



HUMAN SECURITY ITS EMERGENCE AND CONCEPT

Karishma Subba

Research Scholar, Jadavpur University, Kolkata.

Abstract

This paper studies the emergence of the concept of Human Security as how the focus from state security shifted to Human Security. As a new paradigm it has started gaining lot of attention but its definition and application are still a matter of debate.

Keywords: *Human Security, UNDP.*

Introduction

The word "Security" comes from the Latin word "Securitas" which means lack of care. Security is a condition of being protected from or not exposed to danger and safety. Security is a state of being free from danger or injury and freedom from anxiety or fear (Georg Frerks and Berma Klein Goldewijk 2007) However, the term security as such has a variety of meanings and connotations and is constantly expanding and changing. In an interstate context, international security stands for the defence capabilities and military powers of the state against threats from other states and non-state actors. The notion of internal security is concerned with violence that threatens the state from within through domestic strife, insurgencies, civil war, and coups. (James, 2002).

Traditionally, security meant the preservation and defence of a status quo the political independence and territorial integrity of states against external military threats. War occurred when there was a forceful deviation from the status quo, and peace existed when territorial boundaries of states were recognized and stable, and no attempt was made to revise state borders through the use of force.

Global or transnational security issues cover the protection of people from a variety of common concerns that transcend state boundaries, such as famines and droughts, the spread of diseases, environmental degradation, human rights violations, and large-scale migrations (ibid, 2002).

The scope of security was thus defined essentially in negative terms as the absence of a military threat (to the state) or the protection of the nation from external military attack, and its domain was restricted to the state or nation (that is, national security). The focus, then, was on the politico-diplomatic military relationships among states. (ibid, 2002).

In international law, security was traditionally been understood as national or state security that is, the security of states as the primary subjects of international law, based on territorial integrity and sovereignty, as formulated in the UN Charter. The maintenance of international peace and security, as laid down in Article 1 of the charter, presupposes the territorial integrity and political independence of states (Oberleitner, 2005 pp.185).

A new form of security was introduced in 1945 which was known as collective security, where security was internationalized allowing states under Chapter VII of the UN Charter to act collectively and, if necessary, with the use of force to uphold or restore international peace and security (Oberleitner, 2005 pp 185). Collective security has continued to dominate the international legal order. The concept has then been broadened by including non-military threats and by reluctantly including internal violence in collective security and peacekeeping activities (ibid).



As the principal concerns of security strategists have changed, however, there has also been a more fundamental rethinking of the very agenda of state security. If many of the newly created states of the formerly colonized world are still quite weak, perhaps the security of the state apparatus which may, after all, be the oppressive tool of the elite ought not to be as significant a concern. A new concept, at times given the name of "Human Security," has been suggested to express the need of individuals for safety in other arenas of basic need access to clean food and water, environmental and energy security, freedom from economic exploitation, protection from arbitrary violence by the police, gangs, or domestic partners, etc. (Sachs, 2003).

Human Security challenges our approach to security in at least two ways, it shifts the focus toward the individual, and it bases security strongly on common values, rather than providing security for abstract entities the state, the notion of Human Security focuses on the security of the well-being, safety, and dignity of individual human beings. In core, it means that there is no secure state with insecure people living in it (Oberleitner 2005).

It seems obvious that in today's world of rising non-traditional, nonconventional, and transnational threats, the protection of borders and the preservation of territorial integrity cannot be the ultimate goal of security. The driving factors of the human security debate, "the constraints on state sovereignty, the mobilization of international civil society in defence of international norms, and the sharing of power between state and non-state actors in a globalizing world leave a clear message, the state is no longer able to monopolize the concept and practice of security" (Oberleitner 2005; p.190).

Emergence of the Concept Human Security

There have been many paradigm changes in social science after the end of the Cold War. Many new ideas emerged, amongst which "Human Security" gained larger importance. It has been embraced by the United Nations (UN) and countries such as Canada and Japan.

During the Cold War period, the notion of security was in general understood in terms of the security of the state and the preservation of its territorial integrity and political sovereignty against military threats (Shinoda, 2004). In the 1980s, the notion of security was broadened to include not only the military and territorial security of a state but also economic and environmental aspects. This concept became to be known as "comprehensive security".

However, the central objective of security was still the State, and although the concept had been "broadened", the taboo to "deepen" it to include the notion of the security of humans was only broken during the 1990s. With this development, the security of the individual became the centre of security strategies, and the concept of human security finally gained recognition.

Acceptance of the notion of human security permitted first a reorientation of the discussion on security towards the individual and away from the previous focus on the state and, second, a broadening of the analysis beyond the military dimension to reach non-military threats to the individual.

The idea to extend the concept of security from state frontiers to individual human beings was first indicated in the Commission's Report on Common Security in 1982 (Shinoda 2004). Thus this report can be seen as the pioneer of the human security paradigm, by stressing that the notion of security has to move away from traditional geopolitical concepts, this document proposes a less military security model.



The exclusive focus on the security of the state (military and strategic approach) is criticized and the importance of the well-being of the people living in a society is stressed. But it was only in the early 1990s that the human security paradigm was first expressly articulated in the context of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) activities (ibid).

The concept of human security was often mentioned before 1994, as the end of the Cold War ushered in the moment for re-examining the “traditional” concept of security. However, it was UNDP's Human Development Report 1994 that made Human Security a common currency among scholars and practitioners of international affairs. Advancing the discussion on “capability” introduced by Amartya Sen and Human Development Report 1993 which first mentioned the concept of human security (ibid). The UNDP Human Development Report 1993 indicates that the individual must be placed at the centre of international affairs. In this document, UNDP stresses that "the concept of security must change from an exclusive stress on national security to a much greater stress on people's security, from security through armaments to security through human development, from territorial security to food, employment, and environmental security" (Zambelli, 2002).

The notion Human Security has been developed in connection with the new development agenda of the post-Cold War period. The UNDP Human Development Report begins with a strong critique of the classic notion of security: The concept of security has far too long been interpreted narrowly as security of territory from external aggression, or as protection of national interests in foreign policy, or as global security from the threat of nuclear holocaust (ibid).

A clearer definition of Human Security is provided by two main aspects, by defining Human Security, first, as "safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression" and, second, as "protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life" the scope of this definition is vast. It refers to seven aspects of human security, economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security, political security (Zambelli 2002).

The drafters declare that they are not interested in defining the exact boundaries of the concept of human security, which should remain "all-encompassing" and "integrative" (Zambelli, 2002). In addition, in drawing attention to the difference between human security and human development, the report indicates that the latter is a "broad concept" referring to "a process of widening the range of people's choice", while the former implies that "people can exercise these choices safely and freely and that they can be relatively confident that the opportunities they have today are not lost tomorrow". This formulation of the concept of Human Security remains still today the most authoritative and quoted formulation of this term (Zambelli 2002).

Significance of Human Security

Two broad phenomena prompted the rise of the concept of human security: the end of the Cold War and the acceleration of globalization. State collapses initiated by the end of the Cold War led to increasing incidences of civil war. Traditional realist (state-centric) security frameworks inadequately capture either sub- or failed state dynamics (MacArthur, 2008).

The concept of human security also arose out of the recognition of state-centric failure to deal with non-military threats to countries and their populations. Many deadly issues fall outside the realm of conventional security analyses. For example mass migrations, transnational crime, environmental



disasters, debt and commodity price crises, and diseases. Roughly 20 percent of the world's population lives on less than a dollar a day, and more than 45 percent on less than two dollars a day. Because of these conditions, approximately 18 million people a year die of preventable causes, many of them are children (Pogge, 2002).

Political and criminal violence on average killed about 800,000 people in 2000 according to the World Health Organization (WHO), compared to 17 million for communicable diseases (Owen, 2005). The nexus of these two phenomena provides the basis for human security, essentially a response to the failures of traditional state-centric and militaristic security frameworks (ibid).

At this point, some characterize the difference between the two conceptions of human security as "freedom from want" versus "freedom from fear." The UNDP Report 1994 posed a direct challenge to the traditional paradigm, and many analysts welcomed the new alternative (MacArthur, 2008).

For Mahbub Ul Haq (MacArthur, 2008), the security of the people is now becoming the dominant concern. Security is increasingly interpreted as security of people, not just territory, security of individuals, not just of nations, security through development, not through arms, security of all people everywhere in their homes, in their jobs, in their streets, in their communities, and in their environment (ibid).

The development of non-traditional security studies aided the development of the Human Security concept. Though critical of Human Security, Barry Buzan's work on securitization and non-traditional threats to the state overlaps to a large degree with the original broad conception that security is no longer solely a military matter (Hampson, 2002). He argues that "as scholars and practitioners developed a better appreciation of how relations of economic interdependence affect the fundamental health and welfare of states, the purview of national security studies and with it, the concept of security expanded" (Hampson, 2002).

Human Security in the 21st Century

As a counterpoint to R2P¹, the Commission on Human Security (CHS) published "Human Security Now" in 2003 (MacArthur, 2008). While acknowledging the need to protect humans from violent conflict, "HS now" builds on the original UNDP broad definition of human security (Commission on Human Security 2003).

Whereas R2P does not discuss the connection between development and large-scale abuses of people, "Human Security now" does. It stresses the centrality of development to the prevention of conflict and the importance of addressing the root causes in addressing conflict in the global system. According to "HS Now", The Commission on Human Security proposes that a global initiative be mobilized to place human security at the top of local, national, regional, and global agendas (MacArthur, 2008). The goals are to prevent conflict and advance human rights and development, to protect and empower people and their communities, and to deepen democratic principles and practices all to promote a Human Security culture and framework.

¹ R2P "Responsibility to Protect" was a report submitted by ICISS in 2001 with the goal of facilitating the development of human security policy.



In contrast to the R2P report, "HS in the 21st century" concentrates its focus on making it clear that there are a variety of interconnected causes of human insecurity. It also stresses that a focus on only one cause will mean the failure to provide adequate capacity-building measures that contribute to sustainable human development.

According to CHS, not only are peace and development important, they are also interconnected. The chain from poverty and deprivation to violent conflict has to be followed carefully. Deprivation persists in countries that do not flare up in conflict, and conflicts flare up in relatively well-off countries. Deprivation and unequal treatment may not generate an immediate revolt, but they can remain in people's memory and influence the course of events much later. While the leaders of conflicts often come from the more prosperous parts of society, poverty can provide rich recruiting grounds for the 'foot soldiers' of violent engagements. The report does not focus on the political feasibility of implementing a broad approach, it simply charts a new normative course for discussions of security (MacArthur, 2008 pp 422).

Human Security Now outlines what has been called the "sustainable human development" concept of Human Security (Ogata and Cels 2003). The challenge then becomes operationalizing these goals. Plans to do so include coordination of a single UN development authority, the implementation of a Tobin tax² to finance Human Security projects, and the bringing together of dispersed agencies (MacArthur, 2008 pp 422). This plan has been strongly supported by the Japanese government and various UN organizations (such as the UNDP), but in recent years it has proven less "sellable" at the international level than R2P. Both at the 2005 World Summit and in the 2006 UNSC resolution, R2P was the focus of debate in cases of large-scale threats to physical security, and no mention was made of economic, environmental, or health factors in the situation or other areas outlined either by "HS now" or the original UNDP 1994 formulation (ibid).

Conclusion

The debate among scholars in recent years shows that there are various traps within human security, like the character of sovereignty, the acceptance of humanitarian law, and humanitarian intervention, all of which influence the usefulness of the concept and which need to be discussed. It is possible that the redefinition of state sovereignty, the building of a global system of accepted humanitarian law, and the idea of the responsibility of the international community for security will lead to the weakening of the state as an independent actor and to the strengthening of direct ties between the individual and the international community (states as well as international organizations). This makes the concept more significant in the days to come.

As we see in the concept of Human Security has been discussed for the last decade or two, and scholars as well as politicians have been unable to find a successful and satisfactory solution as regards definition. The human security concept today is incorporated into the agenda of various international organizations but the conception used is very different, leading to different instruments used by those organizations for ensuring and promoting the security of the individual.

² Tobian Tax is a fee levied on transactions which 'externalize' costs to the global commons. Some suggestions have been for fossil fuels, currency trading and capital movements, and arms shipments.



References

1. Oberleitner, Gerd (2005), "Human Security: A Challenge to International Law?" *Global Governance*, 11 (2), 185-203
2. MacArthur, Julie (2008), "A Responsibility to Rethink? Challenging Paradigms in Human Security" *International Journal*, 63 (2), 422-443
3. Fen, Hampson (2002) *Madness in the Multitude: Human Security and World Disorder*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
4. Ogata, Sadako and Cels Johan (2003), "Human Security-Protecting and Empowering the People" *Global Governance*, 9(3), 273-282
5. Busumtwi-Sam, J. (2002). Development and Human Security: Whose Security, and from What? *International Journal*, 57(2), 253.
6. Zambelli, Mirko (2002), "Putting people at the centre of the international agenda: the human security approach" *DieFriedens Warte*, Vol 7 no.2 pp 173-186
7. Georg Frerks, & Berma Klein Goldewijk. (2007). *Human security and international insecurity*. Wageningen Academic Publishers.
8. Shinoda, Hedeaki (2004) 'The Concept of Human Security: Historical and Theoretical Implications', *Conflict and Human Security: A Search for New Approaches of Peace-building*, IPSHU English Research Report Series No.19, pp. 5-22
9. Pogge, Thomas (2002) *World Poverty and Human Rights: Cosmopolitan Responsibilities and Reforms*. Cambridge: Polity Press.