonser , "Humanitarian Military Intervention", in Rob Mc Rae and Don Hubert, (eds.), *Human Security and The New Diplomacy: Protecting People Promoting Peace* (Montreal: Mc Gill Queens University Press, 2001), p. 111.

[148] Ibid.

[149] The main architects of the report were Gareth Evans of Australia and Mohamed Sahnoun of Algeria, who were assisted by other prominent figures like Giséle Coté-Harper and Michael Ignatieff of Canada, Ramesh Thakur of India, Lee Hamilton of the United States, Vladimir Lukin of Russia, Klaus Naumann of Germany, Cyril Ramaphosa of South Africa, Fidel Ramos of the Philippines, Cornelio Sommaruga of Switzerland, and Eduardo Stein Barillas of Guatemala. Three years later in 2004, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges, & Change embraced and pleaded for its implementation. In October 2005 UN World Summit, the principle R2P was adopted in World Summit Outcome Document, accordingly approved by the General Assembly (GA) in document A/RES/60/1, and subsequently affirmed by the UN Security Council in resolution 1674 of April

conditions the international community does have right to protect a population, suffering serious human insecurities, as a result of internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure, and the state in question is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it. And, what theoretical base could possibly justify such outside intervention? The Commission prefers to talk not of a "right to intervene" but of a "responsibility to protect."[150] Thus, *The Responsibility to Protect*, therefore, has been an attempt to address a false choice posed by humanitarian intervention between two extremes: either standing by in the face of mounting civilian deaths or deploying coercive military force to protect the vulnerable and threatened populations.[151]

The responsibility to protect, according to the report, embraces three specific responsibilities:

> (i) **The responsibility to prevent:** to address both the root causes and direct causes of internal conflict and other man-made crises putting populations at risk; (ii) **The responsibility to react:** to respond to situations of compelling human need with appropriate measures, which may include coercive measures like sanctions and international prosecution, and in extreme cases military intervention; (iii) **The responsibility to rebuild:** to provide, particularly after a military intervention, full assistance with recovery, reconstruction and reconciliation, addressing the causes of the harm the intervention was designed to halt or avert.[152]

However, the commission regards prevention as a single most important dimension of the responsibility to protect. What does it prescribe that "the prevention options should always be exhausted before intervention is contemplated, and more commitment and resources must be devoted to it."[153] Dwelling on the precautionary measures, it recommends: "Firstly, the right intension to intervene should be reflected through legitimacy in action; secondly, military intervention should be the last resort after every non-military option for the prevention or peaceful resolution of the crisis has been explored; thirdly, military intervention should not

---

2006. In a historic move on 21 July 2009, the UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon presented his report "Implementing the responsibility to protect" to the General Assembly that was released earlier on 30 January 2009 to make this principle guiding a parameter for protecting the world from menaces of various atrocities. The report is analysed in Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, "Implementing the Responsibilty to Protect: The 2009 General Assembly Debate—An Analysis", August 2009, [Online: Web] Accessed on January 21, 2010, URL: http://globalr2p.org/media/pdf/GCR2P_General_Assembly_Debate_Assessment.pdf. p. 11.

[150] International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), *Responsibility to Protect*, [Oneline : Web] Accessed on July 17, 2006, URL: http:// www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/iciss-ciise/pdf/Commission-Report.pdf.

[151] David Chandler, "R2P or Not R2P? More Statebuilding, Less Responsibility", *Global Responsibility to Protect*, Vol. 2, 2010, p. 162.

[152] *Responsibility to Protect*, n. 150, p. XI.

[153] Ramesh Thakur, "Opinion Pieces on R2P: Responsibility to Protect is Universal", [Online: Web] Accessed on January 21, 2010, URL: http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/component/content/article/136-latest-news /2661-ngo-forum-adopts-rtop-resolution-ramesh-thakur-reflects-on-ga-debate#Opinion.

prolong disproportionally nor should it be less than minimum necessary to secure the defined human protection objective; and finally, action should not be boomeranged."[154]

Given all principled action in the name of military intervention, however is fraught with unintended consequences. Nevertheless, as Upadhyay argues, any outside action should be acceptable, if it aggregates sovereignty instead of undermining it.[155] Hubert and Bonser argue that humanitarian military intervention must be followed under a set of internationally recognised parameter. However, they prefer the following parameter:

- Strengthening norms and practices regarding the protection of civilians;
- Multilateral in nature, requires a collective decision and such action should have strong degree of international support; and
- It should not be viewed as a standalone activity. The promotion of good governance, democratic institution building, and respect for the rule of law are key components of a longer-term strategy to help build sustainable peace and prevent further conflict.[156]

Evolving the Framework for Human Security in Pakistan

The real assessment of human security in any state of the world irrespective of the fact whether it is developing or developed can be done on the basis of two fundamental issues: *freedom from fear* and *freedom from want*. However, it is apparent from above that human security is a comprehensive measurement of security. It accounts for all those menaces which threaten the roots of security of a society or state, which has usually been remained untouched by some of the popular approaches dealing with security in the realm of international studies. In contrast to the conventional wisdom, a state is said to be safe and secured if it is safe not only from the external threats posing challenges to its sovereignty and territorial integrity political independence but also from internally posed challenges, which in terms of Johan Galtung, called structural violence. Thus, *index of security* for a state is the security of the *individual* rather than security of the *state*. How much Pakistan is secured can, in its best possible way, be measured by human security rather than military security. Seeing the overall scenario of security from this perspective, Pakistan's case presents an ambivalent picture.

In reality, security in Pakistan has always been precarious. Because, Pakistan has never been free of significant threats to the well-being of individuals, communities and even the state. Therefore, in terms of human security, Pakistan is viewed as one of the most insecure states of the world. It is realised that a big proportion of the people have neither *freedom from fear* nor do they have *freedom from want*. There are a number of factors which threaten these two prime

---

[154] *Responsibility to Protect*, n. 150, pp. XII-XIII.

[155] Priyankar Upadhyay, n. 125, p. 85.

[156] Don Hubert and Micheal Bonser, n. 147, pp. 112-120.

values of human security in Pakistan. These factors are nothing but challenges of human security. Clearly, threats to the safety and security of the people of Pakistan, at one level, stem from the conflictual dynamics of the relations with the states within and outside the region, which has often been demonstrated in interstate, intrastate and transnational conflicts. While on the other level, colossal human deprivation which arises on account of the failure of political, economic and civic governance has been serious blow to the security and well-being of individuals in the state.

The framework on human security in Pakistan encompasses two core dimensions: freedom from fear and freedom from want. It means threats to human security in Pakistan can be assessed on the basis of two broad categories: (i) threats which go against *freedom from fear* and (ii) threats that imperil *freedom from want*. Out of five proposed area (personal, political, poverty, health and environment) of threat assessment, first category comprises threats to personal security and political security, while second category consists of threats from poverty, treats to health and threats from environmental dilapidation. To cope with the challenges of human security the framework suggests shifting the priority of security from military to people. However, the proposed chapter five will go into details regarding the measures to improve the state of human security. Here it is important to note that first and foremost task would be to reducing people's vulnerability by preventing the conditions which make them vulnerable in the first place. It can further be advanced by the protection of human rights, the rule of law, democratic development, good governance and the peaceful resolution of conflicts. There are five required measures for human security in Pakistan: (i) placing human security on the security agenda of state; (ii) employing human governance; (iii) finding out sustainable solution of interstate conflict: the conflict with India over Kashmir; (iv) expediting regional cooperation at human security level; (v) seeking the mutual cooperation of some of the leading states and multinational organisations of the world, which are taking human security agenda at their policy levels and assisting the states from coming out the trap of human insecurity.