CHAPTER-1
The Concept of Security: An Examination of Various Security Paradigms

Mapping the Context

In the discipline of international relations, the basic concept of security has undergone a huge change during last few years. Observing the changing trends of security studies, Richard Wyn Jones rightly sets forth that the concepts and theories in international relations, which were the dominant source of orientation and direction during the Cold War, have lost whatever limited relevance they once enjoyed. Jones has rightly added further: "In response, the last few years have witnessed a sustained and determined attempt to rethink some of the basic categories of thought concerning world politics and to delineate the contours of this new era. As a result, much of what has previously passed muster as timeless wisdom has been fundamentally problematised and challenged. Nowhere has this been more apparent than in notions of security." In recent times, the sheer impact of the demise of the Cold War, multidimensional predicaments of globalisation, inflamed religious and cultural sensibilities, militant nationalism, growing disparities in life chances between the haves and the have-nots, the inexorable rise of the world’s population, and later, the events of September 11, 2001, have been the critical factors for the changing edifice of international security dynamics. Such developments have, in fact, advanced the debate on reconceptualisation of security especially in the discipline of international relations in more ways than one.

The debate on reconceptualisation of security, as Barry Buzan and Lene Hansen argue, poses four basic questions: "The first question is whether to privilege state as the referent object; the second question is whether to include internal as well as external threats; the third question is whether to expand security beyond the military sector and the use of the force; and the fourth question is whether to see security as inextricably tied to a dynamic of threats, dangers and urgency." The answer of this central question can be discovered in Peter Hough's argument. Hough maintains as: "The main paradigms of international relations offer alternative conceptual

---

2 Ibid.
3 Ken Booth in his book Theory of World Security has upheld such version in the approved manner as: "The evidence is all around that the world has entered one of the most decisive phases of its history. Never before in this span of one and a half million years have we, the collective of global human society, been able to inflict as much decisive damage on each other and on the natural world on which we utterly depend; and never before have we, individually and in small groups, been as capable of transporting and visiting as much politically targeted destruction against those whose minds and actions we want to change......Indubitably The threats to our safety are proliferating and growing in destructiveness." See: Ken Booth, Theory of World Security (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p.1.
frameworks for comprehending the complexity that emerges from attempting to study the huge volume of interactions between actors that makes up the contemporary global system. These different lenses for making sense of this political complexity focus in very different ways when it comes to thinking about issues of security in international relations.\(^5\)

Security, however, in its generic sense means safety from and protection against damage or attack. For Bjørn Møller, “security” is both a terminus technicus of the academic discipline and a word in common usage.\(^6\) The term “security” bears deep controversy with regard to its meaning and scope. Moreover, the concept of security has always been a contested domain. This is significantly because of the reason that security, both in terms of theory and practice, is an evolving concept.\(^7\) For decades, the concept of security has been understood from the perspective of realism or structural realism, which has usually been regarded as dominant school of the discipline. Estimating the dominance of realist-driven approach of international relations,

Ken Booth goes to the extent of saying that till the end of the Cold War realism identified the referents of security, selected the threats and determined the legitimate knowledge about security and therefore also the experts to interpret it. Crawford also drew that “the field of security studies has been a child of Machiavellian and Hobbesian realism.” What it implies that security thinking in international relations has virtually been shaped and developed in accordance with the virtues of realism or structural realism, which posits for state-centric analysis of security. Realism/structural realism, preferably clubbed as conventional paradigm of security, describe security synonymous with national security and strictly confine it to the defence of states’ sovereignty, integrity and national independence. For this prevailing realist view, the security analysis centres on macro-level instability thus making the state as referent object of security. And therefore, as Alexander Wendt, a constructivist theorist, says that it views security in Hobbesian terms that if the state is secure, then, those who live within it are also secure.

But with the demise of the East–West confrontation in the last decade of the 20th century, the macro-level instability by and large narrowed. War remains now no more frequent phenomena fought between states at two ends. The security values as stated in conventional security paradigm: sovereignty, integrity and national independence are apparently not experiencing high degree of risks. Nonetheless, it is difficult to say that the world is safe now. Certainly, as Owen rightly says, states may not have suffered from outright nuclear attack but the people are being killed by the remnants of proxy wars and the related violence. Large scale socio-economic deprivation, unjust political systems, human rights abuse and environmental deterioration have also made them vulnerable and brought their survival at stake. Over such paradoxical situation, as a matter of fact, conventional school of security fails to provide conceivable explanation.

Critiques popularly known as non-conventional proponents of security, who are engaged in the venture of re-defining security give their profound arguments under the lights of the contemporary international security realities. They argue that defining security merely in military terms conveys false image of reality. It is because, first, this worldview, and the security that it defines, masks the actual issues threatening the people.

13 Ibid.
Secondly, conventional paradigm of security often neglects the protection of the individual due to an over-attention on the state. Thus, it causes states to concentrate on the military threats and to ignore other and perhaps more alarming threats to the survival of individual.\(^{14}\) While the truth is that state is the *means*; security of individual is the *end*. *Human Security Report 2005* says: “Secure states do not automatically mean secure peoples. Protecting citizens from foreign attack may be a necessary condition for the security of individuals, but it is certainly not a sufficient one....”\(^{15}\)

Thirdly, what will happen in the case if state itself becomes security threats to its own people instead of their security provider? Barry Buzan, in an elaborate study, has drawn attention to the fact that how the state, recognised as a security provider, has been in many ways a source of fear and insecurity for its own people.\(^{16}\) Indeed, during the last century far more people have been killed by internal violence and even some times perpetrated by their own governments than by foreign armies, writes *Human Security Report 2007*.\(^{17}\)

Finally, Richard Ned Lebow, a celebrated critique of conventional proposition, argues that conventional paradigm fails to accommodate with the newer developments and challenges in the world system.\(^{18}\) On the similar line, Edward Newman\(^{19}\) (2001 and 2004), Michael E. Brown\(^{20}\) (2003) and Goerge Mclean\(^{21}\) (2000) hold that the obsolescence of major wars; the prevalence of intra-state conflicts; the evolving identities and interests; the growing importance of international institutions and the impact of globlisation on the world politics have changed the features of the world system. “In the present times many of the most severe and persistent threats to security are arising not from conflicts between major political entities but from increased disorder within states, societies and civilizations along ethnic, racial, religious, linguistic, caste


or class lines.\textsuperscript{22} Such new but revolutionary developments and changing contour of international security scenario necessitated the quest for a broader framework for security analysis that could inquire the causes of threats to the survival of individuals and communities as well. The quest now seems to be accomplished with the emergence of human security.

What is human security? How it gained prominence in the non-conventional paradigm of security? And how it deals with newer kind of instrument and sources of threats is to be elaborated in the subsequent sections of the chapter. Here it is suffice to say that as a concept, human security is relatively new. It is, as Ronald Paris maintains, the latest in a long line of neologism—including common security, global security, cooperative security and comprehensive security.\textsuperscript{23} Nevertheless, since last one decade the concept of human security has been the subject of renewed and intense discourse. Maley Caballero-Anthony expressed this occurrence in the following words: "Whether this active discourse is a reaction to the massive suffering of humanity globally, or a reflection of trends towards re-conceptualisation or redefining security, this new security agenda has certainly been at the forefront of both national and international arena."\textsuperscript{24} Drawing the emerging importance of human security, UNDP's 1994 report said that "it would be no surprise if human security revolutionises society in the 21st century."\textsuperscript{25}

This chapter has four prime objectives. First, to draw focus on the concept of security: its meaning, nature and scope and how the concept has been inquired in the discipline of international relations; Secondly, to examine the theoretical aspect of security through evaluation of various paradigms dealing with it; Thirdly, to draw special emphasis on the evolution of the idea of human security under various phases of its historical development and to examine the factors that make human security indispensable in contemporary international security affairs; And finally, to analyse briefly the challenges and opportunities for human security in Pakistan.

**Security: The Multi-faceted Concept in International Relations**

As described earlier, security means safety from and protection against damage or attack. Etymologically, according to Hans Gunter Brauch, "Security (Lat.: 'securus', 'securitas', 'cura'; It.: 'sicurezza'; Fr.: 'sécurité'; Sp.: 'seguridad'; Port.: 'segurança'; Ger.: 'Sicherheit') was introduced by Cicero and Lucretius referring to a philosophical and psychological state of mind,

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid, p. 269.


or the subjective feeling of freedom from sorrow.\textsuperscript{26} It was used, Brauch writes, as a political concept in the context of “Pax Romana” by referring to political stability in the era of Augustus.\textsuperscript{27} However, for P.H. Liotta, the word “security” implies for the state of being secure or as a freedom from danger (freedom from fear or anxiety). In the classical sense, “security refers to tranquility and freedom of care, or what Cicero termed the absence of anxiety upon which the fulfilled life depends.”\textsuperscript{28}

\textbf{Contested Domain of Security:} In the discipline of international relations, understanding security is a matter of perspective. It is a term widely used in both the analysis and the practice of the international relations. The “security” is treated as a multi-dimensional term. Its meaning, interpretation and scope is regarded as extremely vast and diversified. And, that is why it is felt difficult to define it precisely. David Baldwin has argued that the concept of security is one of the most ambiguous and value-laden terms in the discipline of international relations.\textsuperscript{29} Patrick Morgon sustains the view that security is a condition ...which defies easy definitions and analysis.\textsuperscript{30} In the similar vein, several scholars, including Barry Buzan, have acknowledged security as an “essentially contested concept.”\textsuperscript{31} In his illustrious work—\textit{The People, State and Fear} (1983)—Buzan has argued, “Our task is to habilitate the concept of security—we cannot rehabilitate it because it has never been in proper working order.”\textsuperscript{32} Even after more than two decades of this version whether his task of habilitating the concept of security has been accomplished is debatable. Indeed, the central problem of what should constitute security still exists; rather, it has attracted many contending perspectives.

However, in this respect, a classic definition of security given by Arnold Wolfers offers some insight into its controversial nature. Security for him, in an objective sense, measures the absence of threats to an acquired values and in a subjective sense, is the absence of fear that such

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{27} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{30} Terry Terriff, n. 10, pp. 1-9.
\item \textsuperscript{31} This oft-repeated version used to describe the concept of security seems to be first and foremost used by Barry Buzan (1983: p.6). It should be noted that the term “essentially contested concept” was coined by W.B. Gallie (1955). According to Gallie, for an essentially contested concept, it is difficult to give a neutral or settled definition. Each definition is equally contested by rival definitions but none provides its true meaning. But Gallie’s assumption is now largely being criticized with the argument that no concept is essentially contested (Birch: 1993), it is perhaps better to treat contested concepts as “currently contested”. Thus Buzan’s idea that security is an essentially contested concept does not seem proper. Therefore, it would be better to treat security as a perennial contested concept rather than an essentially contested concept.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Buzan, n. 16, p. 2.
\end{itemize}
values would be attacked. Though scholars have advanced varied notions of what security involves, most avoid the need to define the term by discussing the sources of security, and indeed insecurity. Baldwin rightly asserts: "Understanding the concept of security is a fundamentally different kind of intellectual exercise from specifying the conditions under which security may be attained. Indeed, conceptual clarification logically precedes the search for the necessary conditions of security, because the identification of such conditions presupposes a concept of security." Recognising the difficulty of expecting a total absence of threat, Baldwin defines security as "a low probability of damage to acquired values." This understanding places emphasis on the preservation of acquired values, and offers a definition of security in its most general sense.

The "securitisation approach" of the Copenhagen school envisages security as a "speech act", "where a securitising actor designates a threat to a specified referent object and declares an existential threat implying a right to use extraordinary means to fend it off." The key notion of securitisation is defined as "the move that takes politics beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics." Thus, in order for something to become securitised, it needs to be presented as an existential threat. What becomes interesting to explore, therefore, is the question "who can 'do' or 'speak' security successfully, and with what effects?"

Highlighting the notion of securitisation further, the Copenhagen School seeks to distinguish between (1) the referent objects of security, i.e. the things that are seen to be existentially threatened and have a legitimate claim to survival; (2) the securitizing actors, i.e. the securitising agents in politics; and finally (3) the functional actors affecting the dynamics of the securitisation process. Such a process of 'securitisation' is successful when the construction of an 'existential threat' by a policy maker is socially accepted and where "survival" against existential threats is crucial. But both definitions of security and of security issues are themselves objects of actor's specific constructions that must be an object of analysis.

According to Elke Krahmann, at least three distinct meanings of security in terms of their intended outcomes can be conceptually distinguished across levels of analysis and different types of threats.

34 Baldwin, n. 29, p. 8.
38 Cited in Carina Meyn, n. 36, p. 4.
39 Buzan, Waever and de Wilde, n. 37, p. 36.
40 Cited in Carina Meyn, n. 36, p. 4.
The first meaning sees security as the absence of a threat. It draws on a preventative concept of security. The second meaning of security refers to existing threats that are suspended in the realm of possibility. There seems to be a link to the mechanism of deterrence with this meaning of security. Rather than attempting to deal with, and remove the causes of a threat, security based on deterrence seeks to hold off a threat from becoming an actuality. The third meaning defines security as the survival of a threat that does become a reality. Typically, these meanings appear to be logically related to specific mechanisms for obtaining security.

Despite controversies on its nature, meaning and scope, it is not surprising that security is understood as the core concept of international relations. Elucidating its importance James D. Derian argued: "No other concept in international relations packs the metaphysical punch or commands the disciplinary power of security." It is, therefore, important to understand why security is a contested or in more appropriate terms a perennially contested concept. Such problems, in fact, stem from three vital factors. (i) The concept of security embraces normative character. (ii) Security has often been confused with power and strategy. (iii) The impact of upheavals in the dynamics of international relations has been crucial as security thinking has to pass through recurrent transformations over the years.

(i) Normative Character of the Concept of Security: The very characteristic of the concept of security is that it bears normative character. Scholars hold that at the core of the concept of security are normative elements. The defining characteristic of normative concept is that it necessarily generates intractable debate about its meaning and application. As Richard Little views, such concepts contain an ideological elements, which renders empirical evidence irrelevant. In the words of John Plamentaz, the aim of the normative concepts is to create commitment to certain values. Such concepts indicate an area of concern rather than a precise condition and consequently require theoretical analysis in order to identify the boundaries of their application.

So is the case with the concept of security. Over the years analysts and policy makers hardly have agreed upon empirical analysis of the concept of security. Buzan, for example, explicitly expressed his view over this matter by claiming that if the domain and contradictions
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43 Terry Terriff, n. 10, p. 2.
44 Cited in Buzan, n. 16, p. 16.
46 Buzan, n. 16, p. 6.
of security could not be explored, the reason should be found in the inherent difficulty of the task.\(^{47}\)

However, the normative character of security can be seen almost in all perspectives. For instance, realist perspective offers empirical analysis largely devoid of moral assumptions. It draws its inferences based on objectivity. An obvious question, then, comes into being that how security can be a normative concept particularly from this perspective. Security of a state, as realism views, lies in its territorial safety and national independence. The threat to territory of a state emanates from outside. This perceived threat of external aggression can be countered by an alliance system.\(^{48}\) But, can a perceived external threat be measured objectively? Decades back, Arnold Wolfers estimated that "the chance of future attack can never be measured "objectively"; it must always remain a matter of subjective evaluation and speculation."\(^{49}\) What is evident now is, by no means, security is free from subjective assessment and thus from normative influences.

Take another instance. Power maximisation of the state, under realist account, enhances security. But, this does not happen in all cases. Say, when this power is used to quell the legitimate political voices of its people of different ethnic groups deprived of political rights then the state is not necessarily secure. It is because of the reason that its internal vulnerabilities have enough cause to make it insecure. As power maximisation by a state often creates "security dilemma".\(^{50}\) Robert Jervis explains that the magnitude and the nature of security dilemma depend on two variables: the offence-defence balance and offence-defence differentiation. This action-reaction process, as described by Charles L. Glaser, is much intricate.\(^{51}\) In fact estimation of offence-defence balance and offence-defence differentiation and so the security dilemma can't be explained in an objective manner.\(^{52}\)

On the other hand, non-conventional perspectives by their nature thrive upon ethical assumptions. Their focus largely centres on value laden facts: how "should" security be achieved? Take the case of human security, which in recent times eclipses the non-conventional debate on security. In the words of Edward Newman, human security is normative because, "there is an ethical responsibility to reorient security around the individual in a redistributive

\(^{47}\) Ibid.
\(^{48}\) The neo-realists, particularly Kenneth Waltz (1979) in *Theories of International Politics* gives succinct explanation of how states can devise plan to defend itself from potential adversaries through balance of power system by going into alliances with likeminded states.
\(^{49}\) Wolfers, n. 33, p. 151.
\(^{50}\) The theory of Security Dilemma was for the first time propounded by John Herz in his famous article published in *World Politics* in 1950. It premises that many of the means by which a state tries to increase its security decrease the security of others.
\(^{52}\) Ibid
sense...and extend security to people perilously lacking in security have a basic human obligation to do so. There is greater understanding that human security has a direct impact upon peace and stability within and between states.\textsuperscript{53} In his remarks about the normative character of human security in a colloquium at Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIО), he argued that "human security has refashioned the relationship between the individual and the state. Instead of sovereignty, it stresses upon conditional sovereignty."\textsuperscript{54} Conditional sovereignty refers to that kind of sovereignty which rests not only on control of territory, but also upon fulfilling certain standards of human rights and welfare for citizens. As a corollary, the sovereignty of states that is unwilling or unable to fulfill certain basic standards may be jeopardised. The use of military force for human protection purposes (humanitarian military intervention) is the starkest example of this concept.\textsuperscript{55} Therefore, it is now being realised that as a concept, human security, which embraces all those human values that are necessary for human survival has brought nonnativism into central focus.

(ii) Relation between Security, Power and Strategy: Security has been used interchangeably with power by social scientists. Throughout the last century, states were seen as locked into a power struggle and security easily slipped into the subordinate role in which it was seen as a derivative of power.\textsuperscript{56} Although after the emergence of nuclear arms, power (military) gradually widened the breathing space for security. In fact, huge literature on defence science has choked the way through which security (theoretical study) could flourish. During the entire Cold War period, security was much more about military capability and relations based on it.

Strategic studies flourished in the Cold War period. "State behaviour, it was commonly assumed, was based upon the policy of power maximization through a strategy of influencing rivals to act in certain ways by means of threat manipulation and force projection."\textsuperscript{57} At the

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid
\textsuperscript{55} With the growing misery of the people all over the world and failure of states to protect their own people from the multitude of menaces, the advocacy is being drawn to shift the focus from "sovereignty as control" to "sovereignty as responsibility." The idea or notion of the responsibility to protect is best articulated in the report of International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), constituted by the government of Canada and a group of major foundations with the name The Responsibility to Protect. The notion of "sovereignty as responsibility" implies a dual responsibility. It refers to as each state has the responsibility not only "to respect the sovereignty of other states" but also "to respect the dignity and basic rights of people within the state." "Sovereignty as responsibility" embraces three specific responsibilities: (i) The responsibility to prevent; (ii) The responsibility to react; and (iii) The responsibility to rebuild. For an elaborate idea on the subject see: International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty 2001, The Responsibility to Protect: Report from the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, [Online: web] Accessed 4 Nov. 2006, URL: http://www.dfait-mae.gc.ca/iciss-ciise/report-en.asp.
\textsuperscript{56} Buzan, n. 16, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{57} Crag A. Snyder, Contemporary Security and Strategy (Basingstoke: Mc Millan, 1999), p. 11.
same time, nuclear deterrence prevented war between the US and the USSR. It also worked effectively in Europe to prevent the fierce military confrontation. Assessing Walter Lippmann’s observation, M. Ayoob has explained as: “A nation is secured to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice its core values. What he tries to narrate is quite simple. Amidst the game of Great Powers rivalries, security rose and fell with the ability of a nation to deter an attack, or to defeat it.”

Even major parts of the last century witnessed perpetual dominance of a particular school of security which, to the great extent, inspired the military security. Powerful western states exploited the situation in their favour and ignited arms race. For that they largely preferred short-term strategic policies instead of long-term security formulations. Buzan fittingly noted: “The shifting patterns of international amity and enmity, plus the ceaseless interplay of developments in weapons technology and deployment, required constant monitoring and evaluation. The vastness of this task largely confines strategic studies to short-term perspectives, leaving neither much capacity nor much inclination, to move beyond empirical and policy-oriented horizons.”

More often than not, this trend has been conspicuous in international affairs since the beginning of the 20th century. Security thinking has, therefore, been subsumed in strategic thinking. Richard Ashley in his critique of technical rationality argued that a short term strategic policy to ensure security was itself a principal factor exacerbating the sense of insecurity among states. Ken Booth thus rightly observed, “Strategic studies pursue state-bound, ethnocentric analyses of security problems that are seriously deficient in relation to the character of the problem.” Power and strategy apparently, therefore, overshadowed the security thinking. Even in the contemporary period priority is accorded to strategic policies that undermine the perspectives of security policies.

(iii) Changing Dynamics of International Relations and Security Concerns: Every historical period is marked to some extent by change. Kegley and Wittkopf observe that the cascade of events in recent past implies a revolutionary restructuring of world politics. Their consequences are more profound and diversified. This led to the changes in the contour of international relations. Their impact is seen on the character of security studies too. However,
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after World War-II, there were many upheavals in the systemic and asystemic order of international politics. So far as security matters is concerned, the great oil crisis of the early seventies gave considerable impetus to the demand of bringing changes in the prevalent concept of security. That crisis of strategically most important resource gave rise to the new aspects of security, later known as nonmilitary or non-conventional model of security. According to H.G. Brauch, the rethinking of security project has been influenced by three crucial factors:

- The change of the international order and the security agenda triggered by the fall of the Berlin wall (9 November 1989), by the terrorist attacks on the U.S. centres of power (11 September 2001), on a train in Madrid (11 March 2002), on the subway and a bus in London (7 July 2005), and by the so-called “war on terror” (since 2001);
- A paradigmatic shift in the social sciences from positivism to constructivism and towards concepts of a (world) risk society; and
- The emergence of “global environmental change” (GEC) as a new topic in the natural and social sciences since the 1970s and 1980s, and of scientific and political efforts to address global environmental challenges as security issues, and thus to securitise “global environmental challenges” (environmental security) but also efforts to broaden the scope of the thinking on security from the state as the major referent of security to ‘society’ (societal security), the individual or humankind (human security) as well as to regions (regional security) and the globe (global security). 63

The end of the Cold War and the advent of globlisation have heavily impacted the security perspectives. The conclusion of the Cold War was one of the most tumultuous and significant events in modern human history. 64 The end of the Cold War is considered unique and equated with other complex events like the French Revolution or the decline and the fall of Rome. 65 As communism collapsed in Eastern Europe a new kind of international system appeared to have come into existence. The new world order, as described by former president of the US, on 11 September, 1990, seems to be based not on ideological hostility between states, but on new kind of chaos that altered substantially the nature of international security. To define this period, Michael T. Klare proposed a term “era of multiple schisms.” 66 However, James N. Rosenau, describing the era of post Cold War rightly argued as:

The new evolving epoch is an epoch of multiple contradictions, the international system is less dominant, but it is still powerful. States are changing, but they are not disappearing. State’s sovereignty has eroded, but it is still vigorously asserted. Governments are becoming weaker, but they can still throw their weight around. Borders still keep out intruders, but they are also more porous. Landscapes are giving way to

---

63 Hans Gunter Brauch, n. 26, pp. 10-11
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ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, and financescapes, but territoriality is still a central preoccupation for many people.67

The end of the Cold War proved to be strategically more important, while globalization has been considered as a complex phenomenon with multiple effects on national and international patterns. The strategic importance of the end of the Cold War can be evident from the following two kinds of developments.

First, decline in the possibility of major global wars that eased the heightened sense of external vulnerabilities to the state. Second, volcanic eruption of internal frailties of states that were possibly submerged in superpowers rivalries during Cold War period.68 In fact, the existence of an external threat promotes internal cohesion and gives societies a sense of purpose and identity. There is evidence that, in many states, the collapse of the external threat has helped to unleash centrifugal pressure, usually in forms of racial, ethnic and regional tensions. This has occurred in many parts of the world, but in particular in eastern part of Europe, as demonstrated by the prolonged bloodshed amongst Serbs, Croats and Moslems. Michael Klare writes that “in the present times many of the most severe and persistent threats to global peace and security are arising not from conflicts between major political entities but from increased disorder within states, societies and civilizations along ethnic, racial, religious, linguistic, caste or class lines.”69

Another powerful development of the contemporary period is Globalisation. Thomas Friedman has argued that globalization is not just some passing trend. “It is today the overarching international system shaping the domestic politics and foreign relations of virtually any country.”70 He further explains that globalization is creating a complex balance of power among states, between states and markets, and between states and individual. It increases global inter-dependence. It has ideological importance but its consequences are heavy in terms that it weakens the boundaries and salience of the state and sovereignty, ignites identity as a source of conflict and diversifies the threats.71 The impact of globalization on security can be assessed in the following ways:

The most far-reaching security effect of globalization is its complication of the basic concept of threat in international relations. For Victor D. Cha, this is in terms of both agency and

68 Ayoob, n. 58, pp. 139-163.
69 Brown, n. 20, p. 311.
71 Ibid
scope. Cha argues: "Agents of threats can be states but can also be non-state groups or individuals. While the vocabulary of conflict in international security traditionally centered on interstate war, with globalisation, terms such as human security become common palance, where the fight is between irregular sub-state units. For this reason, security threats become inherently more difficult to measure, locate, monitor, and contain."  

Globalisation is linked to the growth of supra-territorial relation between people. "It is a reconfiguration of social space in which territory matters less because an increasing range of connections have a “trans-world” or “trans-border” character." Non-state actors are gaining ground. It is being perceived that states are not only losing their autonomy in economic arena but they are sharing powers – including political, social, and security with non-state actors. Quoting Jessica T. Mathews, Brown writes that the relative power of state will continue to decline. This certainly will make the security problems trans-national instead of inter-state and intra-state. Besides, as Peter Hough writes, the process of globalisation has led to internal political issues increasingly externalised and external political issues becoming increasingly internalised. 

Globalisation makes localisation and local conflict fierce. It ignites the identity, empowers non-state actors in their activities as never before. Globalisation has facilitated proliferation of small arms into conflict prone areas. It spreads local conflicts into different parts of the world and encourages international crime, terrorism, and extortion, often through the active cooperation of ethnic Diaspora, which may itself be virtually global in geographic extent. 

Globalisation also has given rise to a “skill revolution” that enhances the capabilities of groups such as drug smugglers, political terrorists, criminal organisations, and ethnic insurgents to carry out their agenda more effectively than ever before. Globalisation gives rise to the newer kind of threats such as, the emergence of new and deeply entrenched patterns of inequality and uneven political and economic development. This might shift global tension from East versus West to North versus South.
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Other problems associated with globalisation are similar to the problems of “risk society”, an idea given by Ulrich Beck. 81 A risk society is one that is characterised by rising individualism and an associated weakening of tradition, community and established institutions. In this respect, uncertainty goes beyond an increase in the pace and a reduction in the predictability of economic and social change, in that it has a personal, even psychic dimension. All fixed points are undermined, people’s basic values and even sense of identity are called into question. The clash of civilizations is, therefore, foreseen as an inevitable consequence. 82

Radical ecologists allege that globalisation is insensitive towards environmental crisis and destruction that create severe threat to the human survival. They also maintain that globalisation is merely an extension of industrialism, an economic system that is characterized by large scale production, accumulation of capital and relentless growth. By spreading materialism and entrenching absolute faith in science and technology, industrialism undermines human values and deadens ecological sensibility. 83

The most recent spell of transformation in security thinking has been noticed after the events of September 11, 2001. The events of 9/11 led to reactions all around the world. In fact, no country could save itself from the heat coming out of the smoking rubble of the World Trade Centre (WTC) instead they proved to be a defining moment for the international security environment as it had been evolving after the end of the Cold War. In the words of Jef Huysmans, the acts of violence of 11 September 2001 in the USA created exceptional times in international politics. Claims of exceptionality feature prominently in the international politics of insecurity. 84 Quoting Blaire, Huysmans wrote that “it was the events of September 11 that marked a turning point in history, where we confront the dangers of the future and assess the choices facing humankind.” 85 The aftermath of 9/11, however, has introduced a new set of techniques to conduct security affairs in international relations. But question is, how has security thinking been affected?

The trajectories of security in post 9/11 era are heading towards multiple directions. First, this has given birth to the concept of “asymmetric warfare.” This implies that an opponent,
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relatively weak in conventional terms, including state, or sub-state actors seek to counter the powerful state with unconventional asymmetric means. For instance, attacks on World Trade Centre and Pentagon in the US, Indian Parliament and more recently in Mumbai by terrorist organisations symbolise this tendency. Asymmetric warfare has taken new course due to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) to the sub-state actors.

Secondly, the threat of Unipolarity seems more potent. The grand design of the sole super power to defend its predominant position in the international system in the pursuit of its interests has arisen now. Although, some has even argued that 9/11 gave a tailor made opportunity to the sole superpower to execute its grand design. At the backdrop of this event, Bush administration’s Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) reflects departure from the pre 9/11 approach to deterrence. It is believed that NPR will simply turn a new page in the arms race by calling for the development of the next generation of nuclear weapons. John Herz has equated such policy of the US as “international social Darwinism”. Herz has argued that “the US seeks to secure its global hegemony through maintaining an incontestable strategic superiority.”

To legitimise its acts, right or wrong, the US has re-evolved theories and doctrines. Among these, the doctrine of pre-emption is important one. It is interesting to notice that the doctrine of pre-emption gives undeterred right only to this sole superpower (not to the other powers like India, suffering equal degree and same nature of threats to their security) against possibility of any threat to its homeland. This doctrine disregards the traditional rules of international law (pacta sunt servanda). The military intervention in Iraq is the noble example. This shows an extraordinary demonstration of the US power and also the possibility that no global strategic competitor can deter it. The combination of great military-technological superiority with the almost absence of (state-level) military antagonists adds up to what is often called the USA’s sole super power status. This historic circumstance has offered it a much larger potential stage with fewer direct risk and penalties.
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Finally, the traditional conviction about the concept of security that the national security is supreme is being given its voice again.\textsuperscript{93} September 11, 2001, attacks brought back the concerns of the homeland security that were virtually being paid poor attention in the post Cold War period. Maley Caballero-Anthony views it as reiteration of dominant security thinking—the privilege of the state as security referent.\textsuperscript{94} This is evident from the fact that many states have raised their defence expenditure particularly under post 9/11 circumstances. And, thus, total global defence expenditure is gradually rising that was on the decline just one decade before. The global arms expenditure during the years 1991, 1992, and 1993 were $855, 815, and 790 billion, while in the post 9/11 era, during the years 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008 were $895, 952, 1015, 1071, 1113, 1142, 1182 and 1226 billion respectively.\textsuperscript{95} The average fall down in the global arms expenditure after the end of the Cold War was about 5 percent. The following graph shows how the defence expenditure line during 1990-93 is on decline but on steep rise during 2001-2008. Whereas the years following September 11, 2001 witnessed the significant rise in the global arms expenditure with an average rate of about 10 percent. However, the cumulative rise in the arms expenditure alone cannot depict rightly the international security trends. On the basis of such trends one can discern that national security cannot be kept into abeyance even though people’s security is emerging as a prime concern in the international security landscape.

**Graph-1.1: Global Military Expenditure between 1990-93 and 2001-2008**


\textsuperscript{93} Such views are expressed by living legend, John Herz and Diplomatic historian John Lewis Gaddis (2002). They have claimed that national security has now become truly national with the homeland at risk and calls this “revolution in strategic thinking.”


Security Debate and Various Security Paradigms

The debate over various paradigms of security primarily tends to revolve around priorities and parameters of security issues. In this discipline the concept of security has been used in three respects:

- Traditional meaning: security as an attribute of state, absence of military conflict (military security);
- Security used in a broader sense yet still referring directly to the phenomena taking place in international relations, or directly/indirectly caused by interstate relations (security as a public good);
- Security in a universal sense (of a unit and of a social entity) (human security).  

There are several schools of thought which deal with the concept of security. Broadly, these are divided into two categories: (i) Conventional: the main representatives of conventional paradigm of security are realist and neo-realist approach; and (ii) Non-conventional paradigm embraces Copenhagen school, constructivism, critical theory, feminism, post-structuralisms and human security.

Conventional Paradigm's Argument and Defence: The central assumption of conventional paradigm, however, is centred upon how the state is made secure. For instance, realism, an important theory of conventional paradigm, posits that security problems are issues involving states, and they involve the threat, use or potential use of military force. The most important fact regarding this perspective is that its theoretical basis is the determination of what the state is being secured against.  

According to realist theories, nation states are the basic building blocks of the international system with unlimited sovereignty. The primary function of the state is to survive and enhance its power in an anarchical and conflictual international system; to compete with other states to maximise its interests, often at the expenses of others; and to develop the state's capability (military and otherwise) to ensure security.  

Michael Sheehan writes as:

For realists, the central reality of international relations is that the system is anarchic. In the anarchic international environment all states maintain military capabilities for their own defense. The realist understanding of international security is structured by specific ideas about the nature of politics at the international level. In many cases overestimation of adversary's capability often gives rise to security dilemma. For realists, security dilemma is an absolute predicament. States cannot escape the security dilemma; because
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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.\(^\text{99}\)

The State, however, is an entity \textit{sui generis}, which is often either portrayed as endowed with certain almost metaphysical characteristics or personified, i.e. treated as if it were an individual "writ large". In conventional terms, therefore, security is about military and the state; meaning the referent object is the state. Threats to security are from military forces, and the defence against them lies in military readiness by the state. The values under threat are the state, its territory and resources. Finally, security is believed to be accomplished by military preparedness, deterrence, arms race as well as alliance with other states or blocks.

At the dawn of the 21\textsuperscript{st} century, when dissention among scholars and analysts got intensified against ontological and epistemological assumptions of security and the entire debate was taking turn against so-called broader framework, proponents of conventional paradigm again opened a fierce debate. Replying the conviction of non-conventional security paradigm that state ought not to be the sole or main referent of security, conventional thinkers have interpolated that the fundamental features of the international system have not yet changed. The international system, as the traditionalists view, is still anarchic in that states and other actors still have to provide their own security; there is no international authority capable of providing security for one and all. Keneth Walz views it as continuity rather than change.\(^\text{100}\)

Defenders put forward their assertion that states are still the dominant actors in the international system and, states are still determined to preserve their survival. The result is that security competitions and confrontations will still be common features of international relations in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century.\(^\text{101}\) Despite realism's failure in explaining the structural changes in the international system or its inadequacy in comprehending emerging security challenges it would be unmindful to invalidate its importance outrightly. Dietrich Fischer argued that "state lies at the core of all aspects of security over and above the differences between them."\(^\text{102}\)

**Non-conventional Paradigm’s Argument and Defence:** Non-conventional paradigm comprises many schools of thought which explain the concept in broader perspective but mainly six schools' work are considered crucial in this respect. These include: the Copenhagen school, constructivism, critical theory, post-structuralism, feminism and human security.
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The Copenhagen School's Approach: The most significant contribution from the Copenhagen school to the security studies has been from Buzan. Barry Buzan’s *People, States and Fear* (1991) can be viewed as the “high-water mark of the Copenhagen school approach to the study of security”. While remaining grounded in a scientific objectivist epistemology and, ultimately, in a state-centric ontology, Buzan produced a rich, suggestive, and sophisticated discussion of the concept of security. Buzan’s attempt to theorise security—in *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (1998), written in collaboration with two of his Copenhagen School colleagues, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde—clearly represents a significant break with both the epistemological and ontological foundations of *People, States and Fear*.

The key element in Buzan’s idea was to broaden the security agenda so as to involve five sectors rather than deal only with one of the five, which was the traditional focus: military security. Buzan added political, economic, societal, and ecological security sectors. Importantly, Buzan also discussed the individual as the “irreducible base unit” for discussion about security. But for Buzan, individuals could not be the referent object for the analysis of international security. That had to be the state for three reasons: it was the state that had to cope with the sub-state, state, international security problematic; the state was the primary agent for the alleviation of insecurity; and the state was the dominant actor in the international political system. Later, Buzan developed the notion of “societal security” as the most effective way of understanding the emerging security agenda in post Cold War. Crucial in this move towards societal security has been work on the idea of “securitisation.”

Security is not only about the objective absence or presence of threats, dangers and risks but also involves the politics of securitisation and desecuritisation. According to the theory of securitization, actors can bring securitisation about by presenting something as an existential threat and by dramatising an issue as having absolute priority. Ole Wæver argued as:

Securitisation is characterised by dramatising an issue as having absolute priority. Something is presented as an existential threat: if we do not tackle this, everything else will be irrelevant. And, by labelling this a security issue, the actor has claimed the right to
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deal with it by extraordinary means, to break the normal political rules of the game (for example, in the form of secrecy, levying taxes or conscripts, limitations on otherwise inviolable rights). The main argument of securitisation theory is that “security is a (illocutionary) speech act, that solely by uttering “security” something is being done. It is by labelling something a security issue that it becomes one.” By stating that a particular referent object is threatened in its existence, a securitising actor claims a right to extraordinary measures to ensure the referent object’s survival. The issue is then moved out of the sphere of normal politics into the realm of emergency politics, where it can be dealt with swiftly and without the normal (democratic) rules and regulations of policy-making. For security this means that it no longer has any given (pre-existing) meaning but that it can be anything a securitising actor says it is. Security is a social and intersubjective construction. In this context, leveling something as a security issue fills it with a sense of importance and urgency that legitimises the use of special measures outside of the usual political process to deal with it. The concern here is that this results in a militarized and confrontational mindset, which defines security questions in an “us versus them” manner. Instead this approach proposes “desecuritising” issues, that is, to remove them from the security agenda.

The Constructivist Approach: According to constructivism, the fundamental structures of international politics are social rather than strictly material. This leads social constructivists to argue that changing the way we think about international relations can bring a fundamental shift towards greater international security. Alexander Wendt, a famous constructivist, speaks to that “anarchy is what states make of it”, to the security realm: thus “security is what we make of it.” Specifically, constructivists want to question the focus of traditional security studies on the state, and to reexamine prevailing claims about security. Basically the stress is on the need to move from a focus on the military dimension of state behaviour under anarchy to a focus on individuals, community and identity. The main assumptions of constructivist approach can be presented in several points as:
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Firstly, Human agents construct social reality and reproduce it on their daily practices. Thus, constructivism sees the international system as 'socially constructed' and not given.

Secondly, at the hearth of constructivist work is that social environment defines who we are, our identities as social beings. In addition, normative or ideational structures do not exist independently from social environment. Constructivists focus both on differences among people and how those relations are formed by means of collective social institutions.

Thirdly, constructivists emphasise the importance of normative or ideational structures as well as material structures in defining the meaning and identity of an individual.

Finally, Constructivist analysis redefines the concepts of roles, rules, identity and ideas considerably departing from the rational choice conceptualisations.116

Constructivism in security realm encompasses two prime thoughts: security communities and security culture. The central theme is that security communities are best understood as path-dependent and socially constructed, with the trigger mechanisms for security communities having both material and normative bases. The important insight that this approach develops is that state actors might see security as achievable through community rather than through power. Security, therefore, is something that can be constructed; insecurity is not simply the "given" condition of the international system. Security is what states make of it. The idea here is that a constructivist approach, which recognises the importance of knowledge for transforming international structures and security politics, is best suited to taking seriously how the international community can shape the security politics and create the conditions for stable peace.117

The second major strand developing a constructivist account of international security is work on the security culture of the different states. The central theme of this approach is that national security interests are defined by actors who respond to cultural factors. This does not mean that power, conventionally understood as material capabilities, is unimportant for an analysis of national security. But the meanings that states and other political actors attach to power and security help us explain their behaviour. Not that for all the focus on identity, norms and culture in this scope, the state is still the actor, and military security remains the form of security to be explained.118

The Critical School's Approach: Critical theory as an approach to the understanding of international relations made only a limited impact when it was first introduced to the discipline
via dependency theory in the 1960s. But the first major contribution came in 1981 by Robert Cox, who attacked the foundations of neorealism because of its hidden normative assumptions. Cox argues that realism typifies what Horkheimer meant by traditional theory. Cox called it problem solving theory, which takes the world as it finds it; the general pattern of institutions and relationships is not called into question. The effect is then to reify and legitimise the existing order. Critical international theory focuses on the existing global power structures of the contemporary world. For critical international theory, prevailing order is shot through with injustices and inequalities on a global scale, and it is on this basis that it favours alternative world view.

Critical theory’s concerns for security reflect from Critical Security Studies (CSS). Critical Security Studies is a sub-field within the academic discipline of international politics concerned with the pursuit of critical knowledge about security. For Ken Booth:

Critical knowledge implies understandings that attempt to stand outside prevailing structures, processes, ideologies, and orthodoxies while recognising that all conceptualisations of security derive from particular political/theoretical/historical perspectives. Critical theorising does not make a claim to objectivity but rather seeks to provide deeper understandings of oppressive attitudes and behaviour with a view to developing promising ideas by which human society might overcome structural and contingent human wrongs. Security is conceived comprehensively, embracing theories and practices relating to multiple referents, multiple types of threat, and multiple levels of analysis.

Rejecting the largely realist/neo-realist and statist mindset of Cold War-era security studies, critical security studies aims at both theoretical re-conceptualisations of what security is, as well as empirical investigations of whether conventional security-enhancing practices actually deliver. Additionally, CSS has served an important function by broadening the scope of the debate within security studies via the introduction of postpositivist perspectives (feminist, postcolonial, neo-Marxist, constructivist, sociological, and postmodernist, amongst others).

This school studies the security through two main approaches; one led by Keith Krause and Michael Williams while other is led by Ken Booth and Richard Wyn-Jones. It was they
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who popularise the distinction between broadening and deepening security. Broadening the concept means inclusion of a wider range of potential threats, beginning from economic and environmental issues, and ending with human rights and migration. Deepening the agenda of security studies means moving either down to the level of individual or up to the level of international or global security, with regional and societal security as possible intermediate points.

Critical security studies can be seen as involving two distinct processes, broadening and deepening. Merely broadening the concept of security by applying it to additional sectors such as the economy or the environment is inadequate, both because it does not address the full threat agenda, and because it does not release the concept from its neorealist influence. This is not to argue that military threats do not exist, or should not be studied—far from it. Military strategy is important, but it is only one part of international relations. Critical theorists Keith Krause and Michael Williams said: “It is impossible to account for threats to referents other than the state unless we deepen our understanding of security as well as broaden it and also contextualize it in terms of different understandings of political possibility.”

The second approach lays its emphasis on six overlapping characteristics. Ken Booth illustrated these six characteristics of critical security studies in the following ways:

- **Universalist**: Based on the historical and anthropological evidence that good ideas travel, and are not exclusive to particular cultures, critical global theorising is for all human society; it is not reserved for the ghetto.
- **Inclusive**: Some ideas can be universalist without being inclusive (faiths that claim to be the one true religion, for example). The cosmopolitan spirit attempts to embrace all, including those whose screams have faded away, or are fading away unheard, in the 'sublime silence of eternity'.
- **Normative**: This body of ideas assumes that the answers to the fundamental questions about politics are not to be discovered by science, but by ethical reasoning conducted through dialogue. Equality is the foundational idea of this way of thinking.
- **Emancipatory**: Critical global theorising seeks to construct a world politics that is not shackled by the chains of oppressive ideas and practices. It seeks to promote freedom.
- **Progressive**: Critical theory attempts to bring theory and practice together in the interests of humankind in general and of the suffering in particular. It assumes that progressive change is possible in morality and politics, not just technology.
- **Critical**: The method of critical theorising is to stand outside the status quo, identify the oppressions within existing structures and processes, and then develop the resources for change. This method consists of both a theoretical commitment and a political orientation.
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This second thread of CSS centres its prime focus on emancipation. For this, only a process of emancipation can make the prospect of security more likely. It argues that emancipation should logically be given precedence in our thinking about security over the mainstream themes of power and order. Human emancipation is defined as “freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from the physical and human constraints which stop them from carrying out what they would freely choose to do.” Ken Booth describing the relationship between security and emancipation says: “Security means the absence of threats. Emancipation is the freeing of the people (as individuals and groups) from those physical and human constraints which stop them carrying out what they would freely choose to do. War and threat of war is one of those constraints, together with poverty, poor education, political oppression and so on. Emancipation not power or order, produces true security.”

The Feminist Perspective: Steve Smith writes that “the feminist work on security is extensive, although much of it deals with security implicitly as a result of a thoroughgoing critique of the gendered assumptions of traditional international relations”. Feminists have a fundamental objection to the ontology and epistemology of the conventional paradigms of security. Mainly critical of realists/neorealist proposition, feminists approach like other post­positivists, challenges realism’s claim to scientific objectivity, arguing that all knowledge and social reality are socially constructed. This rejects the neorealist account of states as unitary actors whose internal characteristcics are largely irrelevant.

Feminist scholars touch an important aspect of security perspective that the thoroughly masculinised perspectives on security must be reconsidered and, if necessary, revamped. Indeed, feminist perspective of international relations shows how women are ignored yet centrally implicated in international relations. It has been argued that whilst security has always been considered a masculine issue, women have seldom been recognised by the security literature; yet women have been writing about security since at least the beginning of the century. The contribution of feminist writers to security studies has been to interrogate the notion of the state as a neutral actor. Crucially, looking at security from the perspective of women alters the definition of what security is to such an extent that it is difficult to see how any form of traditional security studies can offer an analysis. It is like looking at the world through completely different coloured spectacles. Feminist theorists have therefore helped to breakdown
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conventional understandings of national security issues, offering a rich array of ways to see and solve problems that highlight conceptions of the body, of nature, of vulnerability, and of the meaning of rationality itself.\textsuperscript{133}

Feminist approach has also promoted new ways of thinking about the problems involved in achieving security. The conception of security by feminists mulls over the development of the broader, multisectoral approach to security in which the social environment be improved to minimize or end the vulnerabilities for women. This approach also fosters to a commitment towards social justice. Thus, security theory clearly needs to evolve to address a changing world. This means acknowledging the different security experience for women, so that questions of poverty, rape, and refugee status are treated with the same seriousness as military strategy and nuclear weapons.\textsuperscript{134}

**Post-Structuralist Approach:** This approach posits against the abuse of structure – legitimisation of the processes of state formation and maintenance. Bradley S. Klein in his influential work *Strategic Studies and World Order* (1994) demonstrates that how the language of strategic studies is just a neutral appraisal of the condition of international anarchy. Instead, the language of strategic studies, concentrated as it is on threats, fear and security is actually one of the tools used to legitimate the process of state formation and maintenance.\textsuperscript{135} Without external threats, fears and dangers, the state's legitimacy to exist and continue existing in the shape that it does on the basis of providing security will come under increasing scrutiny. David Campbell empirically studies this assumption in the context of the U.S. foreign policy in his outstanding book *Writing Security* (1992). This work specifically argues that the U.S. foreign policy demonstrate certain dangers and threats to construct a specific identity for the U.S. as an international actor.\textsuperscript{136}

**Human Security Approach:**

The term “human security” is believed to be coined by Lincoln Chen but pioneered by Mahbub ul Haq.\textsuperscript{137} However, the idea of human security is derived from W. E. Blatz's mid-1960s theory of “individual security.”\textsuperscript{138} As a concept human security is rather a promising but still evolving
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to understanding contemporary security realities. The first major statement regarding human security appeared in the 1994 Human Development Report in its chapter two entitled *New Dimensions of Human Security*. However, the idea associated with it can be dated back to accounts of peace and human values envisioned in Vedas and Buddhist texts in the Ancient India.

An explicit human security perspective, although, got articulated at the beginning of the 1990s when the late Mahabub-ul-Haq broke new theoretical ground by advancing the theory of human security. It is true that it could find its expression in the 1990s at different levels but its roots can be explored in the distant past in many scholarly expositions, various commissions' reports and outcome of different conferences held over the years.

Taylor Owen finds the roots of human security in early liberal philosophic writings focusing on the protection of the individual. For him, many of the basic principles of human security are crude reflections of the writings of Montesquieu, Rousseau and Condorcet. Montesquieu drew more emphasis on freedom and perceived rights of individual over the dictated security provided by the state. Condorcet sought to foster the idea that if freedom from fear was not guaranteed, then individuals could not be effective members of a political relationship. He, therefore, advocated for a societal contract in which the security of the individual was accorded central priority.

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), in his idea of world government, viewed that by combining reason and morality we should avoid the war. The image of "universal and lasting peace" he shaped is one of the worthy goals of human security. One of the most influential vestiges of this concept in the 18th and 19th centuries has been found in the classic liberalism’s notion that war does not pay. In the early 20th century the devastating First World War stimulated the quest for the conditions under which war might be avoided and peace maintained.

Later period witnessed the advocacy of human values, international peace and order by Tran-nationalist/idealist school (from Kelson, Wilson, Alfred Zimmern, Friedman, David
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Mitrany to Robert O. Keohane, Joseph Nye and John Murton). Views of Hobson and Norman Angell on war and peace in terms of social justice, democracy, free trade interdependence motivated many contemporary theorists of international relations. David Mitrany (1943) wrote in *A Working Peace System* – the reference work of the transnational school – international life should be based on the search for peace, the satisfaction of everyone's needs and the participation of all in the concert of nations.

"This should not surprise us", as Human Development Report 1994 wrote; "the founders of the United Nations had always given importance to people's security." As far back as June 1945, the US secretary of state reported this to his government on the results of the San Francisco Conference:

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......No provisions that can be written into the Charter will enable the Security Council to make the world secure from war if men and women have not their personal security.

But only the late 1960s or early 1970s witnessed the growing activism towards the safety of the individuals' well-being, in general, and their survival, in particular. The values which the concept of human security adhere to were to be given due recognition in different projects, conferences at international level. This activism sought to produce the possible solution to the world’s ills in terms of human misery. For the better understanding of the historical development of the concept it can be divided into three major phases. The first phase refers to initial activism, which is normally traced between the late 1960s and the whole 1970s. The second phase symbolises the 1980s intensity of different commissions’ reports which began to take notice of the concerns of people’s security. While the third and final phase refers to the exercise of conceptualising human security which began from UNDP’s 1994 *Human Development Report* and still continues.

**Initial Phase of Development:**

Growing awareness towards people's misery acquired its trajectory in terms of World Order Models Project (WOMP). This project was the outcome of a transnational collaboration, which took off in the mid 1960s with main intellectual figures including Ali Mazrui, Yoshikazu
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Sakamota, Rajni Kothari, Gustavo Lagos, and Johan Galtung. The prime objective was to find out a just, equitable, and peaceful world order model. Indeed, the concerns were related to the people's well-being and individual's security. The World Order Models Project (WOMP) accepted its goal as the projection of models of "preferred worlds for the 1990s." It resulted in a series of books: *Footsteps into the Future* by Rajni Kothari, 1974, and *On the Creation of a Just World Order* by Saul Mendowitz, 1979.

The Club of Rome group began another remarkable effort. It produced a series of volumes on the "world problematique." They were premised on the idea that there is a complex of problems troubling men of all nations; poverty; degradation of environment; loss of faith in institutions; uncontrolled urban spread; insecurity of employment; alienation of youth; rejection of traditional values; and inflation and other monetary and economic disruptions. In short, the group proposed that there was a complex global system influencing the individual's life chances and there were alternative ways of conceptualising global development and, ultimately, global security so as to sustain and improve those life chances.

A further direction of normative effort involves the prescriptive energies associated with global intergovernmental conferences on large planetary issues held under the auspices of the United Nations. Issues that were raised certainly related to the survival of the human being. The initial unplanned debut of this type of global undertaking was the 1972 UN conference on the Human Environment held in Stockholm. However, it was supposed to have ignited the track-II diplomacy. Track-II increased interaction between civil societies and governments. It generated something genuinely innovative and encouraged the formation of more democratically oriented global policies and perspectives. Furthermore, The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights- which came into force in 1976- created much of the groundwork for such an idea. It basically encompassed most of the social goals, including the rights of food, health, shelter, education and work, as well as other non material aspects of life which are included even today in the many approaches dealing with the concept of human security as its basic value.
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Second Phase of Development:

In the beginning of the 1980s the thrust of normative energy in this regard came from a new vehicle of transnational elite expression, the independent world commission composed of small number of eminent persons. Among the more renowned of these commissions were: the Willy Brandt Commission (1980) on North & South Issues, The Olaf Palme Commission (1982) on Disarmament and Security, Bruntland Commission (1987) on Environment, and the Julius Nyerere Commission on the South Perspective (1990).\(^\text{154}\)

Willy Brandt’s report emphasised on common interest of humanity and pleaded whom to address the problems of human survival. Necessarily the central focus was on how dangerous tension between states should be receded. It focused on how to devise the instrument of cooperation between the rich North and the poor South in order to bring real security for the mankind.\(^\text{155}\)

The linkages between disarmament and development and the resultant impacts on the concept of security were first articulated within the UN system by the General Assembly through two special sessions devoted to Disarmament and Development in 1978 and 1982. Following on from these sessions, the report of the Palme Commission (1982) and the Thorssen Report (1982) also stressed the need to identify the relationship between these two areas. Both reports noted security could not be attained through nuclear détente. By pursuing active armament as a strategy to make oneself “more secure”, the world was edging closer to nuclear war – a scenario where no state could possibly come out the winner. Instead the focus had to be on disarmament, development and capacity building. Olof Palme Commission 1982 report *Common Security. A Blueprint for Survival* added the concept of “common security” implied that no nation could achieve true security through its own efforts alone, but through some form of co-operation with its potential adversary.\(^\text{156}\) The Palme Commission stressed that security under conditions of anarchy and high levels of armaments required “mutual restraint and proper appreciation of the realities of the nuclear age”, in the absence of which “the pursuit of security can cause intensified competition and more tense political relations and, at the end of the day, a reduction in security for all concerned.”\(^\text{157}\) The Report also took note of third world security and asserted that security
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of these states is in fact threatened more often by poverty, economic inequality and deprivation. For the report, many of the global problems that humanity faces now and in the future can be solved only through cooperative measures taken at the regional and global level.\(^\text{158}\)

Apart from these commissions’ reports, some scholarly enquiries appeared during that period. Richard Ullman, Ken Booth and Jessica Tuchman Mathews were notable among those. These scholars primarily touched upon the entirely new domain, rather, an expanded one than that of usual domain of security. By doing so they vehemently advocated for a wider range of nonmilitary issues. Richard Ullman cautioned against ignoring the more harmful dangers likely to be more perilous for people’s security by pretending to beef up merely the border security.\(^\text{159}\) Similarly, Mathews estimated the calculus of losing the attention from the conflicts likely to originate from the competition of scarce resources, demographic transition, and ecological devastation.\(^\text{160}\)

**Third and Final Phase: An Occurrence of Paradigm Shift**

Beginning of the 1990s brought a much-needed breathing space in which an alternate security paradigm has begun to be explored with the idea of “putting people first”. And consequently human security moved to the centre stage. Therefore, an explicit human security perspective got articulated with some rigour. One of the earliest efforts was the Bonn Declaration of 1991 issued by the European Parliamentarians conference on “Building Human Security.”\(^\text{161}\) Global human security is, it said, “the absence of threat to human life, lifestyle and culture through the fulfillment of basic needs.”\(^\text{162}\) However, as stated earlier, the first major contribution to this concept came from Prof. Mahbub-ul-Haq even before 1994 UNDP report.\(^\text{163}\) Haq’s approach was premised on the belief that human development was the bedrock for security. He also questioned the relevance of existing theories of national security based on territoriality by including there in the imperative of securing people from economic deprivation, disease, hunger, social conflict and environmental degradation.\(^\text{164}\)

\(^{158}\) Ibid.
\(^{159}\) Cited in Brown, n. 20, p. 311.
\(^{160}\) Ibid.
\(^{162}\) (Ibid).
\(^{163}\) An early guide to Mahbub Ul Haq’s thinking is also available in his “New Imperatives of Human Security”, Rajiv Gandhi Institute for Contemporary Studies, Paper No. 17, RGICS, New Delhi.
\(^{164}\) Bajpai, n. 137, pp. 200-201.
As it has been mentioned above that an important step in the evolution of the human security concept was taken in 1994, when the UNDP combined together development and security by including it in *Human Development Report*.\(^{165}\) According to the report, human security is the sense that people are free from worries, not merely from the dread of a cataclysmic world event but primarily about daily life.\(^{166}\) Human security is people centered while being tuned to two different aspects: it means, first, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. And second, it means protection from sudden and hurtful disruption in the patterns of daily life — whether in homes, in jobs, or in communities. Human security means freedom from want and freedom from fear.\(^{167}\)

The Ramphel Commission on Global Governance issued a report in 1995 called *Our Global Neighbourhood*, which said global security must be broadened from the traditional focus on the security of states to include the security of people and the security of the planet. The proposals and principles contained in this report continued to challenge the supremacy of the state-based system of global governance. As part of its guiding principles, the report noted “All people, no less than all states, have a right to a secure existence.”\(^{168}\) The report went on to state “…Global security policy should be to prevent conflict and war and to maintain the integrity of the planet's life-support systems by eliminating the economic, social, environmental, political and military conditions that generate threats to the security of people and the planet.”\(^{169}\)

The Report of the Independent International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), *The Responsibility to Protect* (2001), was the endeavour of the Government of Canada.\(^{170}\) It devises to procure the mandate to produce a guide to action on responses by the international community to internal and man-made emergencies.\(^{171}\) The report notes that “sovereign states have a responsibility to protect their own citizens from avoidable catastrophe — from mass murder and rape, from starvation—but that when they are unwilling or unable to do so, that responsibility must be borne by the broader community of states.”\(^{172}\) The report goes on to elucidate the three responsibilities embodied in this principle: the responsibility to prevent, the responsibility to react, and the responsibility to rebuild. The report also focuses on the principles
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\(^{165}\) UNDP, n. 140, pp. 1-46.

\(^{166}\) Ibid, p. 22.

\(^{167}\) Ibid, p. 23.


\(^{169}\) Ibid.


\(^{171}\) Ibid, pp. 1-8.

\(^{172}\) Ibid, p. VIII.
of military intervention, focusing on (a) the Just Cause principle, (b) the precautionary principles, and (c) the right authority to sanction such action. 173

The most formidable contribution by any of the commission reports to human security is believed to have come from the Commission on Human Security, which produced its report in 2003 entitled *Human Security Now.* 174 The Commission was an initiative of the Government of Japan with the help of the UN. It worked under the chairmanships of Nobel laureate Amartya Sen and former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Sadako Ogata. The Commission sought to fulfill three objectives: (i) promoting public understanding, engagement and support of human security and its underlying imperatives; (ii) developing the concept of human security as an operational tool for policy formulation and implementation; and (iii) proposing a concrete programme of action to address critical and pervasive threats to human security. 175 The report *Human Security Now* goes into various aspects of human security. It is extremely helpful in the proper conceptualisation of the human security. The report, however, restrains one from giving any laundry list of threats to human security and emphasises on "the vital core of life." 176 It is, therefore, evident that the process of evolution of human security as a concept right from UNDP's 1994 report to the report of Commission on Human Security (2003) has marched a long distance.

In the line of reports, *Human Security Report* earlier produced by Human Security Centre at British Columbia University now shifted to Simon Fraser University, Canada has contributed immensely in mapping human security challenges in all regions of the world. 177 The report presents a comprehensive and evidence-based portrait of global security. The report is significant in two respects: (i) it identifies and examines major trends in global political violence, asks what factors drive these trends and examines some of the consequences and; (ii) It poses major challenges to conventional wisdom of post-Cold War security environment. 178
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175 Ibid
176 Ibid, p. 4.
178 The report empirically proves that over the past dozen years, the global security climate has changed in dramatic, positive, but largely unheralded ways. Civil wars, genocides and international crises have all declined sharply. International wars, now only a small minority of all conflicts, have been in steady decline for a much longer period, as have military coups and the average number of people killed per conflict per year. This report however goes against the post Cold War conviction and proves wrong many hypotheses regarding changing international security threats. Why then this report is useful? It is because the report like other major works implies that "to ensure the fair conditions for human security at global level managing additional resources, more appropriate mandates among nations, greater commitment to conflict prevention and peacebuilding, and greater political commitment are
At the government level, Japan, Canada and Norway are the most vocal promoters of human security. But they started their efforts in this direction seriously after 1980s. Japan came up with the term comprehensive security in 1980, though slightly tilted to national security but stressed upon many issues that are considered a part of human security. Canada’s two major statements of its position, one in 1997 and another in 1999 are considered vital in this respect. Canada’s foreign office defines human security as the freedom from fear, but does not include freedom from want. Canada views it under the purview of development. The Japanese foreign office also defined human security, as freedom from fear and freedom from want, like the UNDP. The Japanese approach implied that “human security comprehensively covers all the menaces that threaten human survival, daily life and dignity.” The Norwegian view which resembles with Canadian view seeks to separate human security with human development and argues that human security is security from vulnerability to physical violence during conflict.

To deal briefly with theoretical concern, it can be drawn that human security is the broadest and the deepest concept of security. Conceptual foundation of human security rests upon the premise that the prime objective of security is individual’s safety from fear and freedom from want. Ramesh Thakur observes that human security is human centred because it focuses on people both as individual and as group of individuals or communities; and it is security oriented because it draws emphasis on freedom from fear, danger and threat. In the words of Jennifer Leaning, “human security is an underlying condition for sustainable human development. It results from the social, psychological, economic and political aspects of life. In the times of acute crisis or chronic deprivation it seeks to protect the survival of individuals. It supports individual and group capacities to attain minimally adequate standard of living, and promote constructive group attachment and continuity through time.” While Caroline Thomas maintains, “human security describes a condition of existence in which basic material needs are met, and in which human dignity, including meaningful participation in the life of the community, can be realised.


Therefore, human security is indivisible; it cannot be pursued by or for one group at the expense of another." \(^{185}\)

Taylor Owen’s definition of human security can be modified to produce an epigrammatic yet suitable definition as: “Human security is the protection of the vital core of all human lives from critical and pervasive threats that emanate from both direct as well as structural violence." \(^{186}\) Broadly speaking, human security comprises two elementary components: *freedom from fear* and *freedom from want*. However, the concept would be dealt in greater fathom in the second chapter; here it would be worthwhile to mention that for this concept the referent object remains the individual; security values, freedom from fear and freedom from want; and security threats range in various realms such as political, social, economic, health and environment.

In the final verdict, summing up all approaches encompassing the non-conventional security paradigm it is clear that if security in real sense has to be achieved then threats to the survival of the individual and means to dispel them should be focused properly. Therefore, the debate emphasises the need to include therein a pragmatic understanding of the broader issues involved within its ambit. There is a fair agreement now that the scope of national security must be broadened beyond military security to incorporate, political, social, economic and environmental concerns. Different dimensions of conventional and non-conventional security can be understood as follows:

**Table-1.1: Dimensions of Conventional and Non-conventional Security Paradigm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Conventional Security</th>
<th>Non-conventional Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
<td>Primarily the state</td>
<td>Individual and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security Values</strong></td>
<td>Territorial integrity and national independence</td>
<td>Freedom from want; freedom from fear and freedom of future generations to sustain their lives on this planet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security Threats</strong></td>
<td>Primarily Military (Structured violence)</td>
<td>Primarily Non-Military, Socio-economic, socio-political, environmental (Unstructured violence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>Diplomatic &amp; Military (Unilateral)</td>
<td>Multilateral States as well as NGOs, Civil Societies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Relevance of Human Security in the Contemporary World

UNDP's 1994 report has drawn rightly that "the dream of a peaceful and secure world will never come true unless people have security in their daily life."187 In the post-Cold War era it has been observed that conflicts often took place within nation rather than between them—with their origins laid in growing socio-economic disparities and the deprivation of political rights and social justice. Often people faced threats to their survival from within its nation rather than outside aggression (except in some cases).188 Thus, prevalent conviction is being countered with the logic that—after all death is death, no matter if it is resulted from a nuclear holocaust or from the bullet of a rival ethnic group fighting for its political rights or from hunger or from gross environmental degradation and has enough cause to dislodge international peace and security.

Interstate conflicts, during last one decade or more, took the lives of millions. At the beginning of the last century, around 90 percent of war casualties were military. At the beginning of this century, about 90 percent of the casualties are civilian—a disastrous shift in the prevalent trend. The violent conflicts in different parts of world can include: in Africa—Angola (Cabinda), Chad, Ethiopia, Morocco, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan, Rwanda, Zaire, Zimbabwe, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Uganda; In Europe—Bosnia, Georgia, Turkey, Macedonia and Russia; In the Middle East—Iraq, Israel and Lebanon; In Latin America, Columbia, Peru and Guatemala and; in Asia—Indonesia (Aceh), Myanmar (the conflict with the Karen National Union), India (from North East to J&K), Pakistan (Sindhi, Baloch), Bangladesh, Philippines, Sri Lanka and Nepal (Ibid). Even Human Security Report 2005, which rigorously examines the facts and figures claimed by various agencies writes that of the 66 armed conflicts in 2002, 34 (52%) were non-state conflicts, and 32 (49%) were state-based. Of the 59 armed conflicts in 2003, 30 (51%) were non-state conflicts, and 29 (49%) were state-based.189

Recent data furnished by Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) suggest that the promising decline in the number of state based conflicts that began in the 1990s has ceased, and the annual number of such conflicts has remained constant at 32 for three years (2004–2006).190 The annual totals for "major armed conflicts", as defined by the UCDP and SIPRI, have also remained relatively stable in the past three years (at 14–15 conflicts in 2005–2007). Furthermore, since 2004, all of the major armed conflicts recorded have been intrastate conflicts.191

188 SIPRI Yearbook 2004, n. 86, pp. 95-145.
regional distribution of conflicts in the world during 1998 to 2001 can be seen in the following graph.

**Graph-1.2: Regional Distribution and Total Number of Armed Conflicts in the World, 1998-2007**

Source: Drawn from data given in SIPRI Yearbook 2008, pp.72-83.

However, the actual description is not as important as the reasons that ignite such violent conflicts. These are: ethnic rivalry; access to control and distribution of resources (natural, economic and political); relative lack of representative systems of governance; and religious and human right grievances. Most of these conflicts that arise from the above mentioned causes could be prevented at a very low cost. The search of security in such a milieu lies in humane governance, human development not in arms contrary to the prevalent conviction. This can be accomplished through human security none other than this.

A fifth of the world’s people—1.2 billion—experience acute income poverty and live on less than $1 a day, nearly two-thirds of them in Asia and a quarter in Africa. Another 1.6 billion live on less than $2 a day. Together, 2.8 billion of the world’s people live in a chronic state of poverty and daily insecurity, a number that has not changed much since 1990. About 800 million people in the developing world and 24 million in developed and transition economies do not have enough to eat.\(^{192}\)

\(^{192}\) Commission on Human Security 2003, n. 177, p. 73.
In an assessment of WHO in 2000, out of 6.04 billion world population annual deaths caused by various diseases was around 55.7 million. In this sequence another aspect has also been brought into attention. For instance, globally on an average 11 million children are dying each year under the age five, in which South Asia (33.4%) and Sub-Saharan Africa (42.8%) account for three-fourth of total number of casualties.\(^{193}\) By comparison, about 75,000 people were killed in the bombing of Hiroshima. Therefore, the silent death toll among small children, which is hardly ever reported in the news, is equivalent to the number of fatalities that could be caused by 147 Hiroshima size bombs dropped each year on the densely populated cities.

Citing Elisabeth Sköns, *SIPRI Yearbook* 2008 stresses: “According to the statistics prepared by the World Health Organization, worldwide 17 million people died of communicable diseases in 2005, while 184,000 deaths occurred as a result of collective violence. Thus, approximately 100 times more individuals died of preventable diseases than perished as a result of direct collective violence. ……Almost five times as many individuals committed suicide and three times as many were killed in interpersonal violence than those who fell victim to collective violence."\(^{194}\)

The spread of small arms and light weapons as well as land-mines kill hundreds of thousands of people each year, majority of them are civilians. In a different instance, more than 630 million small arms are estimated to be currently circulating in the areas of armed conflict. So is the case with landmines which kill and maim civilians long after a conflict ends. The UN estimates that around 96,000 people die every year from mines. What is evident from the previously mentioned facts that security implies not only protection from war, but also from other potential dangers (threats) to survival and well-being. Achieving true security requires dynamic efforts to correct unjust conditions.

Mahbub-Ul-Haq, a distinguished scholar of human security, stated rightly as: “Military buildup cannot always protect the national sovereignty. The countries spending very little on defence and much more on human development have been more successful at defending their national sovereignty than those spending heavily on arms."\(^{195}\) This is evident when it is compared with the relatively peaceful experiences of Botswana, Costa Rica and Mauritius with the conflicts afflicting Iraq, Myanmar and Somalia. “Interestingly military to social spending ratio was among the highest in the world in Iraq, Somalia and Nicaragua. All these countries
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failed to protect their national sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and the welfare of their people, despite liberal acquisition of arms. \textsuperscript{196} 

There is a growing realisation that when the security of people is attacked in any corner of the world, all nations are likely to get involved. Ethnic conflicts, social disintegration, failing of states, pollution, changing character of terrorism are no longer isolated events, confined within national borders. Their consequences are felt across the globe. At the backdrop of such developments an intensive research into the concept of human security seems to be the need of hour.

**Human Security in Pakistan: Challenges and Opportunities**

The complex nature of security in Pakistan, whether it may be termed as conventional or non-conventional, has always been precarious for both individual and the state. More explicitly, in terms of human security, Pakistan is viewed as one of the most insecure states of the world. There are a number of factors which threaten the prime values of human security in Pakistan. Threats to the safety and security of the people of Pakistan, at one level, stem from the conflictual dynamics of the relations with the states within and outside the region, which has often been demonstrated in interstate, intrastate and transnational conflicts. While on the other level, colossal human deprivation which arises on account of the failure of political, economic and civic governance has been serious blow to the security and well-being of individuals in the state.

Having obfuscated with the state security under the Cold War scenario, Pakistan constantly neglected the required measures of human security. \textsuperscript{197} Even after the end of the Cold War when the superpower rivalry has withered away and states around the world are changing their priorities in the realm of security from state to individual, Pakistan still follows the traditional approach to security, which gives high priority to the attainment of military power, that in turn unfairly undermines the spectrum of human security. Pakistan has still been spending considerable amount of its scarce resources on defence. According to the most recent data released by Stockholm International Peace Research Institute in March 2010, Pakistan falls in

\textsuperscript{196} Ibid. 
top ten arms importer of the world during last five years.\textsuperscript{198} It continues to redirect scarce resources towards building new weapons of mass destructions.

There are many significant reasons but the most dominant one is considered as its rivalry with India. To the large extent, right from its independence in August 1947 to January 2004 (since the inception of Bus Diplomacy), Pakistan remains locked in stiff antagonism with India, which in turn constructed a new type of Cold War in South Asia. And for more than fifty years, it completely overshadowed the security environment of the region. It helped build up arms pillaging, strategic balance and alliance with or without extra-regional involvement, and, ultimately security of Pakistan by and large revolved around the military security.

Such non-productive investments, in the name of national security, are taking a high toll on human security while people’s lives, the means as well as the ends of all development concerns, are left unheeded. This frightening military aspect of Pakistan’s security has veiled the real security concern: security of the individuals or people. It is widely recognised that “national security cannot be achieved in a situation where people starve but arms accumulate; where social expenditure falls while military expenditure rises.”\textsuperscript{199} The overarching emphasis on national security as against human security over the last five plus decades has severely affected the security concerns of people in Pakistan. Mahbubul Haq’s dictum portrays the reality as “when most basic services miss in a state . . . . . . the rising military burdens continue to impose prohibitive social and economic costs on their people.”\textsuperscript{200}

However, an elaborate study has to be produced in the third, fourth and fifth chapters, here a modest sketch of the challenges to human security in Pakistan needs a space. As in the brief outline of the concept stated above, challenges to human security in Pakistan go against its both the dimensions. The threats which go against freedom from fear and the threats which imperil freedom from want have wide sphere.

The phenomena of violence, conflict and war have been defining characteristics of Pakistan’s security affairs. Pakistan is facing acute challenges to organisational stability of social order, internal legitimacy of the political unit and the failure of the state and nation building. Politically, Pakistan has been ruled by Martial Law for more than half of its political life. Pakistan is suffering from poor political governance. It is because, first, power remains

\textsuperscript{200} Ibid.
concentrated and distant from common people. A few privileged groups retain access to political power and state patronage. The stubborn resistance to power-sharing is also visible in the centralised nature of governments. This has hampered human development, precluded popular participation, and alienated citizens.

Security at personal level is also dismal. Intra-state conflicts, inter-state conflicts, terrorism, sectarian violence, criminal activities, drug culture, small arms proliferations and alarmingly high level of corruption have turned the life of people dreadful. The intra-state conflicts have primarily stemmed from the lack of social cohesion among diverse groups of communities that inhabit a given territorial state. Problems which stem from internal conflicts and turmoil that led to ethno-nationalistic strife, poor law and order, fundamentalism induced terrorism, and fragile socio-economic conditions funnel the criminal violence. Islamist extremism has been one of the most frightening matters for the security. According to SAARC Human Rights Violators Report 2006, Pakistan although stands better in comparison of other South Asian states like Bangladesh and Nepal in terms of overall indices, but, it is worst in violence against women; second most violator of rights to life and; stands fourth out of seven states of the region in terms of protection of minorities' rights.²⁰¹

Besides, Pakistan is witnessing chronic and widespread poverty. Between 25-30 per cent population of Pakistan is below poverty line. Over 50 million people in Pakistan suffer from severe deprivation, with little or no access to adequate nutrition, health, housing, water, sanitation, education, and employment. One in two Pakistani is illiterate, one in ten lacks access to safe water and one in three deprives from health services, over three out of five do not have access to sanitation, one in two children under five is malnourished, and four out of five have no access to financial services.²⁰² Several recent studies indicate an alarming increase in absolute poverty in Pakistan over the last two decades. Despite continued efforts of governments, civil society organisations, and international agencies, poverty still persists. Simply poverty has caused greater threat to the individual's well-being.²⁰³

Health profile of Pakistan is awful. Infant motility rate is highest in South Asia with 83 per 1,000 live births while, Life expectancy is lowest in the region. Paradoxically, Punjab, comparably developed province than North West Frontier Province (NWFP), registered highest

²⁰³ Ibid.
rate of infant motility. More than half of the people of Pakistan have been left behind, unable to achieve their full health potential. Pakistan’s health today spotlights the paradox of unprecedented achievement among the privileged and a vast burden of preventable diseases among those less privileged, the majority of Pakistani population.

Environmental threats are potent from the security point of view in Pakistan. Scarcity of resources is going to be the reality for Pakistan. The most crucial resource for human life is water. The current situation of environment in Pakistan can be seen by a report 2008 Environmental Performance Index prepared by the Yale Center of Environmental Law and Policy, Yale University and Centre for International Earth Science Information Network, Columbia University. Out of 149 countries studied in the report, Pakistan’s rank lies in the bottom 25 countries. Its Environment Performance Index (EPI) is 58.7. In a separate 23 Asia-Pacific category of countries, Pakistan’s rank is 20; it means Pakistan is placed in bottom 5 countries of Asia-Pacific region.

Environmental damage in Pakistan is a serious matter of concern. In Pakistan, total estimated loss of environmental damage has been presented by World Bank’s “Pakistan Strategic Assessment Report” in 2007. The implication of this continuing degradation is that despite favourable GDP growth rates many development indicators continue to show limited improvement. The mean estimated annual cost of environmental and natural resource damage is about 365 billion Rs. per year or 6 percent of GDP.

In this complex and multifaceted scenario, Pakistan genuinely needs human security approach. For that, Pakistan requires to redirect its priorities in security arena. First and foremost requirement to cope with the challenges to human security is to shift the priority of security from military to people. For Pakistan, so far as the dimensions of human security, “freedom from fear” and “freedom from want” are concerned, there is a greater need to reduce people’s vulnerability by preventing the conditions which make them vulnerable in the first place.
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