CHAPTER - I

PEACE AND SECURITY: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Peace is the elixir of happy life. The Hindu scriptures, more particularly the Vedas, are replete with "Peace, Peace, Peace." Absence of it is the cause of worry for all right thinking human beings. In a world pervaded with violence and terror the struggle for peace and security must begin in everyday and everybody's life. Peace has always been among humanity's highest value for some supreme end. The quest for peace and security has been a central motive in the life of man. Since his heralding cry upon birth and thereby his presence on the worldly scene, mankind has been searching for an ideal society where men could lead a happier, worthier and more rewarding life. Peace and security continue to be an intensive wish, desire and a passion with millions as well as a conviction deeply felt and aspired to by them. All nation-states long for it. Leaders negotiate for it yet it remains the most elusive than ever. The culture of peace is a fabric that has been woven for generations by all societies, though, its practices are not necessarily dominated by that specific title. All over the world, it has its defenders; some working in obscurity and others in the spotlight of public life. Spinoza argued that "peace is a virtue, a state of mind, a disposition for benevolence,
confidence and justice."\(^1\)

Peace is not an end in itself.\(^2\) It is a way to achieve a better, happier and safer life for human beings on this earth. The quest for peace and security began with a desire to live and live better on the earth planet. Aristotle made distinction in which all ‘particular goods’ are constructed with a single ‘final good’. He has also stated that "there are many things which are valued "for their own sake." But he refrained from terming them "final" because these particular goods are also valued as promoting something else, namely what he calls “Happiness for humankind”.\(^3\) Every step that men took in his emotional march to conquer the forces of evil was beset with all kinds of problems.

Conflicts and tensions of all sorts are mounting up. Highly sophisticated weapons are being piled up in the name of better life. The nuclear weapons are increasing day by day. A void looms large and feeling of insecurity has grappled humanity with total absence of the will for reformation of the man’s life for a peaceful and secure world. The unfolding dialectic of world history is entering into comprehensive and perhaps the most problematic phase. Domestic social structures are deeply destablized. The poor and the oppressed both are rising in revolt. The so called superpowers of the world who very often assume the role of the custodians of the rest of the world are competing


\(^{3}\) Ibid.
with one another in testing and developing more weapons to teach the others a lesson. All this has led us to a situation of deepening conflicts and violence. We are witness to a great schism in the human community, dividing the world into extremes of affluence and extremes of distress with concentrations of poverty, scarcity and unemployment and deprivation in one vast section of mankind and over abundance, over-production and over consumption in another very small section of the same species. Industrialization was expected to put an end to the conditions of scarcity for mankind as a whole but it has made even basic needs of existence more scarce and inaccessible for an increasing number of human beings. These paradoxes have put a big question mark on the basic necessity of human life i.e. peace and security of the mankind.

The problem of human life at the present juncture of world history is peaceful and secure 'Survival'. Survival of species, survival of civilization and survival of the whole of creation! Will man-in-society survive peacefully? Will he be able to contain the seeds of conflict and violence that he has himself sown in the pursuit of civilization and turn them into instruments of change and reconstruction towards a new and different peaceful secure order?

Violence has been a part of human societies since early times. There may be no society in which violence has never occurred. Challenges to peace and security are numerous. Society has always been involved in violence and war preparedness. During the past 100 years, the proportion of civilian casualties in war or violence has increased dramatically.
Equally disturbing factor is the expansion of violence inside society for political ends with or without any external linkage. This is one of the most serious problems of peace and security since it not only undermines national and international security but it also threatens the social and human peace and security. At the same time, there is no society in which peace never occurred. Peace is a word that is uttered almost as frequently as "Truth", 'beauty' and 'love'. It may be just as elusive to define it as are these virtues. Common synonyms for peace include "amity", "friendship", "harmony", "concord", "tranquility", "repose", "quiescence", "Truce", "pacification and "neutrality". All these descriptions are quite limited in describing both the nature and role of peace.

Different people have given different interpretations to the word 'peace'. Even then, it is still difficult to give any generally acceptable definition of it. The whole history of peace movements also fail to provide any acceptable definition of peace.4

Through social time, nomadic societies, the Eskimos, are purely Buddhist and are peaceful societies. It would be an advantage to human kind if we all were Buddhists, the Eskimos or something similar to that. But the fact is that we are not.

Peace is universally desired. It is not a matter of personal attitude alone, it is a question of establishing a new society founded on values, culture and a way of life integral to peace at

---

local, regional or global levels. Peace can emerge for the kind of the life style and the type of value system which cultivates value among our children and grand children. It depends on the way we nourish or flourish the cultural traditions. This is by no mean an easy task. It is rather a far too complex mission requiring high degree of comprehension of the forces that stimulate or create the tensions and conflicts. No development can be effectively pursued without an assured and durable environment of peace and security.

Earlier it was argued that "if you want peace prepare for war" but now it must be "if we want peace prepare for peace." "We need to remember that to prepare for peace is the most effectual means of preserving peace." War must be unconditionally rejected and peace must be promoted.

Origin of the word Peace

The concept of peace in our modern civilization is the facade of war, dominated by the calculations of realpolitik. This English word originates from the French concept which denotes 'agreement'—agreeing to stop a conflict or war. According to The Universal Dictionary of the English Language, the first notion of 'peace' is 'cessation of freedom from strife, warfare', and the second notion of it is 'treaty of peace between hostile nations'. According to the third notion, it is understood as, 'freedom from strife, controversy or agitation or freedom from civil disorder and disturbances. These notions tranquility, concord, mental calm, serenity of mind crystallized into common place words, universally understood and emphasized by
teachers and preachers alike, also enshrined in scriptures of all
religions and beliefs.

Hindu, Jain and Buddhist traditions treat peace as
peace of mind, peace of the inner self, interpersonal peace and
nonviolence, the moral injunction of not committing violence
against nature (the biosphere) and also against micro organisms.
The Chinese and Japanese traditions focus on the culture space
that is harmony and order in personal, social and global
organization and relationship as well as in nature itself.
Presently, we look at the problem of peace through the spectrum
of beauty, creativeness and art. We regard beauty and art as the
most powerful mediums in the process of mutual understanding
of different nations and their peaceful co-existence.5

Johan Galtung, a celebrated peace researcher, in his
article 'Violence, Peace and Peace Research', has stated that
peace is absence of violence. This of course is not a
definition of peace since it is a clear cause of what he calls
obscurum per obscurcur. What is intended is only to suggest that
the terms "peace" and "violence" be linked together in such a
manner that peace can be regarded as absence of violence.6

Peace has the potential to mean many things. The
definitions of peace can vary with religious, social, cultural or
the study of things. However, two dominant interpretations of
peace exist as Negative peace; and Positive Peace

---

5 Pasricha, Ashu, Peace Studies: The Discipline and Dimension
(Delhi: Abhijeet Publications), 2003, p. 2
6 Ibid., p. 3.
Negative Peace

The meanings of the peace that are usually given are taken mostly in the negative sense. Peace denotes bombs not falling on Bergrades; it denotes artillery and missiles not falling; Hindus and Muslims not rioting; blood not driving fast into veins by the cries caused spraying bullets piercing through doors and windows, so on and so forth. The negative peace can be discussed under three headings which are as given below:

1. Absence of violence;

2. Absence of antagonistic conflicts; and

3. Absence of war

To start with, two compatible definitions of peace are reproduced:

- Peace is the absence/reduction of violence of all kinds.

- Peace is nonviolent and creative conflict transformation.

The underlying assumptions in both the definitions are:

- Peace is to reduce or effect absence of violence by peaceful means.

- Peace is the study of the conditions of peace.
First definition by John Galtung is violence oriented; peace being its negation i.e., if one wants to know what peace is, he should first know what violence is. The second definition is conflict oriented; peace is the context for conflicts to unfold non-violently and creatively. To know about peace we have to know about conflicts and how conflicts can be transformed, both non-violently and creatively into peace.

Both definitions focus on human beings in diverse social settings. Therefore, Peace is the reduction of violence in nonviolent way then peace and violence be linked together in such a manner that peace seems to be mere absence of violence.

Peace as Absence of Violence

Peace is often regarded as 'Absentia Belli’ mean the absence of any organized violence. Like John Galtung's concept of "Negative peace as absence of violence", Reardon insists that "Peace is the absence of violence in all its forms physical social, psychological and structural". This definition is negative in a sense that it fails to provide any affirmative picture of peace or its ingredients.

Reasons behind this popular version of negative concept of peace may be that peace studies tend to focus on violence as a unit of analysis rather than peace as a unit of analysis and there is a strong tendency, therefore, to define peace simply as a 'Non-violence.'

---

The Encyclopedia of social science defines negative peace as the "absence of any organized violence between major human groups or nations but also between social and ethical groups because of the magnitude that can be reached by internal wars."\textsuperscript{9}

Now, the meaning of 'violence' too is ambiguous. Different societies and different individuals explain it in their own way. The root meaning of violence comes from the Latin word 'violentia' meaning vehemence, a passionate and uncontrolled force. The opposite of a calculated exercise of power'.\textsuperscript{10}

Traditionally, the word meant to prevent some object, natural or human, from its natural course of development and to exceed some limit or norms.\textsuperscript{11} Microsoft Encarta Encyclopaedia Deluxe 2000 compact disc describes violence as.\textsuperscript{12}

a. The use of physical force to inure somebody or damage something.

b. The illegal use of unjustified force, or the effect created by the threat.

c. Extreme, destructive or uncontrollable force, especially of natural events.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{12} Microsoft Encarta Encyclopaedia Deluxe, 2000 Compact Disc.
d. Intensity of feeling or expression.

Similarly, Webster recognizes the different shades of the meaning of violence as:

a. Physical force used so as to injure or damage.

b. Intense powerful force as of hurricane, etc.

c. unjust or callous use of force of power as in violating another rights, privacy etc. - the harm done by this.

d. vehemence, fury.

e. A twisting of sense, phrase etc. so as to distort meaning.

f. A violent deed or act.

This meaning of violence does not necessarily imply violence as we understand it in the eyes of law. It has been estimated that more than fourteen thousand and five hundred wars which claimed the lives of about four billion people, have been fought on the earth in five thousand years since the dawn of civilization. Armed conflicts have taken toll of 21 million lives since world war-II. War appears to be natural to man and the aggressor justifies war as a mean of ending of all wars i.e. - "peace through war". There will neither be total peace nor total violence in human civilization; what may eventually happen would be a better balance between peace and violence.

The first distinction to be made is between physical and psychological violence. The narrow concept of violence is mentioned with focus on physical violence only. Under physical violence, human beings are hurt to the extent of killing them.
Negative peace is defined as "state requiring a set of social structures that provide security and protection for the acts of direct physical violence committed by individuals groups or nations. Johan Galtung calls it "Direct violence". This type of "violence includes physical violence where the actor is visible and action is direct e.g., if a group of persons attacks another group of persons. This is a case of direct violence." Direct violence shows the object of direct violence perceives the violence and may complain about it.

Direct violence can be divided into verbal and physical violence harming the body, mind and spirit. This leaves behind traumas that may carry violence over time. In highly dynamic society, personal or direct violence may be seen as wrong and harmful e.g. domestic violence and child violence.

"The peak period of Roman Empire was peaceful in the sense that there existed 'Absence of violence' (Pax Roman) It was the system that ultimately proved too exploitative and enriched numerically small elite in the centre."

**Peace as Absence of Conflicts**

Absence of violence should not be confused with absence of conflicts. There may be conflicts in society but without any violence, or there should be no violence but no other forms of

14 Ibid., p. 20.
15 Galtung, Johan, Peace by Peaceful Means, op. cit., p. 31.
interaction either. Can there be loving, cooperative and just peaceful society with a society of damage, slavery, injustice but without any violence? Conflicts will be there in such society though violence may be missing. Violence may occur without conflicts and conflicts can be solved non-voluntarily. Does peace mean absence of conflicts?  

Galtung is of the view that, "these is no substitute for creative conflict resolutions in breach for peace." Unsolved conflicts may lead to frustration, which may again lead to aggression and ultimately to violence.

The popular meaning of conflict is quarrel between two persons or groups. It is a physical fight or verbal duel preceded by disagreement and followed by indifference and enmity. Some define conflict as "a state of mutual antagonism or hostility between two or more parties."

Kenneth Boulding says, "conflicts exist when any potential position of two behaviour units are mutually incompatible." He further defines conflict as a situation of a competition in which the parties are aware of the incompatibility of potential future positions and in which each party wishes to occupy a position that is incompatible with

\[ \textit{Pasricha, Ashu, Peace Studies: The Discipline and Dimension, op. cit., pp. 4-5.} \]
\[ \textit{Galtung, Johan, Peace by Peaceful Means, op. cit., p. 36.} \]
wishes of the other.\textsuperscript{21}

John Galtung suggests that a conflict moves among the triangle’s three corners where A refers to conflict attitude, B to conflict behaviour and C the conflict or contradiction itself (the incompatibility) A conflict sequence can begin in any of these forms. Galtung emphasises on 'C' as a more frequent starting point.\textsuperscript{22}

\textbf{Figure 1.1}

\textit{The Conflict Triangle}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\coordinate (A) at (0,0);
\coordinate (B) at (2,2);
\coordinate (C) at (0,2);
\draw (A)--(B)--(C)--cycle;
\node at (0.5,1.5) {B, Behaviour};
\node at (-1,0) {Manifest level: Empirical, observed, conscious};
\node at (1,0) {Latent level: Theoretical, inferred Subconscious};
\node at (-0.5,1) {A, Attitude Assumptions};
\node at (0.5,1) {C, Contradictions};
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

\begin{quote}
It will be difficult to conceive of an ongoing society where conflicts are absent. The society without conflicts is a dead
\end{quote}
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\bibitem{22} Galtung, Johan, Peace by Peaceful Means, op. cit., p. 72.
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society. Conflicts are reality of human existence and therefore a means to understand behaviour of human beings.

Peace as the Absence of War

Peace should not be judged by negative yardstick of absence of war or explicit violence, or control over armaments and banning of all nuclear arms. Nor should we derive satisfaction from the fact that a Third World War has not taken place. A peaceful world should provide and create conditions where individuals can lead fuller and richer lives, that is, a balanced development of human personality in its social, cultural, political and economic aspects. Predominance of one aspect (economic as at present) would not be conducive to peace amongst the individuals, small groups, nation-states, and to the world community at large. It should provide for a rapport between the individual and the social order and permit peaceful socio-economic changes consistent with changing times and aspirations of the people. The imitation and leadership should remain with individuals and small groups. In such an order, conflicts at the individual, small groups, national, and international levels will be reduced to insignificant dimensions. In those rare cases where conflicts may still arise, they can be resolved speedily by peaceful methods.23

In the era of cold war, war was a form of politics, a way in which states sought to resolve certain issues in international
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23 Pasricha, Ashu, Peace Studies: The Discipline and Dimension, op. cit.
relations. Outcome of this is states' willingness to amass military power for defence and deterrence and to project it in support of their defence and foreign policy.

Many writers, especially of the west, asserted that "peace is absence of war." Clausewitz said that "war is an act of force intended to compel our opponents to fulfill our will and a continuation of political intercourse with a mixture of other means." Webster dictionary defines war as "state of usually open and declared armed hostile conflict between states or nations.

According to New English dictionary "war is a hostile contention by means of armed forces, carried on between nations or state, the employment of armed forces against an opposing party in the state."

Quincy Wright defines war in a broader as well as in narrow sense. In broader sense, he defines war as "A violent contact of distinct but similar entities." In narrower sense he means by war, "The legal conditions which equally permits two or more hostile groups to carry on a conflict by armed forces." Over a period of time war has been considered as legitimate instrument of state policy.

25 Webster Dictionary,
26 English Dictionary,
28 Ibid., p. 764.
O’ Kane defined peace as an vacuous, passive, simplistic and unresponsive escape mechanism resorted to in the past without success. Mere absence of war can’t lead us towards peaceful state. It is a myopic version of peace. We can’t ignore the feeling of mistrust and suspicion that the winners and leaders of a war harbor towards each other. The suppression of mutual hostile feelings is not taken into account by those who define peace so simply. Their stance is as long as people are not actively engaged into overt, mutual, violent, physical and destructive activity, peace keeps existing.

They define the term ‘peace’ to the state of affairs that are not truly peaceful. John Galtung is of the view that "No war" is a negative version of peace. It is simply saying, "let us not destroy each other". Negative version of peace is paired with positive version of peace. Peace as absence of "violence, war and conflicts", articulated within itself a structural theory of peace i.e., positive peace. He further said, 'Peace as the absence of violence shall be retained valid'.

Positive Peace

Two concepts of peace may be empirically related even though they are logically independent. According to the encyclopedia of social science, "positive peace is a pattern of cooperation and integration between major human groups. Absence of violence is combined with a pattern of cooperation." Positive peace is associated with ideology, particularly as defined by John Galtung. He is the main exponent of the positive

concept of peace.

_Galtung’s Concept of Positive Peace_

Galtung believes that the traditional concept of violence i.e. intended physical restraints or harm of another is inadequate to define peace. The traditional concept of peace as absence of physical violence is unacceptable. He argues, "if a positive-valued alternative to violence is to be meaningful, violence must be redefined so that its negation implies an acceptable positive peace."³⁰

He defines violence as, "it is present when human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations."³¹ Violence is that which causes human beings to under-achieve their potential realizations.

John Galtung opines violence as, ‘a mode of influence about which different dimensions can be made’.

1. Physical v/s psychological violence such as lies and brain washing.

2. Negative v/s positive approach which is between punishment v/s reward influences.

3. Structural v/s indirect violence. It involves people who are hurt or manipulated.

---

³¹ Ibid., p. 18.
Structural violence is present when there is no concrete individual actor and the violence results from the structure and is perceived as unequal power, deprivation and unequal life chances. Violence is built into the structure and shows up as unequal power and consequently as unequal life chances. Structural violence refers to inegalitarian and discriminating social structures which also indirectly inflict violence upon individuals or groups in a systematic and organized way. Slavery was an example of structural violence in the past and discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity or gender is an example of structural violence in our time. A society in which such social structures exist is not at peace even though it may not be at war.

Structural violence = Unactualized human potentials.

Social injustice/inequality = No peace.

The positive concept of "peace would lead us to consider not only absence of direct violence and structural violence, but also presence of a non-violent type of egalitarian, non-exploitative and non-suppressive cooperation between units-nations as well as individuals." It can be represented as under:


---

Brock-Utne, a feminist peace scholar, expands Galtung's definition on violence, it shortens the life span and reduces the quality of life.

When no war is going on (organized physical violence), peace can't be said to exist when children or women are abused within the home (unorganized physical violence). There is no peace if life span is lessened because of the effect of inequitable economic structures or damages to nature by pollution, radiation etc. or if a girl child is not safe in mother's womb; food, health and clothing are not provided adequately because of gender. Women and children are the victims of direct violence and are found in the so-called peaceful nations. So, the fruitful definition of peace has to include both the direct violence and the absence of structural violence. This version is also known as feminist version of peace.

This definition corresponds well with definition of peace agreed upon in the United Nations resolutions for the United Nations and UNESCO. UNESCO's Medium term plan for 1977-1982 was agreed upon by all member-states.

"No international settlement secured at the cost of freedom and dignity of peoples and respect for individuals can claim to be a truly peace settlement, either in its spirit or in term of its durability. General conference has associated the struggle for peace with a condemnation of all forms of oppression, discrimination and exploitation of one nation by another, not only because they inevitably generate violence but also because

they themselves constitute a form of violence and partake of the spirit of war".35

The struggle for peace and action to promote human rights are recognized as being inseparable. The UN systems do not define peace only as the absence of war and violence but also as the presence of justice.

Gandhi equated peace with non-violence (Ahimsa) and satyagrah and its determinant is the achievement of truth (satya). His non-violence ruled out all exceptions in the applications of Ahimsa. His concept of non-violence is very broad. His non-violence doesn't include only non-killing but also cultivation of love, compassion and altruism to all. We should not hurt anybody in actions, words and deeds. He tries to apply non-violence in every walk of life - domestic, institutional, economic and political. "Peace is outcome of the application of non-violence at intra-personal, social, economic, political, cultural and religious levels"36, he said.

Michael Howard describes "peace is the simple assurance that one can sow a crop with some hope of reaping it; build a house with good hope of living in it; raise a family, learn and pursue a vocation; lead a life which will not be interrupted by the incursion of violence by physical destruction, wounding,

maiming, torture and death.  

Figure 1.2

Peace: Two Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Phase</th>
<th>Present Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Concept of Peace</strong></td>
<td>Negative Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levels Involved</strong></td>
<td>Multi level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disciplines involved</strong></td>
<td>Social sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification level</strong></td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The above mentioned two figures adequately depict the two phases of peace and extended concept of peace. Creating peace
obviously has to do with reducing violence (cure) and avoiding violence (prevention). And violence means harming and/or hurting. We then assume the existence of something that can experience being harmed and being hurt, and follow the Buddhist tradition in identifying that something with life. Life is capable of suffering (dukkha) violence done to the body and to the mind, referred to as physical and mental violence, respectively. But life is also capable of experiencing bliss (sukha), the pleasure that comes to the body and the mind. Some might reserve the term 'positive peace' for that experience.

So far, we have looked at violence from the perspective of the receiver. If there is a sender, an actor, who intends these consequences of violence, then we may talk about *direct* violence; if not, we talk about indirect or *structural* violence. Misery is one form of suffering, hence there is violence somewhere. The position taken here is that *indirect violence = structural violence*. Indirect violence comes from the social structure itself - between humans, between sets of humans (societies), between sets of societies (alliances, regions) in the world. And inside human beings, there is the indirect, non-intended, inner violence that comes out of the personality structure.

The two major forms of outer structural violence are well known from politics and economics: *repression* and *exploitation*. Both work on body and mind, but are not necessarily intended. They are embedded in the structure. For the victim, however, that argument offers scant comfort.
Behind all of this is cultural violence: all of it symbolic, in religion and ideology, in language and art, in science and law, in media and education. The function is simple enough: to legitimize direct and structural violence. In fact, we are dealing with violence in culture, in politics and in economics, and then with direct violence. We need a concept broader than violence, and also broader than peace. Power is that concept. Cultural power moves actors by persuading them to accept what is right and what is wrong; economic power by the carrot method of quid pro quo; military (or 'force' in general) power by the stick method of 'or else'; and political power by producing decisions.

This leads us to the four types of power, or discourses that are: cultural, economic, military, and political. Well-known words, but not merely to be tossed around. They stand for four realms of power and four types of violence (structural violence has political and economic faces), and by implication for four types of peace. Before we turn to the question of what they look like concretely, some words about the relations between the four realms of power.

They all impact on each other; twelve arrows can be drawn. But, however true, that is the easy way out, because no stand is taken. Another truth should be added. There is also a general thrust in the power system: single acts of direct violence come out of structures of political decisions and economic transactions; and the latter causes the other. But underneath it all lurks the culture; legitimizing some structures and acts, delegitimizing others.
The 'realist' assumption that only military power counts is the least realistic of all. However, the liberal faith in the right political structure and the Marxist faith in the right economic structure are alike. They all matter, particularly culture. But single-minded culturalism is also insufficient. My own position is an eclectic one, but with the causal flow more in the direction from culture via politics and economics to the military than vice versa. Thus, the major causal direction for violence is from cultural via structural to direct violence.

_Roads to Peace: the Eightfold Path_ 38

According to Galtung, there are two types of therapies or remedies i.e.: curative and preventive aiming at negative and positive peace, respectively. And four types (with the two subtypes) of violence have been identified. This gives us eight combinations, the 'eight-fold path'. Each combination, for instance 'cultural power, positive peace', confronts us with a question: what can be done?

There is no place to start and certainly no place to end policies for peace. The best is to work on all eight cells at the same time. It is better to have some moves ahead on all than a single thrust on one, hoping that the others will take care of themselves or can be easily handled afterwards. Experience with single-factor peace theories has generally been negative. Kant hoped for republics and democracy, liberals for free trade and democracy, Marxists for social production and

---

38 Galtung, Johan, Peace by Peaceful Means, op. cit., pp. 3-5.
guided democracy, mondialists for a strong UN. Peace did not follow in their wake.

Most proposals aim at the world as a system of countries with states inside it: the inter-country system usually called the inter-state system. With slight modifications they also apply to inter-gender, inter-generation, inter-class and inter-nation (ethnic) systems; all relevant today.

People working for world prate, whether in the state system or the non-state system of organizations, will recognize something; very few will recognize all the points made or necessarily agree. That debate is essential if peace movement is to grow and become at least as influential as the anti-slavery and anti-colonialist movements were in their time. Being against war is a good moral position, but the questions of alternatives to war and the conditions for abolition of war will not disappear. They have to be addressed.

*The Political Dimension*

Democracy is a great idea, but it has been badly understood in relation to inter-state affairs. If a democracy works well within a country, it will, in principle, produce a relatively content population that, on the average and over time, gets much of its wishes fulfilled, within the limits of the feasible. Again, in principle, this should lead to a peace surplus inside the country, with democracy functioning as a nonviolent arbiter between parts of the population vying with each other for power and privilege. But there is no
guarantee that this intra-state peace surplus will translate into peaceful activity in the inter-state system. Democracy has to be global, in the inter-state system, in the world system. But that system is today conservative - feudal, not liberal-democratic.

That opens for two approaches: making the inter-state system more democratic, and making the intra-state system even more peaceful, with democratic means. Both are laudable goals and approaches: there is no need to justify a more democratic country with the assumption (at best unproven, at worst blatantly wrong) that intra-peace translates automatically into inter-peace. If that were the case, the leading democracies in the world today would not also have been slaving, colonialist, and highly belligerent in general -- except for the smaller democracies, which probably are peaceful more because they are small than because they are democratic. This also works the other way: a democratic inter-state system does not automatically guarantee that all component parts will become democracies overnight.

The most direct approach is to democratize the inter-state system. One country/one vote is a formula that could be applied to the Bretton Woods institutions, reducing the money power of the richest countries in the world. This would probably also reduce the credit available. The question is whether the World Bank record makes that eventuality so deplorable. Obviously, the formula rules out Big Power veto - that has to go.
Military Dimension

The argument made here is not to abolish the military but to give it new tasks. That institutions had very bad habits in the past, such as attacking other countries and nations, and other classes usually at the behest of the ruling elites, killing and devastating through external and internal wars. But there have also been virtues: good organization, courage, willingness to sacrifice. The bad habits have to go; not necessarily the military, and certainly not the virtues.

Let us give the military new tasks, substituting defensive defense with defensive means (short-range conventional military, para-military and non-military defense) for aggressive external warfare. Pure defense provokes nobody and causes no fear, yet makes it clear that attacks will be strongly resisted.

Peace-keeping forces can be used to prevent aggressiveness, even in places where there has been no open display of violence (but good reasons to assume that something may happen). One idea may be to station such forces preventively in the 30-odd small countries without military forces, to forestall the possibility of some Big Brother demanding to be a ‘protector’ in crisis.

But this is not enough. There has to be further development along nonviolent lines - delegitimizing arms, nonviolent skills, reducing the conventional and para-military components, at the same time building up non-military defense, turning to civilian peace-keeping and to
international peace brigades in hot areas. We are at the threshold of such important endeavours; they must be developed much further. The military are hereby invited!

There is also a negative side to all of this. The long-term goal is the abolition of war as an institution, like the abolition of slavery and colonialism as institutions - an entirely realistic goal, but demanding difficult and absolutely necessary direction. Of course, there will still the violence around, some still organized collectively as wars. But it will not be institutionalized, and not internalized. Nor legitimate. What upholds war? Many factors, three of them being patriarchy (rule by the male gender of the human species), the state system with its monopoly on violence, and the super-state or superpower system with the ultimate monopoly of the hegemons. Males more than females tend towards violence; and those who possess arms tend to think and act according to the old adage that to the person with a hammer the world looks like a nail. Incidentally, this is not necessarily so because such a person is violent, but because he has the use of military power as both profession and monopoly and simply wants to be relevant.

To fight patriarchy means fighting patriarchal cultures and structures and arriving at a motor equitable power-sharing between the genders. The danger is that, in the process of the struggle women may take on some of the male values they are fighting.

The struggle against the tendency of states to seek
recourse to military power goes by way of alternatives that are 
more compelling. And the struggle against hegemonic 
tendencies in the world society of societies goes by way of 
democratization of that society, creating alliances of non-
hegemonic countries within or across their 'spheres of interest', 
and through decision-making of the oar country/one vote 
variety.

_The Economic Dimension_

The problem here is not only economic practice, but 
also economic theory with its carefully nursed neglect of the 
side-effects of economic activity, the externalities. Some of them 
are positive, like the _challenge_ derived from taking on complex 
problems for which there are no immediate, routine solutions. 
And some of them are negative, like _ecological degradation_, not 
to mention _human degradation_. They are not reflected in 
economic theory, or at most as ‘side and after-thoughts.’ 
Economists focus on quantities and prices of products, goods, 
and services offered in the market place without reflecting 
whether they might also be bad and disservices. Such variables 
are referred to as _internalities_, internal to the paradigm. One 
example is 'terms of exchange', the quantity of one product 
needed to get in exchange a constant quantity of another 
product, like how much oil for one tractor. Another approach 
would be to compare the working hours needed.

Exploitation means that one party gets much more 
out of a deal than the other — measured by the sum of 
internalities and externalities. The terms of exchange may be
bad and getting worse: in addition, one party gets all the challenge, leaving the routine work to the other, who also gets ecological and human degradation in the bargain. As this is a fairly adequate description of the trade between rich (not all in the North) and poor (not all in the South) countries in the world today, we are dealing with a key case of structural violence. This condition often leads to direct violence intended to change or to maintain the structure, and is solidly protected by the cultural violence provided by mainstream theory - A heavy triangle of violence.

One way out is to trade less, relying more on one's own resources (factors). This means that the positive externalities stay at home; the negative externalities will be suffered by oneself rather than inflicting them upon others. The hope is that Self-interest may lead to better types of economic activity. If this is *Self-reliance I* then *Self-reliance II* extends this to include exchange with other countries, but then with sensitivity to externalities. The short formula is to share them. What this means in practice is to give each other positive externalities, and to cooperate in reducing the negative ones.

At this point, a Catch-22 problem arises. Considerateness, taking the effects of international economic transactions on others (at least) as seriously as the effects on oneself, would generally presuppose some kind of closeness, a feeling of kinship. This is what good family relations are supposed to be about. One formula may be 'neighboring countries', another 'like-minded countries', still another 'countries at the same level of development'. Self-reliance II is
supposed to develop such affinities — yet those affinities are at the same time the very condition for their coming into being.

All the same, the best approach is simply to get started. The Nordic countries, the ASEAN countries and the European Union countries did just that. This is probably also the best, perhaps even the only, way for developing. Poor countries in the South to develop — lifting not only themselves but also each other up with shared bootstraps. In that perspective South—South cooperation as advocated by the Nyerere Commission is a policy not only for development, but also for peace, at least within the South.39

The Cultural Dimension

Why do people kill? Partly because they are brought up that way — not directly to kill, but to see killing as legitimate under some conditions. That brings us to culture, that great legitimizer of violence, but also of peace. Where do we find the key carriers of violence? The easy answer would be 'religion and ideology', since people are known to kill in the name of either. However, not all religions or ideologies are violent; some are even outspoken in their advocacy of nonviolence. Or, to use the formulation preferred here: religions and ideologies can come in hard and soft varieties, the harder varieties tending to focus on some abstract, transcending goal and the softer ones on empathy, even compassion. Examples of the former world be the triumph of it - transcendent God, for instance in the occidental version of a male deity 'in the

heavens'; of some political over the world (capitalism, socialism, democracy, fascism) of some 'great' nation. Examples of softer or gentler goals would be an immanent God, as that of everyone; satisfaction of concrete basic needs in concrete human beings; regard for all life.

Obviously, the greatest occidental religions and ideologies, Islam and Christianity, liberalism and Marxism (the latter will probably have some kind of comeback) have streaks of both, so we should speak of hard and soft 'aspects' rather than hard and soft religions and ideologies, or even of hard and soft varieties. In addition, all four are also singularist, claiming to be the single, valid carrier of truth, and universalist, claiming validity all over the world and for all future time.

Such faiths become particularly dangerous when they define a chosen people (gender, generation, race, class, nation) with the right and duty to spread and defend the faith. The occidental faiths (and not only those) have elements of this, the archetype being the Judaic of a Chosen People with a Promised Land. All such notions should be challenged, replete as they are, with violence and war. And violence itself should be challenged directly. In the pragmatic West that is perhaps the best done by pointing out how violence breeds violence, probably one of the safer propositions of social science. And the best form of challenge is dialogue. Christianity comes in hard and soft varieties; the dialogue between the two varieties within a faith may be more meaningful to the believers than ecumenical dialogues across faiths. One approach need not exclude the other, however.
Therefore, the best approach is probably a positive one. The four systems criticized above are carriers of a faith maximum, with answers to (almost) everything. To demand the same belief from everybody is like prescribing the same size shoes for all. And yet, a world civilization needs some faith minimum.

**Security**

The moment human being came into this world, his search for security begins. In the history of mankind, his sense of survival has been the most powerful motivating force. Security has been one of the several basic drives for people to come together in communities. Men have shown their faith in the prince or the king for their security as a collective unit. Security has always been an important element of the responsibilities of leadership and authority.

With the passage of time, the meaning and scope of security has become much broader. The threshold of the new millennium is also the cusp of a new era in world affairs. The business and politics of the world has changed almost beyond recognition over the course of the last one hundred years. There are many actors in politics and their patterns of interaction are far more complex. The focus of power and influence is shifting. The demands and expectations made by governments and the international organizations of the world are also changing. Individuals have found diverse ways to secure their security.
What is security: security is a term widely used in both the analysis and the practice of international relations and social science. But interesting, "the concept of security falls within the category of an 'essentially contested concepts' as stated by Barry Buzan, characterized by unsolvable debates about its meaning and application." \(^{40}\)

Security is an elusive term; it means different things to different persons. It has also different meanings in different circumstances. Security as an individual or societal political value has no independent meaning and is always related to a context and a specific individual or societal value system and its realization. Michael Sheehan opines thus: "security, as a social construction term has no meaning in itself; it is given a particular meaning by a person." \(^{41}\)

The term 'security' presents the feeling of peace and harmony at psychological level, a feeling of being well guarded for several uncertainties. Although security is a contested concept yet there is a consensus that security implies 'freedom from threats to core values'.

Arnold Wolfess described the term security as, "Security, in an objective sense, measures the absence of threats to acquired values and in subjective sense, the absence of fear that such

---


values will be attacked."^{42} John E. Mroz described security as, "relative freedom from harmful from war, coupled with a relatively high expectation that defeat of the opponent shall secure position."^{43}

The standard dictionary definition of security is "security means simply the 'absence of threats'. The word absence here leaves open the possibility of both being safe from dangers of one sort or another as well as feeling safe. 'Being' and 'feeling safe' imply an objective and subjective dimension to security, respectively.

Now, the question is what it means 'to be free' or 'to feel free' or 'relatively free' from the absence of threats in a world full of uncertainties?

Within the discipline of international relations and its sub-discipline, security as discipline, studies discussions about 'security' that are often conducted within a conceptual framework and that refers to the 'referent object' of security, 'threats' to those referent objectives and the 'means' by which the referent object attempts to prevent and protect itself from threats. Within this framework of security, each will have different views about the 'referent object' to be secured from the types of 'threats' most feared and which means to be taken as a key effort for action.

---

For more clear understanding of the term security, the whole literature can be divided into two paradigms.

1) State centric Paradigm of security.
2) Human centric paradigm of security.

1. State centric Paradigm of security:

The peace treaties of Westphalia (1648) established the legal basis of modern statehood. The Westphalia constitution gave birth to the modern state system. State has been regarded as the most powerful actor in international system. The states have been universal standard of political legitimacy with no higher authority to regulate their relations with each other. Security has been seen as the priority obligation of state goods. By security, we mean "the protection of national territory." The states have to take their own protection. It was the birth of territorial state in Europe that encouraged the growth of doctrine of state centered security. National security became synonymous with territorial integrity.

This school of thought is also known as realistic school of security. The main supporters of this school are E.H. Carr and Hans Morgenthau. The realist security studies has been described as 'a child of Machiavellian and Hobbessian realism'. Realist believes that society in general is governed by objective

laws that have their roots in human nature. Hans Morgenthau saw that security dilemma originated in the flawed human nature, which was power seeking and prone to violence. "To live, to propagate and to dominate are common to all men."\textsuperscript{47} In order to understand society, it is necessary to understand the laws by which society lives. The international system was viewed as a brutal arena in which states would seek to achieve their own security at the expense of their neighbour. States constantly attempt to take advantage of each other. It proceed from such situation that permanent peace is unlikely to be achieved.

The realistic school became popular after the second world war. The concept of national security is based on two major assumptions:-

1. Most threats to the state security arise from outside its borders.

2. These threats are primarily, if not exclusively, military in nature and usually require a military response if the security of the target state is to be preserved.

These assumptions are best summed up in Walter Lippman’s celebrated statement “a nation is secure to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice its core values; if it wishes to avoid war, is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war.”\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{48} Lippman, Walter, USA Foreign Policy: Shield of the Republic (Boston: Little Brown), 1943, p. 51.
Lippman's definition according to Arnold Wolfers implies that "security rises and falls within the ability of a nation to deter an attack or to defeat it."\textsuperscript{49}

These definitions are in accord with the common usage of the term national security. National security is, "ability of a nation to protect its internal values from external threats."

Frank N. Trager said, "national security is that part of government policy, having as its objectives, the creation of national and international political conditions favourable to the protection or extension of vital national values against existing and potential adversaries."\textsuperscript{50}

Encyclopedia of social sciences describes national security as "national security focuses on the underlying unity of the internally identified values as the key factor in international politics. State must pursue power and it is the duty of the state men to calculate rationally the most appropriate steps that should be taken to perpetuate the life of the state in the hostile and threatening environment."\textsuperscript{51}

Political realism finds its way through the landscape of international politics; it is the concept of interest defined in terms of power. Morgenthau's visualized, "the concept of interest defined as power imposes intellectual discipline upon the observer, infuse rational order into the subject matter of

\textsuperscript{49} Wolfer, Arnold, Discord and Collaboration, op. cit., p. 151.
\textsuperscript{50} Trager, Frank, N. And Frank, L. Simonie, An Introduction to the Study of National Security (Kansa: Kansas University Press), 1973, p. 36.
\textsuperscript{51} Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, op. cit., p. 42.
politics and makes the theoretical understanding of politics possible."\(^{52}\)

Power is crucial to the realist and has been defined narrowly as military strategic term. Irrespective of how much power a state may possess, the core national interest of the states must be survival "the pursuit of power; the promotion of the national interest is an iron law of necessity."

Each state actor is responsible for ensuring its own well being and survival. For its own survival, state should not depend on other states or international organizations like UNO to ensure its security. Even international anarchy for realist means, "a somewhat less dangerous and less violent world rather than a safe, just or peaceful one."\(^{53}\)

Similar views are expressed by Morgenthau, "Struggle and competition ensure man can't hope to be good, but must be content with not being too evil."\(^{54}\) Realism maintains that moral universal principles cannot be applied to the actions of the states.

The instrument for pursuing the national interest of security (political freedom) is military strength "what needed to be secured was the state and the mechanism by which security would be achieved was the manipulation of military capability in

---


\(^{53}\) Ibid., p. 32.

\(^{54}\) Ibid., p. 5.
relation to actual or potential adversaries.\footnote{Baylis, John and Steve Smith, The Globalisation of World Politics (New York: Oxford University Press), 2008, pp. 210-226.}

The key assumption made by neo-realists about the way international system works, state claiming sovereignty will develop offensive military capabilities to defend themselves and extend their power in the anarchical international system. As such, they are potentially dangerous to each other. States can never be sure of the intentions of their neighbours and, therefore, they must always be on their guard. In 'offensive realism theory', "states trying to achieve security in doing so, they end up in conflict with other states."\footnote{Michael, Sheehan, International Security: An Analytical Survey, op. cit., p. 6.} State can't escape the security dilemma because military power is not inherently defensive, it will always appear offensive to others, regardless of whether or not it is being acquired for offensive purposes.

During the cold war, NATO tended to be fixated by the overall size of the Soviet armed forces and their potential offensive capabilities against western Europe.

The structural realist also feels that international system is anarchical that means absence of any central control over the states. This international anarchy derives the states towards competition and war, and ensures that any international cooperation will be unstable and limited.

Barry Buzan’s\footnote{Buzan, Barry, People States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era op. cit., p. 11.} gives more comprehensive analysis of the
concept of security in international politics. Buzau added political, economical, societal and ecological security sectors with military sector.

- Military security concerns the two-level interplay of the armed offensive and defensive capabilities of states, and states’ perceptions of each others intentions.
- Political security concerns the organizational stability of states, systems of good and the ideologies that give them legitimacy.
- Economic security concerns access to the resources, finance and markers necessary to sustain acceptable level of welfare and state power.
- Society security concerns the sustainability with the acceptable conditions for evolution of traditional patterns of language, culture, and religious and national identity and customs.
- Environmental security concerns the maintenance of the local area the planetary biosphere as the eventual support system in which all other human enterprises depend.

The main reasons for broaden the concept of security are: first broadening was needed in order to capture the changing reactions of the world. Second, the concept had useful political qualities. Third, security had potential as an integrative concept as a field of inquiry that had nationally fluid boundaries.

Buzan’s proposal to open up the subject of security was radical and important departure for traditional security. Even
then, the existence of the anarchy is the basic ontological premise of his work. He reduced the individuals as "irreducible basic unit. For him, individual can't be the referent "object" for analysis of the security.

The post-modernist approach to the security, is 'Realism as one of the central problems of international insecurity." According to them, alliances don't produce peace. But lead to war."58

The idea is that the software program of Realism that people carry around in their heads has been replaced by a new software program based on cooperative norms. Individuals, states and regions will learn to work with each other, and global politics will become more peaceful.

Human Security

'Freedom from fear' and 'freedom from want' have become the catch phrases of an approach to security called human security. Often referred to as 'people-centred security' or 'security with a human face', human security places human beings—rather than states—at the focal point of security considerations. Human security emphasizes the complex relationships and often-ignored linkages between disarmament, human rights and development. Today all security discussions and policy decisions demand incorporation of the human dimension.

Human security is an emerging paradigm for understanding global vulnerabilities whose proponents challenge the traditional notion of national security by arguing that the proper referent for security should be the individual rather than the state. Human security holds that a people-centered view of security is necessary for domestic, regional, national and global stability.

Small arms and landmines are grim examples of threats to human security. We know that once a conflict has ended, these weapons remain—stockpiled, buried, hidden or in circulation. In addition to posing the very real threat of physical harm, they have enduring consequences in vulnerable and fragile societies, inhibiting reconstruction, development, and an eventual return to normalcy. Their victims are predominantly civilians, and too often, they are children.

The idea of “human security” emerged in the early 1990s. The ending of the cold war saw a global reduction in armed conflict and political tension. The phrase “human security” was part of a deliberate attempt to switch attention from the security of states to the security of individuals. It was also an attempt to focus development efforts on mitigating risks and preventing disasters.

During the Cold War, the prevailing security concepts were based on notions of absolute security implying that one side’s security was to be achieved at the expense of the respective other’s security. Deterrence and arms racing characterized mainstream security policies throughout this period, and the
arms race became so all-pervasive that no nation was able to stand aloof from it, yet without net gains in security.

Only belatedly did nations arrive at an understanding of the 'security dilemma' phenomenon,\textsuperscript{59} on the basis of which security experts proposed alternatives to absolute security that would contribute to a world of peaceful coexistence, including concepts of mutual security, common security, and cooperative security.\textsuperscript{60} These three types of security are described below:

\textit{MUTUAL SECURITY}

In the modern age, security cannot be obtained unilaterally, and the security of one nation cannot be bought at the expense of others. The danger of nuclear war alone assures the validity of this proposition.\textsuperscript{61} According to this school of thought, the world is confronted with common dangers, hence must also promote security in common. Mutual security policies thus aim at improving the security of both sides under conditions of some mutual insecurity—a precept that is valid not only for two nations, but also for two alliances or two militant organizations threatening each other. Mutual confidence building endeavour requires compromising poser.

Mutual security proponents recommend efforts to make


\textsuperscript{60} Mutual Security and common security were used synonymously, but mutual security refers exclusively to East-West security whereas common security refers to the security of all nations.

the interaction among nations as full of positive-sum games as possible. Under such conditions, where the actors involved see opportunities for positive-sum interactions, substantial improvement in inter-state relations are actually feasible. Thus, one party should create conditions under which the other party becomes aware of the possibility of long-term gains to be derived for engagement. Furthermore, each side should endeavour to demonstrate that its chief goal is nothing but security, because the other side is often liable to misperceive this objective as victory rather than security. The concept of 'the shadow of the future' is very relevant in this connection, implying that it is important for two opposing nations to resist the temptation to seek short-term gains from cheating and defecting and rather cultivate cooperative behaviour to obtain long-term gains. Cooperation creates goodwill, mutual understanding and universal brotherhood.

COMMON SECURITY

Nations seeking to enhance their own security by means of increased threats against others inevitably find themselves facing a security dilemma, as they achieve a loss of security as a paradoxical result of their quest for security. The more defence measures one nation adopts in order to increase its sense of security, the more insecure the other feels. As a

---

62 Ibid., p. 72.
64 Moller, Bjorn, Common Security and Non-offensive Defense: A Neorealist Perspective (Boulder: Lynne Rienner), 1992, p. 36.
consequence thereof, the latter nation responds with further
defence measures that render the former nation feel less secure,
etc. The national security of both sides is thus reduced and both
intensify efforts to at least equal security level.

Common security advocates the view that international
peace must rest on a commitment by each nation to joint
survival rather than on threats of mutual destruction. The
security of the world becomes increasingly interdependent as
interdependence grows among nations in the political,
diplomatic and economic domains. Hence, one nation's pursuit
of its national security may endanger global security in a world
devoid of authority that might control the pursuit of security by
individual nations by adopting a global perspective.

Globalisation aims at this holistic inter-cultural inter-action and
attack at poverty of money income and poverty of deprivation,
among other things.

As a means to resolve the security dilemma, this school of
thought advocates disarmament. Their goal is to prevent nuclear
war, hence they urge a cut-down of nuclear arsenals. As a
means to alleviate the security dilemma, nations are to be
made aware of the irrationality in their arms competition. As a
means towards disarmament, nations are urged to adopt a non-
offensive defence posture. Still such an appreciation is far cry.

Non-offensive defence (NOD) implies that nations change
their military postures structurally, including the size of forces,
range and kinds of weapons, training, doctrine, logistics, and
operational manuals, so as to remain capable of a credible
defence, yet become incapable of offence. NOD is a strategy, materialized in a posture, intended to maximize defensive while minimizing offensive capabilities. The NOD approach is the key to tackling otherwise intractable arms race mania, as it targets military capabilities rather than intentions that are, by their very nature, subject to quick changes as men, behind all activities possess and adopt volatility in their behaviour.

A good example of a unilateral NOD-type measure is South Korea's unilateral abandonment of nuclear enrichment and plutonium reprocessing in November 1991. The United States, likewise, unilaterally announced a withdrawal of all tactical nuclear weapons from South Korea. Those two initiatives exerted pressure on North Korea to respond positively to the request for IAEA's inspections. However, the limitations of unilateral measures in relations with nations such as North Korea became apparent, as the latter came to take such unilateral measures on the part of South Korea and USA for granted and calling for no reciprocation. North Korea still retains its recalcitrant posture.

**COOPERATIVE SECURITY**

The concept of cooperative security implies that nations seek to achieve national security by pursuing only such objectives as are compatible with the security of other nations and that they seek collaborative rather than confrontational

---

Cooperative security is thus very similar to common security in that nations should recognize the security concerns of other nations, respect each other's security interests as legitimate, and pursue peaceful coexistence. The main difference between the two concepts is that cooperative security places greater emphasis on institutionalized consent and agreed-upon measures for war prevention as well as means to prevent successful aggression so as to ensure security of nations. Conflicting interests have to be reconciled in open diplomacy.

Cooperative security has come to the fore in the post-Cold War period. The end of the Cold War and the demise of the former Soviet Union automatically changed traditional security concepts and removed the foundations for previous strategies. Furthermore, the Gulf War showed the world how multinational forces could be effectively mobilized and equipped with the most advanced defence technology to defeat an aggressor's forces—thereby providing cooperative security advocates with insights into effective means of dealing with future aggressors. Moreover, the demonstration that aggression is self-destructive and entails enormous costs will also motivate nations to prefer cooperative security.

The main issues facing defence planners under the new circumstances are neither large-scale land attacks nor nuclear war. Deterrence, nuclear stability and containment are no longer the organizing principles of international security. Instead, the main issues have become security based on

---

cooperation and conflict prevention. For that to happen, world opinion is created.

Cooperative security cannot be accomplished by means of physical threats, but requires that nations show mutual restraints, provide reassurances against a resort to force, and enhance transparency with regard to defence policies and military postures, arms transfers, etc. On the other hand, cooperative security is entirely compatible with those existing arrangements and regimes that have contributed to war prevention, prohibited the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and long-range missiles, and which have promoted arms control in general. Mutual restraint should be observable and verifiable, and the reassurances that are sought through amendments of military postures, doctrines, weapons production, arms sales and acquisitions presuppose transparency. So, transparency and disclosures are the unavoidable planks to achieve and sustain security for all.

**COMPREHENSIVE SECURITY**

In Asia, the ASEAN member states have vigorously pursued a multilateral security dialogue with a view to facilitating cooperation among the Asia-Pacific states in both the economic and security fields — which Andrew Mack has aptly termed a policy of comprehensive security.67 This is best understood as a commitment by states to resolve interstate problems by peaceful means, to pursue economic cooperation

---

and regional dialogue, also as contributions to enhanced military security. In contrast to Europe, the ASEAN states have thus taken an indirect approach to their security, also as a reflection of the fact that interstate military problems were difficult to raise from the beginning.

The UNDP *Human Development Report 1994*, the first major document to use the concept, summed it up this way: “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.”68 Human security is an integrative framework. People at risk from war are also at risk from famine. Epidemics have no respect for national borders. Most development issues have to be addressed at both national and global levels. The 1994 report offered a simple definition: “Human security can be said to have two main aspects. It means, first, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. And second, it means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life—whether in homes, in jobs or in communities.”

This early report also offered a preliminary scoping of the components of human security to be expanded to include threats in seven areas:

- Economic security — Economic security requires an assured basic income for individuals, usually from productive and remunerative work or, as a last resort,

---

from a publicly financed safety net. In this sense, only about a quarter of the world's people are presently economically secure. While the economic security problem may be more serious in developing countries, concern also arises in developed countries as well. Unemployment problems constitute an important factor underlying political tensions and ethnic violence.

- Food security — Food security requires that all people at all times have both physical and economic access to basic food. According to the United Nations, the overall availability of food is not a problem, rather the problem often is the poor distribution of food and necessary lack of purchasing power. In the past, food security problems have been dealt with at both national and global levels. However, their impacts are limited. According to UN, the key is to tackle the problems relating to access to assets, work and assured income (related to economic security).

- Health security — Health Security aims to guarantee a minimum protection from diseases and unhealthy lifestyles. In developing countries, the major causes of death are infectious and parasitic diseases, which kill 17 million people annually. In industrialized countries, the major killers are diseases of the circulatory system, killing 5.5 million every year. According to the United Nations, in both developing and industrial countries, threats to health security are usually greater for poor people in rural areas, particularly children. This is mainly due to malnutrition
and insufficient supply of medicine, clean water or other
necessity for healthcare.

- Environmental security — Environmental security aims to
  protect people from the short- and long-term ravages of
  nature, man-made threats in nature, and deterioration of
  the natural environment. In developing countries, lack of
  access to clean water resources is one of the greatest
  environmental threats. In industrial countries, one of the
  major threats is air pollution. Global warming, caused by
  the emission of greenhouse gases, is another
  environmental security issue.

- Personal security — Personal security aims to protect
  people from physical violence, whether from the state or
  external states, from violent individuals and sub-state
  actors, from domestic abuse, or from predatory adults. For
  many people, the greatest source of anxiety is crime,
  particularly violent crime.

- Community security — Community security aims to
  protect people from the loss of traditional relationships
  and values and from sectarian and ethnic violence.
  Traditional communities, particularly minority ethnic
  groups are often threatened. About half of the world’s
  states have experienced some kind of inter-ethnic strife.
  The United Nations declared 1993 the Year of Indigenous
  People to highlight the continuing vulnerability of the 300
  million aboriginal people in 70 countries as they face a
  widening spiral of violence.
• Political security — Political security is concerned with whether people live in a society that honours their basic human rights. According to a survey conducted by Amnesty, political repression, systematic torture, ill treatment or disappearance was still practised in 110 countries. Human rights violations are most frequent during periods of political unrest. Along with repressing individuals and groups, governments may try to exercise control over ideas and information.

Since 1994, human security has been receiving more attention from the key global development institutions, such as the World Bank. Tadjbakhsh, among others, traces the evolution of human security in international organizations, concluding that the concept has been manipulated and transformed considerably since 1994 to fit organizational interests.69

Freedom from Fear vs Freedom from Want and beyond

In an ideal world, each of the UNDP's seven categories of threats would receive adequate global attention and necessary resources. Yet attempts to implement this human security agenda have led to the emergence of two major schools of thought on how to best practice human security — "Freedom from Fear" and "Freedom from Want". While the UNDP 1994 report originally argued that human security requires attention to both freedom from fear and

freedom from want, divisions have gradually emerged over the proper scope of that protection (e.g. over what threats individuals should be protected from) and over the appropriate mechanisms for responding to these threats.

Freedom from Fear — This school seeks to limit the practice of Human Security to protecting individuals from violent conflicts while recognizing that these violent threats are strongly associated with poverty, lack of state capacity and other forms of inequities.\textsuperscript{70} This approach argues that limiting the focus to violence is a realistic and manageable approach towards Human Security. Emergency assistance, conflict prevention and resolution, peace-building are the main concerns of this approach. Canada, for example, was a critical player in the efforts to ban landmines and has incorporated the “Freedom from Fear” agenda as a primary component in its own foreign policy. However, whether such “narrow” approach can truly serve its purpose in guaranteeing more fruitful results remains to be an issue. For instance, the conflicts in Darfur are often used in questioning the effectiveness of the “Responsibility to Protect”, a key component of the Freedom from Fear agenda.

- Freedom from Want — The school advocates a holistic approach in achieving human security and argues that the threat agenda should be broadened to include hunger, disease and natural disasters because they are inseparable concepts in addressing the root of human

insecurity\textsuperscript{71} and they kill far more people than war, genocide and terrorism combined.\textsuperscript{72} Different from "Freedom from Fear", it expands the focus beyond violence with emphasis on development and security goal.

Despite their differences, these two approaches to human security can be considered complementary rather than contradictory. Expressions to this effect include:

- Franklin D. Roosevelt's famous Four Freedoms speech of 1941, in which "Freedom from Want" is characterized as the third and "Freedom from Fear" is the fourth such fundamental, universal, freedom.

- The Government of Japan considers Freedom from Fear and Freedom from Want to be equal in developing Japan's foreign policy. Moreover, the UNDP 1994 called for the world's attention to both agendas.

Surin Pitsuwan\textsuperscript{73}, current Secretary-General of ASEAN cites theorists such as Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau and Hume to conclude that "human security is the primary purpose of organizing a state in the beginning." He goes on to observe that the 1994 Human Development Report states that it is "reviving

\textsuperscript{71} United Nations Development Programme (1994): Human Development Report


this concept” and suggests that the authors of the 1994 HDR may be alluding to Franklin Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms speech without literally citing that presentation.

Although “freedom from fear” and “freedom from want” are the most commonly referred to categories of human security practice, an increasing number of alternative ideas continue to emerge on how to best practice human security. Among them:

G. King and C. Murray⁷⁴ try to narrow down the human security definition to one’s “expectation of years of life without experiencing the state of generalized poverty”. In their definition, the “generalized poverty” means “falling below critical thresholds in any domain of well-being”; and it is in the same article, they give brief review and categories of “Domains of Well-being”. This set of definition is similar with “freedom from want” but more concretely focused on some value system.

Caroline Thomas⁷⁵ regards human security as describing “a condition of existence which entails basic material needs, human dignity, including meaningful participation in the life of the community, and an active and substantive notion of democracy from the local to the global.”

Roland Paris argues that many ways to define “human security” are related with certain set of values and lose the neutral position. So, he suggests to take human security as a

category of research. As such, he gives a 2*2 matrix to illustrate the security studies field. 76

Table 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security for Whom?</th>
<th>What is the Source of the Security Threat?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Military, Non-military, or Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td>Redefined security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National security</td>
<td>(e.g., environmental and economic [cooperative or comprehensive] security)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(conventional realist approach to security studies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societies, Groups, and Individuals</td>
<td>Intrastate security (e.g., civil war, ethnic conflict, and democide)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human security</td>
<td>(e.g., environmental and economic threats to the survival of societies, groups, and individuals)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sabina Alkire 77 different with those approaches seek to narrow down and specify the objective of human security, Sabina Alkire pushes the idea a step further as "to safeguard the vital core of all human lives from critical pervasive threats, without impeding long-term human fulfilment". In a concept as such, she suggests the "vital core" cover a minimal or basic or fundamental set of functions related to survival, livelihood and

dignity; and all institutions should at least and necessarily protect the core from any intervention.

Lyal S. Sunga\(^{78}\) in 2009, argued that a concept of human security that is fully informed by international human rights law, international humanitarian law, international criminal law and international refugee law, and which takes into account the relevant international legal norms prohibiting the use of force in international relations, will likely prove more valuable to international legal theory and practice over the longer term, than a concept of human security which does not meet these conditions because these fields of law represent the objectified political will of States rather than the more subjective biases of scholars.

**Relationship with Traditional Security**

Human security emerged as a challenge to ideas of traditional security, but human and traditional or national security are not mutually exclusive concepts. Without human security, traditional state security cannot be attained and vice-versa.\(^{79}\)

Traditional security is about a state’s ability to defend itself against external threats. Traditional security (often referred

---

\(^{78}\) Sunga, Lyal S., “The Concept of Human Security: Does it Add Anything of Value to International Legal Theory or Practice?” in Power and Justice in International Relations Interdisciplinary Approaches to Global Challenges Power and Justice in International Relations (Edited by Marie-Luisa Frick and Andreas Oberprantacher) 2009.

to as national security or state security) describes the philosophy of international security predominance since the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 and the rise of the nation-states. While international relations theory includes many variants of traditional security, from realism to idealism, the fundamental trait that these schools share is their focus on the primacy of the nation-sate. The table 1.2 contrasts four differences between the two perspectives

Human security also challenged the earlier conception (Traditional Security) and drew from the practice of international development. Traditionally, embracing liberal market economics was considered to be the universal path for economic growth, and thus development for all humanity. Yet, continuing conflict and human rights abuses following the end of the Cold War and the fact that two-thirds of the global population seemed to have gained little from the economic gains of globalisation, led to fundamental questions about the way development was practiced. Accordingly, human development has emerged in 1990s to challenge the dominant paradigm of liberal economy in the development of community. Human development proponents argue that economic growth is insufficient to expand people’s choice or capabilities, areas such as health, education, technology, the environment, and employment should not be neglected.

---

Table 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referent</th>
<th>Traditional Security</th>
<th>Human Security</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. Traditional security protects a state's boundaries, people, institutions and values.</td>
<td>Human security is people-centered. Its focus shifts to protecting individuals. The important dimensions are to entail the well-being of individuals and respond to ordinary people's needs in dealing with sources of threats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>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 uses of deterrence strategies to maintain the integrity of the state and protect the territory from external threats.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor(s)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Traditional security relies upon building up national power and military defense. The common forms it takes are armament races, alliances, strategic boundaries etc.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

82 Lippmann, Walter, U.S. Foreign Policy, op. cit., p.51.
83 Jeong Ho-Won, Human Security and Conflict (George Mason University), undated.
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Human security could be said to further enlarge the scope for examining the causes and consequences of underdevelopment, by seeking to bridge the divide between development and security. Too often, militaries didn’t address or factor in the underlying causes of violence and insecurity while development workers often underplayed the vulnerability of development models to violent conflict. Human security springs from a growing consensus these two fields need to be more fully integrated in order to enhance security for all.

Frances Stewart argues that security and development are deeply interconnected.

- Human security forms an important part of people’s well-being, and is, therefore, an objective of development. An objective of development is “the enlargement of human choices”. Insecurity cuts life short and thwarts the use of human potential, thereby affecting the reaching of this objective.

- Lack of human security has adverse consequences on economic growth, and therefore development. Some development costs are obvious. For example, in wars, people who join the army or flee can no longer work productively. Also, destroying infrastructure reduces the productive capacity of the economy.

---

Imbalanced development that involves horizontal inequalities is an important source of conflict. Therefore, vicious cycles of lack of development which leads to conflict, then to lack of development, can readily emerge. Likewise, virtuous cycles are possible, with high levels of security leading to development, which further promotes security in return.

Further, it could also be said that the practice of human development and human security share three fundamental elements:

- First, human security and human development are both people-centered. They challenge the orthodox approach to security and development i.e. state security and liberal economic growth respectively. Both emphasize people are be the ultimate ends but not means. Both treat human as agents and should be empowered to participate in the course.

- Second, both perspectives are multidimensional. Both address people's dignity as well as their material and physical concerns.

- Third, both schools of thought consider poverty and inequality as the root causes of individual vulnerability.

Table 1.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Human Development</th>
<th>Human Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Well-being.</td>
<td>Security, stability, sustainability of development gains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Moves forward, is progressive and aggregate: “Together we rise”</td>
<td>Looks at who was left behind at the individual level: “Divided we fall”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Combines short-term measures to deal with risks with long term prevention efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General objectives</td>
<td>Growth with equity.</td>
<td>“Insuring” downturns with security. Identification of risks, prevention to avoid them through dealing with root causes, preparation to mitigate them, and cushioning when disaster strikes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expanding the choices and opportunities of people to lead lives they value.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy goals</td>
<td>Empowerment, sustainability, equity and productivity.</td>
<td>Protection and promotion of human survival (freedom from fear), daily life (freedom from want), and the avoidance of indignities (life of dignity).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite these similarities, the relationship with development is one of the most contested areas of human security. "Freedom from fear" advocates, such as Andrew Mack, argue that human security should focus on the achievable goals of decreasing individual vulnerability to violent conflict, rather than broadly defined goals of economic and social development. Others, such as Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy, argue that human development and human security are inextricably linked since
progress in one enhances the chances of progress in another while failure in one increases risk of failure of another. The following table is adopted from Tadjbakhsh to help clarify the relationship between these two concepts.

---