CONCLUSION

Human insecurity is an ancient phenomenon. Threats of famine, war, drought, flood, wild animals, plague, and enslavement appear in ancient times across the world. Human insecurity, however painful, is not an historic anomaly. What has changed, and changed considerably, are the kinds of insecurity that people face, and the institutional possibilities of tempering that insecurity.

The particular phrase, “human security,” is most often associated with the 1994 Human Development Report on Human Security, even though the term itself was in circulation earlier. The intent of human security is to bridge the freedom from want and freedom from fear. The battle of peace has to be fought on two fronts. The first is the security front where victory spells freedom from fear.

The second is the economic and social front where victory means freedom from want. Only victory on both fronts can assure the world of an enduring peace.

The phrase ‘freedom from fear’ is intended to indicate freedom from violence, and the phrase ‘freedom from want’, freedom from poverty. It is important to bear this mental equation in mind, because of course people also fear poverty and destitution; they also want peace and protection. The 1994 Human Development Report was also explicitly crafted as an agenda for the Social Summit in Copenhagen, at which extensive discussion of the peace dividend was held and emphasized their central concern with human beings. In the final analysis, human security is a child who did not die, a disease that did not spread, a job that was not
cut, an ethnic tension that did not explode in violence, a dissident who was not silenced. Human security is not a concern with weapons – it is a concern with human life and dignity.

In a slightly more systematic mode, the report identified the following four essential characteristics of human security:

Human security is a universal concern. It is relevant to people everywhere, in rich nations and poor. The components of human security are interdependent. Human security is easier to ensure through early prevention than later intervention. It is less costly to meet these threats upstream than downstream. 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.

Finally, the 1994 UNDP report defined human security as:

1) Safety from chronic threats such as hunger, disease and repression.

2) Protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life – whether in jobs, in homes or in communities.

The report developed this definition in relation to seven dimensions of human security: personal, environmental, economic, political, community, health, and food security. The report argued for deliberate actions to provide human security during economic crises, as well as to reduce other causes of human insecurity such as global crime, environmental degradation, and communication that threatens cultural diversity.
The key premises of the report are (i) its joint focus on freedom from fear and freedom from want; and (ii) its four emphases on universality, interdependence, prevention, and people-centeredness. These formed, and continue to shape, human security discussions.

Human security in its broadest sense embraces 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 fulfil his or her own potential. Every step in this direction is also a step towards reducing poverty, achieving economic growth and preventing conflict. Freedom from want, freedom from fear and the freedom of future generations to inherit a healthy natural environment – these are the interrelated building blocks of human – and therefore national security.

It is quite important to work out carefully the relationship between human security and state security. One key reason is that the United Nations’ “existing organizational mandates and mechanisms draw heavily from state security assumptions.” Another key reason is that collaboration with state security forces would be essential to human security at the national level. Also grave threats to state security evoke well-funded, emphatic, expert responses. In the face of security threats, groups that otherwise differ on many niceties will rally and support joint action. And nations regularly invest considerable resources in anticipation of security threats, which range from the doctoral research of engineers to the daily callisthenics that maintain the musculature of army troops. As a result, state security issues are associated in many minds with effective response mechanisms. These characteristics of funding, research, consensus, efficacy, and “get-to-the-bottom-of-the-matter” attention are also necessary to confront the grave threats to human security.
Furthermore, human security may be a timely extension of the state security framework, one which explores and develops the newer issues that are already on the edges of the security agenda, and brings outside expertise to bear on issues that already have the attention and concern of national security advisors.

Security not only advocates investment in education as part of the national security strategy, but also relates the material well-being and the worldwide expansion of material abundance and the eradication of poverty. It should also promote political pluralism, freedom of thought and speech, and individual liberty. There are no guarantees against violence and evil in the world. We believe, nonetheless, that the expansion of human rights and basic material well-being constitutes a sturdy bulwark against them.

The broadening scope of state security has also been reflected in the emergence of terms such as “common,” and “collective” and “global” to modify “security.” Common Security is “inclusive of but extending beyond the human dimensions of military conflict – incorporating health and population dimensions of political, ethnic, economic and environmental security as well.” Collective Security, refers to a system in which each state in the system accepts that the security of one is the concern of all, and agrees to join in a collective response to aggression. Global security must be broadened from its traditional focus on the security of states to include the security of people and the planet.

Three changes can be identified: The first is that many more “fundamental” issues are on the agenda about the various possible security configurations. For example, would a collective security system be feasible or desirable or is this a period of transition to a situation of
rivalry between a different set of powers. The agenda of human security likewise raises fundamental issues about the international order, both because some global threats to human security may best be addressed by international institutions, and because security concerns are also being undertaken by NGOs and by local and regional groups. The second change is that security studies has “a fresh and full agenda.”

Finally, it is “a more scholarly agenda.” This reflects the increasing need for a strong conceptual framework and a clear methodology in order to manage effectively the increase in relevant institutions and in security agendas – a need that is shared in human security. The ongoing developments of conceptions of national security clearly overlap with the human security agenda.

There are also key differences between state and human security. One regards an issue of presentation or of substance in the human security agenda. Traditionalists … have little patience with those who would dilute the established field of security studies by overloading it with an ambitious agenda of problems and issues that would compromise the analytical power of their critical ideas. Human security advocates are cast as offering the promise of a new, more cooperational, but perhaps unattainable and unrealistic international order. One writer went so far as to associate human security with liberals who believe “human nature is essentially good and peace loving.” To many in national security, it seems that human security lies at the outer edge of liberal internationalism, remote in relevance, ideal rather than reliable, and undisciplined by the burden of accountability and responsibility that national security advisors regularly shoulder.
A key conceptual difference between state security and human security is the populations under consideration. State agencies by definition have a different responsibility to the citizenry than they do to international populations at large. This difference is by no means a deficiency. Yet it does require clarity of the grounds for obligation to citizens outside the nation-state. One set of possible justifications is that the expansion of human rights and basic material well-being constitutes a sturdy bulwark against violence and evil. That is, protecting others’ human security strengthens the security of national populations and thus would be in the self-interest of the nation-state, because it would be significantly less costly than countering violence or terrorism. The problem with this logic of course is that interest in human security might swiftly cease if more cost-effective terrorism prevention mechanisms were discovered. A more durable justification would be that all nations have an imperfect obligation to address breaches of human security. The case for responsibility for non-citizens must be made to state entities (as well as to individuals and groups within states), and it matters how it is made.

Second, state security has at least one additional objective that is distinct from human security. For a characteristic aim of foreign policy in the realist theory, which is also a de facto aim in many nations, is to maximize the state’s power. Thus national security is also substantially concerned with the relative distribution of power between states, and with territorial integrity. That concern is legitimate and lively worldwide. However, it is not part of the human security agenda. In theory, the human security agenda could be realized, so long as human beings enjoyed security of their core vital functions in a way that was consistent
with their long-term fulfilment, the human security agenda could be said to be complete.

The concept of human development refers to the broad approach to expanding people’s choices or capabilities not only in terms of income, but also in areas such as health, education, technology, the environment, employment. The human development school, emerged in the 1990s, building on a series of previous reactions against the dominant paradigm of economic development, which took economic growth maximization as its objective. Growth, it was argued, was insufficient as an objective, since aggregate growth could be realized alongside less desirable states such as wrenching deprivation among the poor, political oppression, or environmental degradation. The route of alternatives to economic growth as the standard bearer of development has a forceful history of several decades.

The goals of human development, which evolved out of the basic human needs approach, were general and could apply to any country, regardless of where it lay on the spectrum of wealth or poverty, of crime or stability, of peace or war. Human development clearly holds that socio-economic policies should focus on people and their well-being as the final objective, rather than focusing on economic growth or any other state of affairs as ends in themselves. While the Human Development Index, which is a well-known by-product of this approach, explicitly includes health and education as well as income, the human development approach is not limited to these sectors but rather focuses on human choice and freedom *per se*. Human development is a process of enlarging people’s choices. Enlarging people’s choices is achieved by expanding human capabilities and functionings.
The change from development aimed at relieving material poverty and providing for basic needs to development aimed at “giving people choices” also came about in response of the impetus to highlight the importance of dignity, esteem and other non-material aspects of life.

Given this sketch of human development, it may now be evident that human development and human security share four fundamental perspectives: they are people-centred; they are multi-dimensional; they have broad views on human fulfilment in the long term; and they address chronic poverty.

First, human security and human development are both people-centred. Both understand people to be “ends” and not “means”. This emphasis has led both to challenge dominant paradigms that take instrumental or technical achievements (national security, economic growth) as an end or objective, because these technical achievements may go alongside deeply undesirable states of affairs. Furthermore, the dominant paradigms do not have a role for ‘bottom-up’ human agency (and understanding people as ends means understanding them not only as objects but also as agents). In both cases, criticism of the dominant paradigm has been far from uncontroversial. While the logic (of ‘people-centred-ness’) may seem simplistic, in both the development community and the security community, the struggle to communicate the relevance, practicality, and importance of looking beyond purely instrumental or technical considerations, has been considerable and is ongoing.

Second, both human development and human security are multi-sectoral and multidimensional undertakings. Both address people’s dignity as well as their material and physical concerns.
The measures of success go beyond income and preparedness. This breadth complicates the approaches, and makes priority-setting a key concern. At the same time, because the task of discussing and setting priorities (amid disagreement) forms an explicit part of the human security and human development approaches, both approaches are able to adapt constantly to new scenarios and new threats.

Third, human development provides the “broad picture” long-term objective of human fulfillment within any society, whether it is rich or whether it is poor; whether composed of refugees or artisans or farmers. This broad objective is shared by human security although the human security approach pursues a narrower agenda. In fact the phrase “in a manner that is consistent with long term human fulfilment” that appears in the working definition of human security could be rephrased as ‘in a manner that is consistent with long-term human development.’

Fourth, human development and human security both address chronic poverty. That is, human development is a broad approach that is relevant for rich and for poor persons and communities. But when the human development approach is applied to impoverished persons who already live with chronic insecurity of food or health or livelihood, it overlaps with and may be indistinguishable from human security. For this subset of persons – the chronic poor/insecure – human security and human development processes (which include participation) are likely to identify and prioritise the same capabilities. And the same types of policy recommendations, such as girls’ education, freedom of the press, and preventative health care, are likely to emerge. And it is in this context Gandhian vision of Human Security becomes relevant and urgent. Gandhi tackled this problem in his own characteristic way. In his opinion:
State: Threat to Human Security. The first and most basic principle applicable is that human security forms a part of the international dialogue, and has to be subjected to the same criteria as have been used to promote this dialogue by tradition and general acceptance. This means state security and human security should not be put in opposition without good reason, that the first effort should be to advance human security by cooperative means. Some have suggested that the state itself is the primary threat to human security. The creation and defence of the Westphalian state form is at the heart of regional insecurity. This view clearly goes too far in asking for intervention as the first choice, is at least for the time being not acceptable within the kind of paradigm that is taking shape. Further, power in international relations continues to maintain the salience it has enjoyed for centuries. While outlining the human security construct in a way that brings closer an agenda for action, we cannot pretend that in the post Cold War world the role of the state, once expressed primarily through military, political and economic power, and now increasingly expressed, as a supplement, through the power of the concept of human security, is about to be abandoned; or that the importance of power has disappeared. This is precisely what Gandhi preached.

State as an engine of violence: Gandhi was also very much suspicious of the power of the state. Gandhi regarded the state as the organization of violence. While Marx and Engels regard the state as the agent of the exploiting classes. Tolstoy and Gandhi consider it as the engine of violence. Gandhi was the protagonist of a divine kingdom on earth and hence, necessarily, he was repelled by the resort to force by political institutions. He has in mind the ultimate vision of the perfection of mankind and hence he is hostile to the modern state which, to him, is a
mechanical structure representing organized and concentrated violence. Unlike St. Augustine and other Christian political thinkers, he did not regard political force as the divinely appointed punishment or remedy for the sins of man. Nor did he regard social and political associations and the state as the actualization and objectivization of universal reason or the revelations of all an all-pervasive Spirit. He is not conservative historicist so as to identify the existing institutional mechanism with the realized realm of free-will. Neither does he regard the state as being almost the second nature of the individual in the external world. Nor is he an exponent of the servile cult of state omnipotence.

There is no element of moral spontaneity in the state. Hence, Gandhi had no love for the organized institutions of political power. He accepted, instead, the worth of the plasticity and spontaneity generated by non-violence. The compulsiveness of the commands of the state leads to the destruction of the plasticity and subtlety of personality. Hence Gandhi said: “I look upon an increase in the power of the State with the greatest fear, because, although while apparently doing good by minimizing exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the root of all progress.”1 This is what a large number of exponent of human security are advocating.

The second principle is that while the borders, there should be just a few simple rules about the way security intersects with the other disciplines involved like humanitarian law, human rights, gender studies etc. There is so far no sign of inter-subjective agreement on such rules. When does poverty, for instance, become a human security problem? There is need to be for a start, some recognizable features of traditional security analysis in the effort to securities anything. There has to be a

1 Young India, 2 July 1931, pp. 162-163.
present existential or a real future anticipated threat in the field concerned, and the threat should be sufficiently grave of emergency action of an extreme kind to be taken; normal methods should not apply.

In the economic sector, as an example, should the possible closure of an industry be treated as a matter of security? The liberal economy treats the rise and fall of the private corporate sector as part of the day to day business of life, something which cannot be securitized, but if a large and important sector is affected, say if the power supply substantially shuts down, there is a case for securitizing. While the inter-subjective process is at a beginning threats to collectivities other than the state could also be incorporated through rules. Included could also be threat to the survival of the collective unit concerned, the minority, tribe or linguistic group, or to an integral element of their being, such as their economy, culture or way of life. In other words, seasonal water shortages, a temporary fall in the availability of food grains, sporadic incidents of crime and similar problems which are common to many societies cannot be included without rendering the concept meaningless from the viewpoint of action by the international community. Another difficult issue is prioritization, whether the environment should get more attention than poverty, health than education, and so on. These are the key issues which Gandhi have a definite opinion similar to those expressed by human security.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referent</th>
<th>Traditional Security</th>
<th>Human Security (Gandhian Vision)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional security policies are designed to promote demands ascribed to the state. Other interests are subordinated to those of the state.</td>
<td>Human security is people-centered. Its focus shifts to protecting individuals. The important dimensions are to entail the well-being of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
state. Traditional security protects a state's boundaries, people, institutions and values.

**Scope**

Traditional security seeks to defend states from external aggression. Walter Lippmann explained that state security is about a state's ability to deter or defeat an attack. It makes use of deterrence strategies to maintain the integrity of the state and protect the territory from external threats.

In addition to protecting the state from external aggression, human security would expand the scope of protection to include a broader range of threats, including environmental pollution, infectious diseases, and economic deprivation.

**Actor(s)**

The state is the sole actor, to ensure its own survival. Decision making power is centralized in the government, and the execution of strategies rarely involves the public. Traditional security assumes that a sovereign state is operating in an anarchical international environment, in which there is no world governing body to enforce international rules of conduct.

The realization of human security involves not only governments, but a broader participation of different actors viz. regional and international organizations, non-governmental organizations and local communities.

**Means**

Traditional security relies upon building up national power and military defense. The common forms it takes are armament races, alliances, strategic boundaries etc.

Human security not only protects, but also empowers people and societies as a means of security. People contribute by identifying and implementing solutions to insecurity.
The third principle is that the concept must have an international locus. The promotion of human security in a particular situation should be susceptible to agreement by the international community that has a responsibility in the matter. There is, in fact, a widening spectrum of developments which happen in one country but which concerns others through international relief efforts that need to be mounted, or the work of NGOs or a donor-recipient relationship. But the areas of disagreement are also wide, human rights, refugees, and the use of resources being examples. Hence, two things are required for this international locus. A set of universally acceptable values, and an agreed pattern of implementing international action, through fire-fighting or long term peace building.

This leads one from Nationalism to Internationalism. Gandhi was intensely attached to the concept of Indian Nationalism. But he was also an internationalist and always emphasized his role as a citizen of the world. He was a great national leader but he was also unsurpassed in modern times as a lover of humanity. In Gandhi, despite his nationalist preoccupations the dominant concepts were, always truth, non-violence and purity and, hence, as a believer in positive love for man he believed in internationalism and in the essential unity of man. The South Africa and Indian politics had been the laboratories in which he “experimented” with his formulae of truth and non-violence which are indeed universal values. There is, thus, indeed, a supreme humanitarian standpoint in Gandhi. He was a great fighter for Swaraj but they would consider human welfare to be a matter of greater concern. He fought against the British empire but he loved the British people. He considered no person to be an enemy because beyond the sovereignty of the nation he looked to the
categorical imperative of human brotherhood. He absolutely believed in a
union of hearts-homonia-of all men and women of the world.

Gandhi’s internationalism was only a sociological and political
application of the great norm of Ahimsa which means universal non-
hatred and non-violence. Buddha and St. Francis showed the tenderest
care for the meanest creatures of the world. Their love extended also to
the animal kingdom. Gandhi, like them, believed in the doctrine of
absolute and universal compassion for all living beings. A believer in God
naturally has the feeling of identity with all creatures because all are the
creations of God. Gandhi was never tired of repeating that men could
receive divine grace and affection only if they loved their brethren. He
said: “We are all tarred with the same brush; we are all members of the
vast human family.”2 Hence love of the human kind was only an aspect of
his ahimsa, and internationalism is a concrete means to realize at the
political level, the universal love for humanity.

But Gandhi wanted that before cosmopolitanism and
internationalism could become a reality, those countries which were still
suffering under feudal overlordship and colonial dependence should have
the political freedom to determine their own future. He, therefore, cried
for a halt to the nefarious game of imperial “gengsterism” among nations.
Nationalism, this, though only a stage, was a very important one towards
the realization of internationalism. He asked: “How is this vast mass of
humanity to be a flame in the cause of world deliverance, unless and until
it has touched and felt freedom”.3 India had first to be free before she
could co-operate on terms of equality with other nations. Hence, it is clear
that Gandhi’s romantic conception of the soul of a nation was not meant

2 Ibid., 18 June 1925, pp. 210-211.
3 Ibid.
as the psychological support to the virulent national chauvinism but was only a means to extol the soul of a people against the effective organizations and combinations of imperialistic power that may attempt to suppress rising nationalism. The units that could form any international union should do that from their own will and this implied the previous attainment of national sovereignty by them. Hence Gandhi wrote: “It is impossible for one to be internationalist without being a nationalist. Internationalism is possible only when nationalism becomes a fact, i.e., when people belonging to different countries have organized themselves and are able to act as one man.”

In an obvious criticism of the League of Nations based on the concept of the great powers’ predominance, Gandhi had written that an international league could really exist, “Only when all the nations, big or small, composing it are fully independent.” Nationalism would not mark the climax of human security; it was not an end but a stage. He, hence, stood only for nationalism that was health-giving, religious and therefore humanitarian. He felt that Indian nationalism should be a step towards internationalism and human unity. He was also of the opinion that India’s freedom could be deserved only if there was good will towards the whole of the human family.

He wanted India to be a free nation in order that she could sacrifice herself for the service of mankind. Hence, he wrote, “I want the freedom of my country so that other countries may learn something from my free country, so that the resources of my country may be utilized for the benefit of mankind. Just as the cult of patriotism teaches us today that the individual has to die for the family, the family has to die for the village,

---

4 Ibid., 16 March 1921, p. 81.
5 Ibid., 18 June 1925, p. 211.
the village for the country; even so a country has to be free in order that it may die, if necessary, for the benefit of the world. My love, therefore, or nationalism or my idea of nationalism is that my country may become free, that if need be the whole of the country may die, so that the human race may live. There is no room for race hatred there. Let that be our nationalism."

Nationalism was thus not the pinnacle of human endeavours but was only a stage in the political evolution of man. Through national consolidations it was possible to get over the obstacles of caste, group and local prejudices, conflicts and struggles. Thus nationalism could become a means to political and psychological integration. Once, local and sectional hatreds had been consumed by the fire of nationalism, the time would naturally come when the nation would sacrifice itself for the good of the world. Gandhi wrote: “My patriotism includes the good of mankind in general. Therefore, my service of India includes the service of humanity. The whole scheme for the liberation of India is based upon the development of internal strength. It is a plan of self-purifications.” He wanted that Indian nationalism should mean the development of the national strength of India so that renovated India could serve mankind. Hence there could be no place for the pursuit of national interest to the detriment of the legitimate rights of other nations, according to the tenets of Gandhian foreign policy, which believed that the destiny of India lay not in militarization but in the realization of the noble mission of friendship and peace in the world. Thus we see that Gandhism teaches the conception of transcendence of narrow, exclusive, aggressive and chauvinistic nationalism and affirms the fundamental proposition that one’s good consists in the good of mankind. Gandhi’s conception of

---

7 Ibid., 17 November 1933, pp. 5-6.
internationalism, thus, is an effective theoretical counterbalance to the almost blind adherence to the cult of national patriotism and absolute sovereignty which we find in Hegelianism, and fascism. Thus, if on the one side he was trenchant critic of western imperialism and a fighter for “Purna Swaraj”, he would refuse to regard the nation-state as the final category in the political evolution of man.

Gandhi visualized a plan of humanity unity to be realized by the federal organization of friendly interdependent states. He had a great devotion to the noble goal of international co-operation and universal harmony, because, according to him, not to believe in the possibility of “permanent peace” amounts to disbelief in the “Godliness of human nature”. Hence he wanted that permanent peace should be secured. He also pleaded for world order and world federation. He wrote: “Isolated independence is not the goal of the world states. It is voluntary interdependence. The better mind of the world desires today not absolutely independent states warring one against another, but a federation of friendly interdependent states. The consummation of that event may be far off. I want to make no grand claim for our country. But I see nothing grand or impossible about our expressing our readiness for universal interdependence rather than independence. I desire the ability to be totally independent without asserting the independence.” In a note addressed to Maurice Frydman on 28th July, 1942, Gandhi has asserted his faith in a federally organized world-state. If I can get freedom for India through non-violent means, power of non-violence is firmly established, empire idea dissolves and the World-State takes its place in which all the states of the world are free and equal, no state has its

---

8 Young India, 21 March 1929, pp. 92-93.
military. There may be a world police to keep order in the absence of
universal belief in non-violence.

On July 4, 1947, at a prayer speech Gandhi visualized that “if by
India’s effort such a world federation of free and independent states was
brought into being, the hope of the kingdom of God, otherwise called
Ram Raj, might legitimately be entertained.”

He agreed that the only condition for the survival of world
civilization was the realization of world union under one central
governing body composed of representatives of the constituent entities.
Most probably, Gandhi had in mind the federal pattern for this central
governing body.”

Gandhi would like the world government to non-cooperate with
the lawless, aggressive and recalcitrant forces. But a world police force
may be necessary in the beginning. This police force, under the control of
world authority, would exercise its power only as the last sanction when
moral and non-violent sanctions had ceased to have effect. This is the
ultimate for human security.