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3.1 Introduction

Social and economic conditions profoundly impact health, disease, and the practice of medicine. So, a discourse on health is also a social, economic, and political discourse.

Rudolf Virchow, the German Physician and considered by many as the founder of Social Medicine, identifies social factors, such as poverty and lack of education and democracy, as key elements in the development of epidemics. Salvador Allende, a public health physician, who served as Chilean minister of health in 1930s (became the president of the country in 1971 and led the Popular Unity Government till 1973) and also produced an analysis of the social origins of suffering in Chile, argued that the solution to health problems lay not simply in improved medical care but also in better sanitation, housing, nutrition, and working conditions. These concerns have also been expressed by liberal humanists like Amartya Sen and his followers in the context of India and other third world countries.

A radical perspective, on the other, reveals that health is embedded into the social dynamics; class, caste, gender equations of the society; accumulation and distribution of wealth and property; political vision of the state and many other related issues. Development alone cannot ensure a healthy or disease-free society.

This is the rationality behind bringing the issue of health security to the centre stage of overall human security of a society.

The current generation of debate on development and democracy is highly influenced by the notion of human security, developed and propagated by the United Nations Development Programme. However, the discourse on human security has not entirely been steered by the UNDP alone. Different other schools on human security
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1 *UNDP Human Development Report 1994* is important in this regard. The main theme of this Report was Human Security. However, one finds lot of convergences between the notion of human
developed in the recent. Whereas, there are convergences among various schools of human security on their vital concerns, but, there are difference in identifying the structural or procedural constraints towards its realization.

With its growing popularity, human security has appeared to succeed in providing an alternative or midway imagination to the two historically opposite discourses on development and democracy- liberalism and Marxism. UNDP engineered human security, nevertheless, draws its basic premises from classical liberalism. At a moment of aggressive campaign and consolidation of neo-liberal market economy and its severe negative implications on life and livelihood of larger majority around the world, UNDP's intervention through its notions either of human development or human security, helps towards demystification of the high claims of self-regulated market economy. UNDP also exposes the false proclaims of inherent relationship between neo-liberalism and that of liberty, freedom and unbridled progress. But, at the same time, UNDP's success has also helped towards putting aside the structural hurdles of development and democracy or of human security- most important of which is capitalism itself. This has, in the long run, contributed towards longevity of capitalism through a disguise form of humane capitalism. The debate on human security and human development, pioneered by UNDP, provides legitimacy towards the collective base and necessity of politics and democracy- very dogmatically rejected by neo-liberal market forces. But, at the same time, it also helps in de-legitimizing discourses striving for structural transformation of capitalism- either by revolutionary or peaceful means. It has, no doubt, explored the inter-relationship between macro policies and micro developments, but at the same time rejected the revolutionary transformation of whole macro process- the current hegemonic world order. It is a discourse of reforming capitalism, rather than a discourse of withering away of capitalism. Class in the line of Marxism is out of reference in UNDP engineered discourse on human development and human security. The proliferation of the notion of human security has succeeded in laying down the alternative parameters of development and democracy. But, despite its one and half decades of campaign, UNDP has miserably failed to contain the aggressive campaign and operation of neo-

development and human security and all UNDP human development reports published in the post 1994 period reflected on new concerns of human security.
liberal market economy. Richard Jolly\textsuperscript{2} from within the UNDP School of human development/security has argued that despite strong reservations expressed about neo-liberalism by UNDP, it (neo-liberalism) still continues to set the framework for economic policy internationally.

The notion of human security, although, different from other notions like human rights or human development etc., however, the substantive analysis of these three categories reveals many similarities among these three categories, despite the fact that each has got its own specific focus. All these discourses are concerned with same sort of human entitlements and thereby one compliments the other more than one way.

The central thrust of these three notions i.e. human right, human development and human security- can be defined in the following way.

Discourse on human rights recognizes people’s wide-ranging demands for liberation as legal entitlements;

Discourse on human development focuses on the required path of development facilitating the fulfillment of those legal entitlements;

Discourse on human security that corresponds to and transcends the discourse on human development strongly focuses on the actual state of wide ranging conditionalities providing opportunities or putting hindrances towards the fulfillment of those legal entitlements. This needs to be stated here that the trajectory of human rights, human development and human security has been creative in nature and in consonance with the ever expanding range of people’s concerns reflecting through people’s movements, the horizon of rights, development and security have also got expanded.

So, the trajectory of human security as a theoretical discourse needs to take into account the trajectory both of human rights as well as human development. The other

important point needs to be sated is that it is the United Nations that played a very crucial role in laying down the basic parameters of all these three notions.

But, as suggested, the very notion of human security can target separate set of obstacle depending on ideological orientation of the researcher. On the other, the revolutionary forces, opposing and fighting hegemonic (capitalist) globalization, have come up with alternative imagination of human security. So, a substantive discourse on human security has to take into account all these complex and conflicting issues involved in.

The Trajectory of Human Security is very long. It stated with the notion of national security. The notion of national security considers the people living within the territorial boundary of a nation-state system as homogeneous category. Accordingly, it perceives that if the lives of the people of a definite geographical territory are secure from external enemies- or enemies across the boarder, than they are secure in other spheres of their lives. The traditional discourse of international politics was obsessed with this notion of national security. The mainstream discourse of political science is still obsessed with the notion of unviable nature of territorial sovereignty, which automatically brings into focus the issue of national security. This issue has not yet got exhausted particularly in the state-centric political discourse. The 9/11 attacks on World Trade Centre (WTC) and Pentagon and the aggressive campaign led by Bush administration of the United States on this issue has added new magnitude to the concern for national security. In India too, for example, the Union Cabinet has got a separate Cabinet Committee on Security (CCS) exclusively focusing on ‘national military and territorial security’.

However, with the consolidation of the democratic movements- movements of the working class or other marginalized categories like the women or the black- both in
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3 Samuel Huntington, in his new book *Who Are We* (2005) informs that just after the attack the sale of the National Flag in the US increased in an unprecedented way signifying the core concern of national security.

4 At this moment of intensive campaign for human security, India’s priority has been military and territorial security. For this purpose, the coercive apparatuses of the state have been consolidated through various draconian laws like POTA, AFSPA etc. POTA, although, has been repealed by the new UPA Government, but the powers invested in this Act has been transferred to other existing laws.
the developed west and in the developing east, the limitation of national security to bring human security/rights got gradually exposed. As a result, the discourse on human rights/security assumed tremendous significance. The upheavals in the interwar period and both of atrocities by and the weakening of the capitalist bloc; anti-colonial movements in the third world countries and establishment of socialist regimes in the erstwhile USSR added new energy to the discourse on security concerns and accordingly the concern of security transcended the obsession with national or territorial security. Establishment of United Nations Organizations (UNO), now United Nations (UN) was a significant milestone in this regard. The first significant development having far reaching implication on human security in the long run was the adoption and enactment of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948. This Declaration was and still remains a substantive document as it focuses on hitherto neglected areas of human concerns.

3.2 Discourse on Rights/Human Rights

Discourse on rights started along with the consolidation of the bourgeoisie revolution. Three basic rights—rights to life; right to liberty and right to private property—outlined by John Locke, the renowned social contract theorist and the pioneer of liberalism, have been important milestones in this regard. The bourgeoisie revolution and liberalism passed through a long trajectory and accordingly the discourse on rights also got enriched in the long run. The issue of rights got legal entitlement particularly through two epoch making events in history—American War of Independence 1776 resulting in the enactment and endorsement of Bill of Rights and French Revolution 1789 resulting in enactment and endorsement of the French Declaration of the Rights of Men and Citizen. In the recent past, these two events have again been brought into focus and has also been romanticized and glorified. It has been argued that these two events contained the very possibility of total democratic liberation of human kind—necessitating no further ideological evolution for humane governance. Francis Fukuyama has defined it as a real case of End of History.

However, in consonance with the logic of bourgeoisie economy and the principles of liberalism— the rights have been projected as negative and individualistic in nature.
These negative connotations of rights do not allow the state or any collective agency to perform anything in the name of collective well-being. This is being legitimized on the ground that every body enjoys equal statutory rights in a bourgeoisie society. Bourgeoisie society and economy have not, however, been based on equality.\textsuperscript{6} The majority could not vote, assemble as they chose, 'publish and be damned', join a trade union, hold many posts if they were Dissenters, vote or dispose of property if they were women.\textsuperscript{7} Things, however, got gradually changed once capitalism developed more contradictions and the marginalized/exploited communities/categories developed political consciousness and started demanding varieties of rights. The struggles by the majority of the ordinary people and the labouring classes to win for them these political and civil rights constituted the basis of the reform movements of the nineteenth century. These did not alter the fundamental form of the liberal state but they substantially modified it by deepening its popular base and its democratic contents. "In the end 'democracy' was grafted on the liberal state, to create that hybrid variant which has to be distinguished from the classical liberalism: the liberal democratic state."\textsuperscript{8} From late nineteenth century onwards, the liberal theorists asserted for a collectivist and positive criteria for rights opening up the domain of the state for collective action. This was a turning point in the liberal discourse on rights. This move towards collectivism was reinforced from two directions.\textsuperscript{9} The dominant classes supported it in the name of greater 'national efficiency'. The working classes, the poor and unemployed, supported it because they believed that only through the state reform would be imposed on industrial capitalism, which would improve their living conditions, greater economic equality and social justice.

These concerns got priority through other developments both within and outside the liberal world like the October Revolution 1917; consolidation of trade union movements in the west and anti-colonial movements in the third world. These developments focused on radical alteration of the notion of bourgeoisie rights. The

\textsuperscript{5} Francis Fukuyama's \textit{The End of History?} (1989) and \textit{The End of History and the Last Man} (1992).
\textsuperscript{6} This is due to the private ownership of property and also for this ownership being confined to minority section of the society. As Marx explained, under capitalism, larger majority is without private property and their only asset of livelihood is their wage.
\textsuperscript{7} Stuart Hall (1993) \textit{The State in Question} in McLennan et al (edited) \textit{The Idea of the Modern State} p 10
\textsuperscript{8} Ibid p 11
\textsuperscript{9} Ibid p 11
United Nations Organization (UNO) was inaugurated in these changing circumstances. Accordingly, the notion of rights assumed greater intensity. Right no longer remained extremely confined to personal concerns. The structural hindrances drew attention of the policy makers. Once it happened, collective responsibility of the state towards the enlargement of rights assumed legitimacy. State emerged as a public domain, as against the inherent rationality of bourgeoisie economy. The notion of right itself had undergone changes and got proliferated through various Declarations of the UNO. It started with the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948*, which proclaims: “...this Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of member states themselves and among the peoples of territories under jurisdiction.”

The Universal Declaration basically talks of individual rights. However, it also focuses on the need of collective endeavour for the realization of some rights like the right to social security.

The Universal Declaration on Human Rights was followed by set of other Covenants and Declarations under the auspices of the United Nations and the important among them are: *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* (adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 16 December 1966 that came into force on 3 January 1976); *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* (adopted by the General Assembly of United Nations on 16 December 1966 that came into force on 23 March 1976); *Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination against Women* (adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 18 December 1979 that came into force on 3 September 1981); *Declaration on the Right to Development* (adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 4 December 1986); *Convention on the Rights of the Child* (adopted by the General Assembly of the United nations on 20 November 1989 that came into force on September 1990); *The Vienna Declaration and the Programme of Action*
These wide ranging rights are procedural in nature, as these rights asserts for due recognition as legal rights and also their insertion in legal constitutional documents. However, their fulfillment or materialization demands substantive change in the very mode of development thinking. In the mainstream development discourse, it was economic growth that was of central concern, with human rights remaining largely marginal. While development discourse evolved through various phases, focusing on Gross National Product, 'basic needs', 'structural adjustment' and so on, a focus on rights was missing. The definition of 'development' had a primary focus on economic growth and material prosperity to the exclusion of the freedom, dignity and overall 'well-being' of the people, and development was not linked to human rights standards.\footnote{The Right to Development: A Primer (2004) Ibid p 44}

The concept of Right to Development (RTD) provided the missing link between these two discourses. It challenged the artificial division between two sets of human rights and established the 'unity of rights' as a prerequisite to 'development'. Coined by the Senegalese jurist Keba M'Baye, in 1972, the term has been debated extensively in various international fora. On 4 December 1986, the United Nations General Assembly formally adopted the Declaration on the Right to Development.\footnote{Ibid p 44}

The Right to Development is an overarching composite right, which comprises Civil and Political Rights (CPRs) as well as Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ESCRs). This is established by the fact that Right to Development (RTD) is defined as the right to particular process of development that ensures the realization of all human rights- civil, political economic, social and cultural. The realization of human rights is not just a legalistic process wherein courts can enforce certain rights. It is dependent on the existence of a particular socio-economic environment, the creation of which may require economic growth.\footnote{Ibid p 44}
The Right to Development was provided an institutional set up with the UNDP embarking upon a huge project of publication of *Annual Human Development Reports* since 1990. Two important economists from Asia- Professor Amartya Sen and Mehbub ul -Haque pioneered the discourse on human development, sponsored by UNDP. This approach stresses that the fulfillment of the basic human rights right like right to life- requires access to wide ranging opportunities like access to safe drinking water, improved sanitation, essential drugs, basic education, adequate livelihood etc.

The basic idea of human development- that enriching the lives of freedoms of ordinary people is fundamental- has much in common with the concerns expressed by Declarations of Human Rights. The promotion of human development and the fulfillment of human rights share, in many ways, a common motivation, and reflect a fundamental commitment to promoting freedom, well being and dignity of individuals in all societies.

### 3.3 Discourse on Human Development

Outlining the basic thrust of human development approach, Fukuda-Parr and Shiv Kumar writes: ‘The term “human development” has come to be accepted in the development economics literature as an expansion of human capabilities, a widening of choices, an enhancement of freedoms and a fulfillment of human rights. Rising incomes and expanding outputs, in the human development framework, are seen as the *means* and not the *ends* of development. Indeed defining people’s well being as the end of development and treating economic growth, as a means have been central messages of the *Annual Human Development Reports* published since 1990’. ¹³

There are several implications in adopting this development approach and framework, argues Fukuda-Parr and Shiv Kumar. First of all, higher income helps many people realize valuable ends and fulfill many aspirations. But, higher incomes not necessarily ensure that which people cherish and value. For example, levels of environmental pollution, safety, crime, and domestic violence, or the quality of education and health care, may not be associated with levels of income in any predictable manner.
“Therefore, the focus of the policy cannot be based merely on the generation of more and more income. How additional income is used, and the degree to which it improves the quality of people’s lives, must be given equal weight.”

Second, as a corollary, the human development approach generates a new set of evaluative questions to assess the impact of development policies. The evaluative criteria will ask: are people truly enjoying an expansion in their capabilities— the capability to lead a healthy and creative life, to be well-nourished, to be secure, to be well informed, and educated. Has there been a significant improvement in the quality of people’s lives? Do they cherish what they cherish? How free are they? How equal? Ultimately, progress has to be judged by an expansions of freedoms, “Freedom to do what you want to do and to be what you want to be.”

Third, focusing on human lives as the goal of development results in the articulation of very different policy concerns that are rooted in the advancement of people’s well being. Thus, in the human development framework, discussion on globalization goes beyond examining the impact on trade, capital flows and economic growth, to consider the changing opportunities and new insecurities in people’s lives. Similarly, a discussion on technology is not confined to its impact on the economy, or for that matter to productivity increases, employment creation and trends in the stock market. In the human development framework, technology becomes a mechanism for promoting human development, rather than a reward of higher incomes. The focus, accordingly, is on public policies that make new technologies work for human development— on shifting investment priorities to end human poverty. Like wise a people-centred approach stresses human security, not military security— that is security of people, not of territory. In other words, the exercise of policy formulation overall becomes one of ensuring not merely growth as such, but growth that promotes human development.

---

13 Introduction by Sakiko Fukuda-Parr and Shiva Kumar in Readings in Human Development (2003) p xxii
14 Ibid p xxii
15 Ibid p xxii
16 Ibid p xxii
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Fourth, human development is motivated by a concern for freedom, well being and the dignity of individuals in society, issues that are not conventionally regarded as central to policy formulation. Human development is concerned with full range of capabilities that cannot be exercised without political and civil guarantees. Indeed, the human development approach emphasizes political and social freedoms through enhanced participation and inclusive democracy as fundamental to the realization of and sustainability of social and economic goals. In human development approach people are not regarded as passive beneficiaries of services to meet basic needs. Nor does the expansion of people’s knowledge and health take place for the sole purpose of promoting the economy. Instead people are seen as active agents of change.  

Mahbub ul Haq, the distinguished economist who steered the UNDP project on Human Development Report, defined human development as holistic approach. “The human development paradigm covers all aspects of development—whether economic growth or international trade, budget deficits or fiscal policy, saving or investment or technology, basic social services or safety nets for the poor. No aspect of the development model falls outside its scope, but the vantage point is the widening of people’s choices and the enrichment of their lives. All aspects of life—economic, political or cultural— are viewed from that perspective.”  

Haq argues that there is fairly broad agreement on the following aspects of human development:

• Development must put people at the centre of its concerns.
• The purpose of development is to enlarge all human choices, not just income.
• The human development paradigm is concerned both with building up human capabilities (through investment in people) and with using those human capabilities fully (through an enabling framework for growth and employment).
• Human development has four essential pillars: equality, sustainability, productivity and empowerment It regards economic growth as an essential but

17 ibid p xxii
emphasizes the need to pay attention to its quality and distribution, analyses at length its link with human lives and questions its long term sustainability.

- The human development paradigm defines the ends of development and analyses sensible options for achieving them.\(^{19}\)

Haq argues that there are four ways to create the desirable links between economic growth and human development.\(^{20}\)

First, emphasis on investment in education, health and skills of the people that can enable them to participate in the growth process as well as to share its benefits, principally through remunerative employment.

Second, more equitable distribution of income and assets is critical for creating a close link between economic growth and human development. Wherever the distribution of income and assets is very uneven (as in Brazil, Nigeria and Pakistan), high GNP growth rate have failed to translate into people’s lives.

Third, some countries have managed to make significant improvements in human development even in the absence of good growth or good distribution. They have achieved this result through well-structured social expenditures by the Government. Cuba, Jamaica, Sri Lanka and Zimbabwe, among others achieved fairly impressive results through the generous state provision of social services. So did many countries in Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). But, such experiments generally are not sustainable unless the economic base expands enough to support the social base.

Fourth, the empowerment of people-particularly women- is sure way to link growth and human development. In fact, empowerment should accompany all aspects of life. If people can exercise their choices in the political, social and economic spheres, there is a good prospect that growth will be strong, democratic, participatory and durable.

\(^{19}\) ibid p 19
\(^{20}\) ibid p 20
Amartya Sen, one of the pioneers of this approach, has defined it as *Capability Approach*, which sees human life as a set of “doings and beings” - also called as “functionings”. This approach relates the evaluation of the quality of life to the assessment of capability to function. It is an approach, as asserted by Amartya Sen, whose roots go back at least to Adam Smith and Karl Marx, and indeed to Aristotle.  

One of the important merits of the UNDP discourse on human development/human security pioneered by the UNDP is to lay down a set of new criteria to measure the progress of a society, defined as *Human Development Index* (HDI). It expresses huge skepticisms about *Gross National Product* (GNP) or *Gross Domestic Product* (GDP) used in the dominant discourse on development. New Indexes were added in the evolution of the Human Development Reports in the last more than one and half decades like *Human Poverty Index* (HPI) or *Gender Development Index* (GDI) as important criteria to measure human progress of a society.

Mahbub ul Haq- the architect of the HDI for the UNDP, opines that the search for a new composite index of socio-economic progress began in the earnest in preparing the Human Development Report under the sponsorship of UNDP in 1989. Several principles guided this search. The most important among them was the principle that the new human development index (HDI) would measure the basic concept of human development to enlarge people’s choices. These choices covered the desire to live long, to acquire knowledge, to have a comfortable standard of living, to be gainfully employed, to breathe clean air, to be free, to live in a community.

3.4 Going Beyond the Human Development Index

Although the HDI was widely accepted as a major policy instrument and useful policy tool within a few years after its introduction, it was recognized first as a measure of average achievements in human development. However, gradually it was realized that it could reflect neither the deprivation nor the distributional aspects of development, particularly the issue of inequality.


Over the years, attempts have been made to rectify this situation. First, in 1995, composite indices were constructed to account for greater inequalities. Second in 1997, a composite index was proposed and constructed for measuring the multidimensionality of poverty. Third, these composite indices were disaggregated in terms of regions, states, provinces, gender, races, ethnic groups and rural-urban divide.

3.4.1 The Gender Related Development Index and the Gender Empowerment Measure

The issue of gender disparity has been a focal point of hot debate throughout the history of political discourse. The mainstream discourses on development and democracy have been blamed as patriarchal in nature. Coming into being amidst political struggles against various forms of patriarchal domination, UNDP realized that the issue of gender parity/disparity must be important indicators of a discourse on human development. Accordingly, a gender related development index (GDI) and a gender empowerment measure (GEM) emerged in 1995. The GDI measures achievements in the same dimensions and variables as the HDI, but takes into account inequality in achievements between women and man. The greater the gender disparity in human development, the lower is a country's GDI compared to its HDI. The GDI is simply the HDI adjusted downwards for gender inequality. The GEM indicates whether women are able to actively participate in economic and political life. It focuses on participation, measuring gender inequality in key areas of economic and political participation and decision-making.

3.4.2 The Human Poverty Index

Poverty remains a core concern in all discourse on development and democracy. But, poverty cannot be reduced to any one-dimensional category. It is multi-dimensional in nature and embedded into different domains of social life. Realizing this multi-dimensional nature of poverty, UNDP, in 1997, explored a composite measure to evaluate the phenomenon of poverty- the human poverty index (HPI). The idea was first to look at human development from a perspective of deprivation, and second to assess how the benefits of human development- as measured by the average
achievements represented by the HDI are distributed. The HDI basically measures shortfalls in average achievements, but it cannot reflect the two issues above. Therefore, the HPI was constructed both for developing countries (HPI-1) in 1997 and for industrial countries (HPI-2) in 1998.

The HPI measures deprivation in basic human development in the same dimensions as the HDI, while also including the aspect of participation for social inclusion.

However, different composite indicator like HDI, HPI or GDI indicates only average achievement in different spheres of social life. All these do not constitute the true state of human development. Human development is more than that. It goes beyond the quantified achievement and involves normative-non-quantified dimensions too. However, as has been pointed out by Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, there has been a tendency to imprison human development strategies and ideas within the human development index. Fukuda-Parr has very categorically stated that the success of the HDI has only served to reinforce the narrow interpretation of human development. “Two flaws in the initial design of the HDI- the simplification of a complex idea, and the exclusion of references to political freedoms and participation- continue to haunt the concept. Despite careful efforts to explain that the notion of human development is much broader than its measure, the HDI’s message is that the essential human development objectives are to expand education, literacy, health and survival, and to raise incomes. The power of HDI as a communications tool has proved difficult to moderate”.

3.5 Discourse on Human Security

Human Security, like human development, assumes huge popularity with the UNDP launching a special report on it through its 1994 Human Development Report. Launched in Copenhagen on 1 June 1994, this report underscored the new imperatives of human security in the post cold war era. Security is now increasingly interpreted as the security of people in their daily lives- in their homes, in their jobs, in their streets, in their communities and in the environment.
With this intervention of the UNDP, the concept of security has undergone changes in two basic ways:

- From an exclusive stress on territorial security to a much greater people’s security.
- From security through armaments to security through sustainable human development.\(^{24}\)

UNDP defines human security as the ‘legitimate concern’ of the ‘ordinary people’ in their daily lives, for whom security symbolises “protection from the threat of disease, hunger, unemployment, crime, social conflict, political repression and environmental hazards.”\(^{25}\) To be very specific, according to UNDP “human security is a child who did not die, a disease that did not spread, a job that was not cut, an ethnic tension that did not explode in violence, a dissident who was not silenced. Human Security is not a concern with weapon- it is a concern with human life and dignity.”\(^{26}\)

Outlining the relationship between human security and human development, UNDP clearly states that although, human security should not be equated with human development, however, there is a link between the two. “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, and the history is replete with examples.” UNDP defines human development as a process of widening the range of people’s choices, and human security as people’s capacity to exercise these choices safely and freely.

Discourse on Human Security invites multiple perceptual changes. First of all, human security must be regarded as universal, global and indivisible. Stressing on the universal dimension of the notion of human security Mahbub ul Haq argues: “Just imagine for a moment that every disease that every drug quietly kills, every disease that silently travels, every form of pollution that roams the globe and every act of senseless terrorism all carried a national label of origin, much as traded goods do.

\(^{24}\) UNDP Human Development Report 2004 p 22
\(^{25}\) Ibid p 22
\(^{26}\) Ibid p 23
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That would bring sudden realization that human security concerns today are more
global than even global trade."27

A second perception must change: it must be recognized that poverty cannot be
stopped at national borders. Poor people may be stopped. But not the tragic
consequences of their poverty: drugs, AIDS, pollution and terrorism. When people
travel, they bring much dynamism and creativity with them. But when only their
poverty travels, it brings nothing but human misery.

Haq stresses on one more perceptual change: it must be seen that it is easier, more
humane, and less costly to deal with new issues of human security upstream than
downstream. He ridicules the very approach practiced in the past decade to incur the
staggering cost of $240 billion for HIV/AIDS treatment and neglecting the very
issue of primary health care. Haq pointed out that investing even a small fraction of that
amount in primary health care and family planning education might have prevented
such a fast spread of this deadly disease. Haq also questioned: "Is it a great tribute to
international diplomacy to spend $2 billion in a single year on soldiers in Somalia to
deliver humanitarian assistance when investing the same amount much easier in
increased domestic food production and social development might have averted the
final human tragedy- not just for one year, but for a long time to come? Is it a
reflection of human ingenuity to spend hundreds of billions of dollars on
administrative control of drug trafficking and on the rehabilitation of drug addicts but
not even a small part of that amount for drug education of consumers or alternative
livelihoods for producers?"28

Haq argues that the emerging concept of human security will lead to many
fundamental changes in thinking.

First, new models of human development will treat GNP as a means, not as an end;
enhance human life, not marginalize it; replenish natural resources, not run them

28 ibid p 30
down; and encourage grassroots participation of people in the events and processes that shape their lives.

Second, a new framework of development cooperation must be based on global compact among nations, not on charity. The 1994 report outlined a new design for development cooperation in the coming decades:

* Aid is regarded as an essential investment by the rich nations in their own human security.
* Developing countries are compensated for trade and immigration barriers imposed by the rich nations.
* Polluting nations are made to pay for their overuse of the global commons.
* The potential peace dividend of nearly $500 billion between 1995 and 2000 is earmarked primarily for the priority human development agenda.
* Global compacts are negotiated in specific areas-population, environment, drug control- between rich and the poor nations based on two way cooperation, not on one-way conditionality or coercion.29

Third, the new imperatives of global human security demand an entirely new system of global governance- particularly a greatly strengthened role of the United Nations in development. In this context, the 1994 report offered at least six concrete proposals for consideration by the global community.

• A world social charter, to arrive at a new social contract among all nations and all people.
• A 3% annual reduction in global military spending, with 20% of the savings by rich nations and 10% of those by poor nations earmarked for global human security.
• A 20:20 compact for human development- to provide basic education, primary health care, safe drinking water and essential family planning services to all people over the next decade, by earmarking 20% of existing developing country

29 Ibid p 32
budgets and 20\% of existing aid allocations to these basic human priority concerns.

- A global human security fund - financed from such global taxes as the "Tobin tax" on speculative movements of international funds, an international tax on the consumption of non-renewable energy, global environmental permits and a tax on arms trade.

- A new framework of development cooperation, in which developing and industrial countries would graduate from their present aid relationship to a more mature development partnership - by including trade, technology, investment and labour flows in a broader design to be negotiated among nations.

- An Economic Security Council in the United Nations, as the highest decision making forum to consider basic issues of human security such as global poverty, unemployment, food security, drug trafficking, global pollution, international migration and a new framework of sustainable human development.\(^{30}\)

The concern for human security received another boost with the adoption of Millennium Declaration in the year 2000 - adopted at the largest-ever gathering of heads of state, committed countries-rich and poor-to doing all they can to eradicate poverty, promote human dignity and equality and achieve peace, democracy and environmental sustainability.\(^{31}\)

Emanating from it, the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) bind countries to do more in the attack on inadequate incomes, widespread hunger, gender inequality, environmental deterioration, and lack of education, health care and clean water. MDG lays down a time framework for the achievement of those goals, which are crucial for vital/basic security of every human being. MDG basically focuses on eight important goals.\(^{32}\)

(1) Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger;

\(^{30}\) ibid p 32-33
\(^{32}\) Ibid pp 1-3
(2) Achieve universal primary education;
(3) Promote gender equality and empower women;
(4) Reduce child mortality;
(5) Improve maternal health;
(6) Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases;
(7) Ensure environmental sustainability;
(8) Develop global partnership for development.

It has clearly been stated that today’s world has greater resources and know-how than ever before to tackle the challenges of infectious disease, low productivity; lack of clean energy and transport and lack of basic services such as clean water, sanitation, schools and health care. So, the issue is “how best to apply these resources and know how to benefit the poorest people”.

UNDP has also clearly stated that prioritizing market over democratic politics, as has been done by the current regime of neo-liberal global economy, is not going to bring solution to these problems that the human kind is facing today. Rather, democratic politics has to play the decisive role. The 2002 Human Development Report, titled *Deepening Democracy in a Fragmented World* has been an important milestone in this regard. The Report very categorically argues that mere economic growth, even achievements in crucial indicators related to human security/development, is not enough unless and until people themselves are engaged in deciding what kind of security or development they want. Security or development cannot be one-way imposition.

Recognition of plural dimension of a society- both historically and culturally, is important in this regard. True human development/security necessitates the crumbling of the regimented views on development/security and recognition of cultural or anthropological diversity that influence in determining a genuine course of development/security of a society. Recognizing this plural dimension and cultural significance of human development/security UNDP Human Development Report 2004 titled *Cultural Liberty in Today’s Diverse World* argues the regimented views on
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culture and particularly treating some culture as advanced and civilized and for that matter conducive for development and other cultures not are not based on proper understanding of history. For example, Max Weber’s explanation of the Protestant ethic as a key factor behind successful growth of capitalism is, although, persuasive, but cannot explain a situation like why catholic countries like France and Italy were growing faster than Protestant Britain and Germany. Even if it is being said that Christianity is conducive for capitalist development then also it cannot explain the situation why Japan, the Republic of Korea, Thailand and other East Asian countries achieved tremendous growth rate despite being affiliated to Confucianism.34

The same is true in case of democracy too. A new wave of cultural determinism is starting to hold sway in some policy debates, attributing the failures of democratization in the non-Western world to inherent cultural traits of intolerance and “authoritarian values”. Samuel Huntington argued that the 21st century would see a ‘clash of civilization’, that the future of democratic and tolerant Western states is threatened by non-western states with more authoritarian values. UNDP, however, argues that the West has no monopoly on democracy or tolerance, and there is no unique line of historical division between a tolerant and democratic West and a despotic east.35

UNDP advocates an alternative approach that respects and promotes diversity while keeping countries open to global flows of capital, goods and people. That invites policies respecting cultural liberty. The current wave of globalization has, however, brought many challenges to this liberty based on diversity. It has also insisted upon respecting traditional wisdom developed through historical practices of different communities, which can positively contribute towards substantive human security. What needs to be ensured is that cultural liberty should not lead towards isolationism, exclusion and conservatism.

UNDP’s intervention has exposed the loopholes of the existing global economic and political order. UNDP has been seriously engaged in for a more humane global order.

35 Ibid p 5
and it has very minutely and comprehensively analyzed and documented various issues related to basic human security around the world.

However, UNDP's discourse of human development/security has generated a permissible critique of the existing undemocratic/hierarchical and patriarchal socio-political order at all levels- international, national, regional and local. This order constantly put hindrances towards the realization of wide ranging human security. UNDP proposes a reformist agenda than a structural change. The vital issues like property relationship, class structures, patriarchy and its social roots etc have not been questioned. The UNDP discourse is married to a humanitarian school within liberalism. However, it is not even radical liberalism as is the case, for example, with Rajni Kothari or C. B. Macpherson. Both Kothari and Macpherson raised some pertinent structural issues related to deprivation and marginalization. Macpherson questioned the rationality of private property as a facilitator of democracy. Rajni Kothari developed a very strong critique of existing state and its apparatuses, the wisdom of technology and industrialization and also explored the alternative means of democracy, development and people's rights. Focusing on the contemporary reality that intensifies human insecurity, Kothari writes: "The contemporary reality is full of contradictions- of overproduction and scarcity, of information explosion and increasing ignorance, of proliferation of commodities and shrinkages in nature’s diversity, of affluence and poverty, of states that are too strong and too vulnerable. Ecological change and cultural destruction are crucial to contemporary change. In the most extreme cases, these paradoxical situations are threatening the very foundation of life, people and the planet." 36

Kothari reminds us that there has also been erosion of the credibility of democratic institutions including the state and consolidation of a sense of uncertainty and insecurity in mass mind. Kothari argues that the growing vacuums created by the undermining of institutions and the decline of the democratic temper have been filled up by specialists in violence, corruption, private arms trade and gang warfare. Reflecting on the reduced role of the state as mediator in social conflicts and the

growing loss of faith in the political process among both the ‘operators of the system’ and the people at large, Kothari states that it has resulted in “large scale social violence, the rise of negativist tendencies (‘communal’ and otherwise) and doctrines of exclusion and dispensability according to which entire populations are looked upon as undesirable and unwarranted.”

People have, of course, responded actively towards those erosions and exclusionary tendencies from a wide variety of vantage points. There has, however, been a paradigmatic shift in the forms of people’s struggles. We witnessed in the recent past a transition from class based struggles against hegemonies of upper castes and classes to the wide spectrum of the struggle at different levels in the society. For example, struggles for women’s rights; new assertions of peripheral and forcibly displaced communities against rampant destruction of their environments and natural resources; tribal uprisings for safeguarding their lifestyles; strident defence of cultures, regional identities and nationalities etc. constitute a broad range of popular awakening, protests and social movements. Kothari has also pointed out that people’s commitments to and faith in democratic values have been rising precisely when these have been in decline among the elites. “The result is a marked transformation in the social basis of democracy- from early liberal defence of incremental diffusion of institutional space to more radical assertion of ‘civil liberties’ and ‘democratic rights’. Paradoxically, most of these struggles and demands are directed to the state, the same state that is otherwise under attack from both global and parochial pressures. The people are still committed to the state though the state seems to pass into the hands of the interests that have no commitment to, or even compassion for, the people.”

Kothari and the other radical-liberal-humanists have brought into the forefront some very important issues related to humane governance and humane security transcending the limited vision of liberal paradigm. Their unique distinction has been to relate security or democracy with the issue of politics- politics defined in a very creative way and not confining it to a state-centric electoral process. Rather, they look into politics from the perspective of peoples struggles for substantive security.

---
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Contestation against hegemonic design in multiple forms for domination and subjugation has been their mission both as theorists and political activists.

In the recent past, from the perspective of Creative Marxist School, a set of new theorizations has been offered on human security. A new generation of Marxists, particularly from the third world countries, has addressed the issue of human security/insecurity transcending the orthodoxy of ‘economic determinism’ followed by the traditional Marxists. For example, Manoranjan Mohanty, a leading Marxist thinker in India, argues that people’s all-round security can be ensured by a ‘Creative Society’. Mohanty’s notion of creative society refers to “a phase of development of a society in which a large number of potential contradictions become articulate and active. This is most evident when oppressed social groups get politically mobilized and demand their rights.” Referring to the current moment in history, particularly in the context of India, Mohanty argues that the upsurge of peasants and tribals, the movements for regional autonomy and self-determination, the environmental movements and the women’s movements in the developing countries are marks of the emergence of creative society in contemporary times. The notion of creative society is plural in nature as the forms of social movements and their intensity may vary from country to country and also from place to place within a country.

Mohanty identifies capitalism as one of the important hindrances towards the realization of substantive human/people’s security. Capitalism-in-practice has violated the primary postulates of itself that it (capitalism) generated through its fight against feudalism. For example, on inception, capitalism’s primary postulates were centered on creativity and individual freedom and targeted to dismantle the feudal shackles on human creativity. Capitalism also stressed on the fact that the new quest for freedom was to be based on reason, which in turn was to be based on practice or real life. On the other, in the more recent history of capitalism “the accent was on pluralism to enable peaceful competition among groups, reconcile their demands and facilitate greater creativity and innovation of individuals and groups. The development of modern organizations including corporations with access to higher technology and

---

information networks is supposed to promote organizational creativity and rationality."^40

However, in course of its development, capitalism itself had degenerated these postulates. Capitalism has rather produced an instrumental view of creativity, which makes it devoid of democracy and humanism. A homogenized vision of market propelled by modern capitalism leaves no space for plural choices and action. The inherent logic of capitalism i.e. constant accumulation of profit and capital gives birth of a need multiplication drive which, in turn, "pulls all individuals into this market, turning them into standardized consumers of goods and services, causing alienation of humans from their cultural setting and producing newer inequalities in society". Capitalism also commodifies life and social process aided by the technological trend under the auspices of monopolies and centralized public corporations and curbs the human urges of a creative society. "This process compels homogenization of identities. It leads to the centralization of political process when they seek multiple structures of autonomy". ^41

As stated, UNDP has been critical about the ongoing process of globalization and the state of insecurity created by it at different domains in social life. However, it conceives the process of globalization as a natural and irreversible process. So, UNDP, despite its comprehensive documentation on negative outcome of globalization, has expressed an optimistic view on globalization with a conviction that the negative fallouts could be restrained and controlled by collective forces like the state. This is, however, a limited understanding of globalization. This perspective on globalization undermines the fact that globalization is a new phase of capitalism steered by the new mode of functioning of capitalism. The process signifies reinforcement of the basic thrust of capitalism and so intensification of people’s insecurity.

This hegemonic globalization reverses the post-Second World War consensus of governance. Within that Post-second World War consensus, the state was conceived

^40 Ibid p 392
^41 Ibid 392-93
as the rallying point of human security. Globalization, while reversing that consensus, has brought into focus new forces of governance - the market, NGOs, self-help groups etc. In other words, this new situation raises doubts regarding the efficacy, status and utility of the state or any form of collecting organization as a rallying point of development, collective security and justice. With the state being gradually rolled back under the processes of liberalization, privatization and globalization (LPG)\textsuperscript{42} the issues related to human security or health security has been pushed into new vulnerabilities.

The current hegemonic globalization also produces anti-politics machines so that the avenues of collective mobilization can gradually be eliminated. This has been done both through new mode of organizational arrangement as well as through new intellectual discourse on development and democracy.\textsuperscript{43}

Politics, political articulation, political mobilization and collective resistance are very important to ensure human security. Human security is not limited only to the fair distribution of property or other material goods and not even confined to access to other non-material assets like culture. These are important, but it is more than that. It is linked up with people's capacity to constantly question the multiple domains of domination and exploitation in whatever forms they exist. The UNDP discourse on human security has not emphasized on these vital issues, although, the political dimension of human security and development has been highlighted by UNDP, particularly through its Human Development Report 2002 titled \textit{Deepening Democracy in A Fragmented World}.

Health is an issue, which cannot be studied without looking into the overall structural issues that a society is embedded into. The very perspective of a healthy society - how to secure and with what form of technology; will health be an individual endeavour or

\textsuperscript{42} The rolling back of the state is confined only to its social/collective security commitments. The state as a provider of juridical infrastructure for market operation still continues and in fact the state is more important today for this particular job when transnational corporations are in operation without any global juridical system to bring legitimacy to its operations

\textsuperscript{43} Chapter 2- titled \textit{Debate on Neo-liberal State} focuses on these anti-politics machines developed by the current hegemonic wave of globalization. Both the discourse on civil society as well as social capital have been used for this purpose.
a collective responsibility; whether the very notion health is a homogeneous concept or a heterogeneous one and accordingly whether plural means of curing diseases will be allowed to be practiced; whether the notion of health will be confined to diagnostic and clinical spheres or it will be linked up with other vital socio-economic issues like access to nutritious food, improved sources of water and sanitation as well wide ranging freedom laying down an infrastructure for tension and constraint free society - are closely linked up with the overall political and economic foundations of the society. So, a society that endeavours to ensure universal access to health care has to fight constantly against multiple layers of forces that put hindrances towards these objectives. One finds historical experiences succeeding and failing to do so basing on the political capacity of the society.44

As stated, UNDP’s journey of publishing Annual Human Development Reports and the consolidation of the Neo-liberal state happened almost in the same historical juncture i.e. in the post-cold war period. The two has diametrically opposite conviction in regards to the role of the state. Whereas neo-liberalism stands for a minimalist role of the state, on the other, UNDP campaigns for an expanding role of the state for the fulfillment of expanded rights of the people. This difference in approach towards the state ultimately brings huge non-convergences between neo-liberalism and human development/security.

Richard Jolly45 did a commendable work by comparing the paradigms of Human Development and Neo-liberalism.

Jolly argues that there is an emerging international consensus on goals for poverty reduction, the importance of sustainable human development and the opportunities of

44 Salvador Allende, one of the early proponents of social medicine, attempted to secure wide ranging human security including health security in Chile during the short regime of Popular Unity in 1970s. However, the bourgeoisie state apparatuses, the armed forces, the bourgeoisie political parties and the international forces put innumerable hindrances and ultimately Allende was assassinated through a coup, which was assisted by US intelligence agency CIA. Fidel Castro, in a public lecture that he delivered along with Allende’s daughter in Havana, gives a brilliant account on the hindrances that Allende faced during his short regime in Chile.

globalization. There are calls for social principles to be introduced in global governance to ensure that the poor countries and people benefit.

But this consensus hides some important differences: on other goals, on the means to be used, and on the whole approach to development to be followed. While strong reservations have been expressed about the neo-liberal paradigm, it continues to set the framework for economic policy internationally.

Jolly has minutely documented some of the stark differences through a comparative approach of analysis. Let us look at a few of those comparative assessments.

### Objectives and Strategies Compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Development</th>
<th>Neo-liberalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective: expansion of human opportunities and capabilities</td>
<td>Objective: Maximization of economic welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of concern: People</td>
<td>Focus of concern: markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding principles: equity and justice</td>
<td>Guiding principle: economic efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis: ends</td>
<td>Emphases: means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend focus: poverty reduction</td>
<td>Trend focus: economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty definition: population in multidimensional deprivation</td>
<td>Poverty definition: population below minimum income line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key indicators: HDI, GDI, GEM and percent of HPI</td>
<td>Key indicators: GNP, GNP growth and percent below income poverty line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The areas where the human development and neo-liberal paradigms do overlap have often given rise to confusion. But even when there are common grounds of focus or concerns, they often stem from different rationales and choices.

Democratic governance is one example of both similarities and differences. Both human development and neo-liberalism emphasizes the need for human rights and for a democratic state as key elements of governance. But neo-liberalism tends to propound a minimal state while human development stresses the importance of core state functions. (Even on this, the neo-Washington Consensus appears to have shifted...)

---
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from its strictly minimalist view of the 1980s to a somewhat more expansive outlook in the late 1990s.

The most fundamental difference between human development and the neo-liberal approaches is one of underlying philosophy. Human development rests on the foundations of capabilities and functionings, while neo-liberalism is based on the utility approach to well being. Neo-liberalism economic theory views utility as the underlying rationale for individual preferences.

The differences in these underlying principles have resulted differences in priorities both in national as well as international action and policies and also in basic paradigms. Richard Jolly has pointed out these differences in the following way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities Compared- National Policy&lt;sup&gt;47&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadening choice and opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening human capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderating inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and health as essentials of human development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring national budgets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigms Compared&lt;sup&gt;48&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasizes decentralized approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasizes ends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other words, there are huge non-convergences between neo-liberal state and human security. The following chapters will reflect on these non-convergences with special focus on the issue of health right/security.

---
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