To proceed with any exploration of the human security index, it is important to use the concept of human security in order to approach the problem from both fear and want dimensions and to probe into the multiple dimensions of the issues in order to identify the issues that would be more relevant in creating an index. It is in this backdrop that this exploration of human security index begins with a review and analysis of the prevailing concepts of human security.

2.1 ORIGIN OF HUMAN SECURITY: INTERSECTION OF DEVELOPMENT DISCOURSE AND SECURITY STUDIES

Although the concept of human security found its expression in development lexicon in 1994 with the publication of the well-known *Human Development Report 1994* by UNDP, the concept of human security soon came to stand at the juncture of two streams of discourses—development and security—on their respective paths of evolution. A brief review of the intersection of the two trajectories would be pertinent at this point.

2.1.1 From Development Economics to Human Development

When the modern science of Economics was founded by Adam Smith, development economics was given a broad-based and inclusive definition, and the goals set by Economics included human well-being. However, the rude realities of the World War II and Post-War period led to focusing of development on measurable indicators of national income. The practices of the World Bank, IMF, NGOs and the academic community alike led to the emergence of what amounted to a development theology—human well-being could be advanced through economic growth measured mainly by national income and product accounts.¹

¹ Gary King and Christopher Murray, op. cit., p.586.
However, growing poverty and inequality beneath apparent growth led to widespread dissatisfaction among political leaders, academics and practitioners about concept and strategies of development. Focus of development discourse shifted on basic needs approach, growth with equity and employment generation strategy. A parallel development was social development experiences in many poorer countries. In the late 1970s and 1980s, countries such as Sri Lanka, Cuba, Costa Rica and the Indian state of Kerala achieved remarkable social development in literacy, life expectancy and public sector social welfare programmes which were not achievable with comparable level of per capita income. Experiences of several other countries show that rise in the level of national income does not necessarily percolate down to raise the level of income of the poorer segments of the population. Both these sets of experiences make it amply clear that income does not always explain human well-being.

The thinking and writing of two South Asian economists—one practitioner, Mahbub ul Haq, who worked for the World Bank and then for UNDP, and one academic, Amartya Sen—raised concerns about the end result of development, e.g., human well-being and entitlement. Mahbub ul Haq started publication of the *Human Development Report* (HDR) series in 1990 stressing that people should be the central concern of development efforts. Development was defined broadly to include well-being, dignity and choice. Since development was still a state-led phenomenon, the priority list of state efforts was usually topped by the security of the state or boundaries, but the strategic importance of human development was underscored by the statement that development (and for that matter, state expenditures) should focus more on people than on securing boundaries. The argument was given sharp relief through publication of the *Human Development Report 1994* which emphasised the concept of human security by advocating the fusion of people and sustainable development through the concept of human development and argued that the goal of human development could be attained by focusing on human security. And what is human security? The report went on to state, “It means, first, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. And second, it means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the pattern of daily life.”
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development, it also attempted to drive home the point that human
development and human security are intertwined. Of course, HDR
1994 also argued that state security does not necessarily ensure human
security. So, the very logical introduction of the concept of human
security in 1994 was a substantive contribution to a discourse that
stimulated further intellectual thinking in the field.

As for the development community, dialogue on human development
was pursued through the annual publication of the Human Development
Index (HDI), a broad and composite measure of income per capita, life
expectancy at birth and educational attainment. Contemporaneous
works by Sen on capabilities, freedom of choice and entitlement only
buttressed the human development perspective of development discourse.
Admittedly, the mainstream development discourse both at academic
and policy levels remained glued to growth theology. But the human
development discourse was able to introduce poverty alleviation and
safety net programmes in the vocabulary of the World Bank, IMF and
other national and international development agencies. And, as indicated
above, at the peak of its intellectual development, it helped human
development to branch out into the domain of security studies.

2.1.2 From Traditional to Broad-based Non-Traditional Security

The origin of security studies is often associated with the twin stimuli
of nuclear weaponry and the Cold War and is regarded as a product of
the Post-World War II period. From the time of its origin in the post-
War period to until very recently, security studies remained an almost
exclusive domain of International Relations and was dominated by
Realist/Neo-realist school of thoughts. Security, both in theory and

3 Gary King and Christopher Murray, op.cit., p.587.
4 Gene M. Lyons and Louis Morton, Schools for Strategy: Education and Research in National
Security Affairs (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965); P.G. Bock and Morton Berkowitz, "The
Emerging Field of National Security", World Politics (October 1966), p.122; and Richard Smoke,
"National Security Affairs", in Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby (eds.), Handbook of
5 See, Hans J. Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace (New York:
Alfred A. Knof, 1960); Michael Joseph Smith, Realist Thought from Weber to Kissinger (Baton
Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1986); Kenneth N. Waltz, Theory of International
Politics (Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1979); Robert O. Keohane (ed.), Neorealism and Its
Critics (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986); Arnold Wolfers, "National Security as an
Politics (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1962); Walter Lippmann, US Foreign Policy:
Shield for the Republic (Boston: Little Brown, 1943); David A Baldwin, "Security Studies and the
practice, as visualised by the Realists/Neo-realists remained a state-centric enterprise with single-minded emphasis on military security. International system was considered as being anarchic, wherein security was seen to be the highest end. Only if survival is assured could a state safely seek other goals such as tranquillity, profit, and power. Thus, the "primacy of national security" among the responsibilities of government was created.

In these circumstances, while the focal point of Realist/Neo-realist school was the security of the state, the preferred term was national security. What the realists were referring to was the security of the territorial (rather than nation-) state, the principal actor in the Westphalian universe. In this regard, military threats to national security dominated all other threats in the eyes of most security specialists.

All these concerns are reflected in the definitions of security. One of the early definitions of security emphasises that "a nation is secure to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice core values, if it wishes to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war." A more succinct definition of security by Arnold Wolfers that "Security, in an objective sense, measures the absence of threats to acquired values, in subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked" has become the standard definition of security. Terms such as, 'acquired values' or 'core values,' in the context of national security are essentially interpreted as the independence and territorial integrity of a state that must be protected and preserved. Wolfers further explains that security rises and falls with the ability of a nation to deter an attack or to defeat it.
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6 Kenneth N. Waltz, op.cit., p.126.
8 The Westphalian State system, based on the separation of political and religious authority, evolved in Europe at the end of the Thirty Years War in the sixteenth century. Territorial sovereignty and the state as the only legitimate wielder of force are its identifying characteristics.
9 Walter Lippmann, op.cit., p.51.
10 Arnold Wolfers, op.cit., p.150.
12 Ibid.
All these concerns have been reflected in the salient features of Realist/Neo-realistic concept of security as summarised below:

i) Nation states are the basic building blocks of the international system with unlimited sovereignty;

ii) The primary function of a nation state is to survive and enhance its power in an anarchical and conflictual international system;

iii) Competition between states to maximise one's interests often at the expense of others; and

iv) Development of the individual state's capability (military and other) to ensure security.

While the Realist/Neo-realistic school of thoughts overwhelmingly dominated the security thinking in the post-War period, there have also been other schools of thoughts. Although these schools did not directly challenge the state-centric notion of security and did not deny the role of military state-craft in ensuring security, they attempted to broaden the notion of security as well as the means to achieve it. Security analysts belonging to these schools have favoured and developed concepts such as international interdependence, non-power influence, and transnational configurations, in order to advance the understanding of global complexities and interdependence. 13

One of the outcomes of such efforts has been wider circulation of the concept of 'Common Security' promulgated in the Palme Commission's 1982 report. Its emphasis was on the attainment of security by "common action."14 However, the growing number of references to Common Security (alternatively labelled "security partnership", "mutual security" or "co-operative security") in political statements and academic literature was not matched by rigorous theoretical analysis of the implications of the concept. According to some accounts, all these referred to little more than co-operation among states, including among adversaries.15 Perhaps, a more radical extension of the idea took place
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15 Bjorn Moller, "National, Social and Human Security: A General Discussion with Case Study from the Balkans," paper presented in the First International Meeting of Directors of Peace
under the rubric of ‘Collective Security’ that envisaged the transfer of power from the state to supranational authorities.\textsuperscript{16} Nonetheless, while some of the concepts on security during the 1970s and 1980s could go beyond state-centric security, these were still far from making a break with the Realist school.\textsuperscript{17}

While the source of the Realist/Neo-realist school of thoughts was the Westphalian ideas of the nation-state, its overwhelming domination in post-War security thinking was based on the bipolar division of the world and the East-West Cold War. That is why rethinking the meaning of security in the bipolar world yielded only marginal results and could not go beyond the state-centric notion of security.

One of the worst outcomes of all these changes was the fact that ‘national security’ was achieved at the expense of the security of the individual or people in terms of their political, social and economic rights and choices. Thus, instead of ensuring the security of its citizens, the state quite often has itself become a threat to their security. It may be pertinent to mention that over the last century, 30 million people were killed in international wars, 7 million in civil wars and 170 million people were killed by their own governments.\textsuperscript{18}

A revolutionary change in security thinking came with the end of the Cold War and the accompanying structural changes of monumental proportion. On the one hand, it dramatically decreased the traditional security threats to most of the states which had encountered similar threats during the Cold War. On the other hand, the world came to confront a series of intra-state violent conflicts of various origins, large-scale atrocities, and even genocide. Suffice it to mention that of the 103 wars since the end of the Cold War, 97 have been fought within rather than between states.\textsuperscript{19} All these could not be even explained by the Realist/Neo-realist security paradigm and there could, therefore, be no question of devising remedies for them.

In the circumstances, rethinking the meaning of security became a growth industry during the 1990s. Scholars and practitioners from

\textsuperscript{16} Ib\textit{id}.\textsuperscript{16} Bjorn Moller, op.cit.

\textsuperscript{17} Romesh Thakur, “Security in the New Millennia,” \textit{Newsletter} (Regional Centre for Strategic Studies, Colombo), Vol.6, No.4, 2000, p.3.

\textsuperscript{18} David Preston and Don Hubert, op.cit., p.345.
diverse backgrounds came to deal with security, adding newer and newer meanings to the concept. In the process, while state-centric security concerns did not disappear, a new security agenda evolved which came to include issues as diverse as intra-state conflicts, ethno-religious violence, landmines, terrorism, democracy, human rights, gender, crime, the consequences of underdevelopment, poverty, hunger, deprivation, inequality, diseases and health hazards, human development, economic security, market, water, energy, migration, environmental degradation and so on. As a matter of fact, a process of 'securitisation' of a wide range of issues is in the offing, while simultaneously, a degree of caution persists with regard to how far the process can proceed.

Perhaps, the most significant outcome of this process of new thinking on security is the idea that the security of an individual in terms of his/her physical safety, human dignity, development opportunity, and socio-economic and politico-cultural rights and choices are as important as the security of a state in the traditional sense. Non-military and non-violent threats to the security of an individual or a group of people are no less important than violent ones. The new thinking also includes the assertion that ensuring security is no more the monopoly of state. 'Non-state' actors—individuals, communities, civil society organisations and others—also have a vital role to play in ensuring security. A whole gamut of new ideas redefining the meaning of security in terms of safety, dignity, rights, opportunities and choices for the individual and people came to be known as human security. These ideas will be discussed at a greater length in the study. While a large body of literature already exists on human security, articulation of a succinct theoretical concept on the issue is far from complete. Attempts are being made to conceptualise human security in general, and in the context of different world regions as well as a diversity of human security issues.


21 A large number of literature on the concept of human security is already available. Some of the best known are cited in footnote No.6 in chapter 1.

22 A large number of papers were devoted to the issue of human security in different world regions in the First International Meeting of Directors of Peace Research and Training Institutes on What Agenda for Human Security in the Twenty-first Century? held in UNESCO, Paris, November 27-28, 2000. Some of these are Jamil D. Ahsan, "Main Challenges Facing the Promotion of Human Security in Asia"; Ghada Ali Moussa, "Challenges to Human Security in
Thus, security studies as an academic discipline has travelled a long way from its single-minded emphasis on the security of the state primarily by military means in the post-War period to human security through human development and humane governance in the post-Cold War period. However, in the changed context, state-centric security concerns with emphasis on their military aspects did not disappear altogether.

In the ongoing discourse on human security, particularly, on issues concerning how and to what extent it differs from traditional security, six questions remain the focus of scholarly attention. Security for whom? Security of what values? Security from whom? Security from what threats? Security by whom? Security by which means?23 We will attempt to answer these questions in our subsequent analysis, as answer to them not only highlights the difference between human and traditional security but also reveals the essence of human security itself.

On the basis of the critical analysis of these approaches and the available literature, an attempt is made in Table 2.1 to delineate the broad contours of human security vis-à-vis national security.

As evident from Table 2.1, the focus of security discourse has shifted away from ensuring the security of the state to ensuring the security and well-being of its citizens, the individuals and people in particular. As against the traditional security agenda of deterring direct threat from other states, the human security agenda are now greatly focussed on a wide range of direct as well as indirect threats to the individual and different collectives from within the family, community, nation and the globe at large. While national security needs investment in military, human security needs investment in human development and humane governance.

All these issues have not only broadened the security agenda but also brought more actors into the scene who can ensure security for all. While the state continues to remain an important player, the broadened security agenda recognise an expanded range of non-state and informal actors: civil society, NGOs, international/multilateral institutions and so on. An important factor that needs to be taken into cognisance is that the state itself is often viewed as a source of insecurity for the
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23 For example, Bjorn Moller, op.cit.; Kanti Bajpai, op.cit.; and George MacLean, op.cit.
Table 2.1: Dimensions of National and Human Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Security</th>
<th>Human Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security for whom?</td>
<td>Primarily, the state</td>
<td>Primarily, individuals and people (groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security of what</td>
<td>Territorial integrity and national sovereignty</td>
<td>Safety, freedom and opportunity for the individual and people (groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security from whom?</td>
<td>Other states</td>
<td>State, non-state actors, globalisation, nature, and so on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security from</td>
<td>Direct threats from other states</td>
<td>Direct and indirect threats from state, non-state and global actors, indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what threats?</td>
<td></td>
<td>threats from nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security by whom?</td>
<td>Primarily by state</td>
<td>State, non-state actors, civil society, NGOs (local, national and international), UN, International/multilateral organisations and, importantly, co-operation among all these actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security by which</td>
<td>Primarily by military means, but, to a lesser extent, also by diplomatic and economic means</td>
<td>Primarily by non-military means: conflict prevention, management, resolution and post-conflict peace-building, democratisation of polity and society, human development and humane governance, building capacity for these purposes, sustainable resource management, prevention and effective management of natural disaster and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

individual or people against which their security is to be organised. The new security concept has also paid considerable attention to the process of globalisation and consequential security threats.

Thus, as an academic discipline security studies has travelled a long way from its single-minded emphasis on the security of the state maintained primarily by military means in the post-War period to the concept of human security through human development and humane governance in the post-Cold War period. However, in the changed context, the state-centric security concerns with emphasis on military aspects have not disappeared altogether. Therefore, attempts at synthesising traditional and human security or even projecting human security as a component of national security continue. In this regard, the conception of human security articulated by the former Secretary General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, has received considerable attention. While explaining human security, Kofi Annan stated that human security in its broadest sense embraces far more than the absence of violent conflict. It encompasses human rights, good governance, access to education and health care and ensures that each
individual has opportunities and choices to fulfil his or her own potential. Every step in this direction is also a step towards reducing poverty, achieving economic growth and preventing conflict. Freedom from want, freedom from fear and the freedom of future generations to inherit a healthy natural environment—these are the interrelated building blocks of human, and, therefore, national security.

While there is a more or less clear delineation between traditional and human security, side by side with attempts at synthesising the two, intense debates are taking place around the evolving concept and scope of human security a discussion on which follows.

2.2 ONGOING DISCOURSE ON HUMAN SECURITY: EVOLVING CONCEPT AND SCOPE

As already indicated, human security studies are attracting growing attention on the part of the scholars and practitioners in the fields of international relations and social sciences. This is reflected in the proliferation of a large number and wide variety of journals, books and monographs devoted to human security dealing with the subject and general focusing on issues such as concept, scope, methodology as well as specific themes within the broader framework of human security studies. Despite the growing interest and accompanying investment in research in human security, no real consensus has yet appeared as to what can or should constitute the focus of human security either from the academic point of view or for practical purposes. Meanwhile, definitions of human security are quite large in number. According to one estimate these could be well over thirty.24 While all these

definitions are useful in one way or the other, these also vary widely regarding the very concept of human security as well as its scope.

In fact, considerable methodological, definitional and conceptual ambiguity persists regarding the real meaning of human security and about the implications of the human security paradigm for the study and practice of national development and international relations. This situation coupled with the growing interest in human security has led to an intense debate on the subject. Amidst these developments, however, a closer look at the numerous literature on the subject would reveal that, by now, two distinct conceptions of human security, or rather, two schools of thoughts have already emerged decisively.

The first one draws its intellectual, moral-ethical as well as practical inspiration from the natural rights/rule of law and humanitarian concept of human security, anchored as it is in the fundamental liberal assumption of basic individual rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and of the international community’s obligation to protect and promote these rights. In practical terms, this school of thought puts most of its emphasis on the violation of political and human rights, and more so, on violence against individual and groups, and seeks remedies to such violation and violence. Thus, the main focus of this school of thought is the ‘fear’ dimension of human security.

The other school of thought takes a much broader view of human security. While it includes the issues advocated by the school of thoughts discussed above, its conception of human security is constructed with a much wider horizon and includes a vast range of issues pertaining to the economic, environmental, social, and other forms of harms to overall livelihood and well-being of individuals and groups. According to this school, the state of the global economy, the
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forces of globalisation, and the health of the environment, including the world’s atmosphere and oceans, are all legitimate subjects of concern in terms of how they affect the security of the individual and groups. Thus, there is a strong social justice component in this broader conception of human security, as well as a wider consideration of threats to the survival and well-being of the individual and of groups. In the ultimate analysis, however, the main focus of this school of thought is the ‘want’ dimension of human security that would be elaborated in the subsequent discussions.

Actions and interactions between the two apparently competing schools of thoughts, and conflict as well as accommodation of their respective diverse ideas have been shaping the course of the ongoing debate and thinking on the concept of human security. Before probing into the evolving concept and scope of human security, an attempt has been made below to understand the nature and direction of the ongoing debate between the proponents of ‘fear’ and the ‘want’ dimensions of human security.

### 2.2.1 Human Security: Debate Over ‘Fear’ Versus ‘Want’

While the term ‘human security’ is of recent origin, the ideas that underpin the concept are far from new. However, as indicated earlier, the articulation of human security perspective is attributed to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Mahbub ul Haq, especially the publication of the *Human Development Report 1994* published by the UNDP. The Report suggested that the concept of security must change urgently in two ways:

1. From an exclusive stress on territorial security we must turn to a much greater stress on people’s security; and
2. From security through armaments to security through sustainable human development.

In the Report, the long list of threats to human security was synthesised under seven broad categories:

1. Economic security (assured basic income);
2. Food security (physical and economic access to food);

---


28 Ibid., p.24.
iii) Health security (access to health care, safe environment, etc.);
iv) Environmental security (safe physical environment);
v) Personal security (security from physical violence from the state, other states, groups of people with different identity, criminals, gender violence, drugs and other sources);
vi) Community security (within family, race, ethno-religious community, and so on); and
vii) Political security (basic human and democratic rights).29

While the Report mentioned human security as being ‘freedom from want’ and ‘freedom from fear,’ its emphasis was, of course, more on the former. As a consequence, the Report overwhelmingly reflected the perspectives of developing countries on the subject.

On the other hand, Canada, for which the promotion of human security is a significant foreign policy objective, regards the UNDP approach to be “extremely ambitious”30 and “unwieldy as a policy instrument.”31 Canada also considers that UNDP “largely ignored the continuing human insecurity resulting from violent conflict.”32 Conceptually, Canada’s interpretation of human security focuses on “freedom from pervasive threats to people’s rights, safety or lives.”33 In practice, it emphasises on the protection of civilians, conflict prevention, public safety, governance and accountability, and peace support operations. Thus, Canada has come out with its own version of human security that puts significantly more emphasis on the ‘freedom from fear’ dimension.34 The concrete issues that Canada emphasises are basically two-fold:

i) The protection of civilians in time of war (legal and physical protection of people in war zones); and

ii) The resolution of violent conflict (conflict prevention, resolution and post-conflict peace-building).35

29 Ibid., pp.24-35.
30 David Preston and Don Hubert, op.cit., p.349.
32 Ibid., p.3.
33 Sabina Alkire, op.cit.
34 Ibid.; Lloyd Axworthy, op.cit.; and David Preston and Don Hubert, op.cit.
35 Ibid.
Norway, likewise, focuses on the freedom from fear dimension of human security, and has identified a core agenda of preventive action, small arms and light weapons control, and peace operations. Along with Canada and Norway, some other European middle powers, like, Austria, Greece, Ireland, the Netherlands and Switzerland, who founded the Human Security Network, have mobilised significant practical responses to human security threats with a comparatively larger focus on the 'freedom from fear' dimension of human security. The topics of their actions include “protection for civilians,” “landmines treaty,” a “permanent international criminal court,” children’s issues (the optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on minimum ages for recruitment and deployment of soldiers), “small arms and light weapons,” and “drug trafficking and organised crime networks.”

However, the Canadian or European middle power viewpoint on human security is not the sole one and does not represent all the developed countries on the subject. As it is becoming evident, Japan is evolving a human security perspective that is closer to the UNDP version than the Canadian one. It has identified the promotion of human security as one of its significant foreign policy objectives. This was expressed in former Japanese Prime Minister Obuchi’s speeches. These include a speech delivered by him in December 1998 in Hanoi and another in a Symposium on “In Quest of Human Security” organised by Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) and United Nations University in December 1999. In addition to articulating a human security concept of its own, in March 1999, Japan also established a special fund called “Human Security Fund” with a view to promoting human security in the developing countries. As indicated, the Japanese perspective on human security puts more emphasis on ‘freedom from want’ than ‘freedom from fear’. Ultimately, however, the Japanese position on the issue, while tilts towards emphasising more on ‘freedom from want’, still remains somewhere in between the third world perspective as reflected in the UNDP Report and the middle power respective as discussed above.

36 Sabina Alkire, op.cit.
37 Ibid.
39 Shinoda, Hideaki, op.cit.
Thus, while the security of the individual and people is the prime concern of all analysts dealing with human security, they disagree on whether preference should be given to ‘freedom from want’ or ‘freedom from fear’. Depending on the answer, human security analysts are divided into two camps. A third approach, for instance, makes attempts to synthesise the two views.  

Central to the debate over the human security concept remains the dichotomous ‘freedom from want’ versus ‘freedom from fear’ dimensions that often reflect in a broad-versus-narrow conceptualisation of human security. In the process of conceptualising human security, the proponents of the former usually tend to include a broad range of issues, while the proponents of the latter tend to include a narrower range of issues.

The proponents of a narrow focus in conceptualising human security, who usually emphasise the ‘freedom from fear’, often justify their case by citing pragmatism, conceptual clarity and analytical rigour as reasons to focus on human security on violent threats. Yuen Foong Khong, for instance, warns that making everything a priority renders nothing a priority, and risks raising false hopes in the policy realm and obscuring real trade-offs between rival human security objectives. Similarly, Andrew Mack states that overly broad definitions of human security can block investigation of the very phenomena that need to be understood. Examining the relationship between poverty and violence, for example, requires us to treat them as separate variables. A definition that conflates dependent and independent variables will confound analysis of causal connections between them. MacFarlane believes that the merit of any definition should be judged on its ‘value added’ conceptual and policy consequences. Because of this reason, analytical clarity and significant normative results are on the side of the narrow focus.

The proponents of a broad focus in conceptualising human security emphasise the ‘freedom from fear’ and argue that human security
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42 Fen Osler Hampson and John B. Hay, op.cit.
means something more than safety from violent threats. They counter the pragmatic rationale of the narrow proponents not only by citing the substantive importance of a wider range of issues (such as poverty, disease, and environmental disasters), but also by arguing that in shifting the referent of security, these issues necessarily fall under the human security umbrella. To them, the subsequent analytical and normative difficulties are unfortunate but unavoidable consequences of broadening the security paradigm beyond threats to the state. 44

What appears to be more or less clear in the debate is the fact that the proponents of narrow conceptualisation, who emphasise 'freedom from fear' have sacrificed non-violent threats for analytical rigour and policy relevance, while the proponents of broad conceptualisation, who emphasise 'freedom from want' have sacrificed some analytical rigour and policy clarity for inclusiveness. In reality, some of the non-violent threats to the security of individual and people are as vital to their survival and well-being as the violent ones are. Similarly, the inclusion of a whole range of non-violent threats to security would contribute very little to the security of individual and people if these lack analytical usefulness or policy relevance.

In the circumstances, because of the shortcomings as discussed above, neither of these two concepts can respond to the prevailing as well as imminent challenges to human security properly and adequately. Thus, the dilemma faced by the human security studies community is how to conceptualise human security by including both violent and non-violent threats to security without sacrificing analytical usefulness and policy relevance. The evolving concept of human security is, in a way, a response to the dilemma faced by the human security community, a discussion on which will follow.

2.2.2 Human Security: Evolving Concepts and Scope

From the preceding discussion on a wide range of concepts of human security in the context of the ongoing debate over 'freedom from want' versus 'freedom from fear' dimensions, a more or less clear conclusion can be drawn. The debate continues among highly disparate circles of scholars and practitioners and the debate itself is perhaps still at the stage of escalation. The possibility of any consensus among them on whether and/or how far either of these dimensions of human security

44 Ibid.
will get precedence over the other seems to be far-fetched. As we have already seen that attempts to define human security from either of these perspectives inevitably invite criticism from the adherent of the other camp.

Attempts to synthesise the divergent concepts have also faced a high degree of criticism. The reasons are not difficult to comprehend. The ‘synthesisers’ often tend to select a set of crucial elements from among a wide range of diverse issues of human security advocated by both sides along the dividing line. When the potential set of critical and pervasive threats is too wide, by what criteria is a small subset of these chosen for consideration? The criteria of selection could include a wide range of considerations. However, these could hardly be based on rigorous academic foundation. Often the importance of a particular human security threat is argued in isolation from other threats, or threats appear to be chosen arbitrarily, or in response to the interests of those responsible. The inevitable consequence is the criticism of arbitrariness. Thus, evolving a widely acceptable theoretical perspective on human security through accommodation of and consensus among diverse views remains problematic.

In the face of persistent debate and consequential ambiguity regarding the concept and scope of human security, some of the ‘synthesisers’ have made efforts at going beyond such debates. In doing so, they have had to face the fact that the debate could continue or could even intensify. Thus, while making efforts to go beyond the debate, they indeed, try to bypass the debate. Such attempts, ultimately, lead to conceptualise human security pending the outcome of the ongoing debate. Complexities and contradictions inherent in such ventures have shaped the concepts of human security of this genre. As will be explored further, in practical terms, broader approach, tentative nature, flexibility and susceptibility to accommodation have become the characteristic features of such concepts of human security.

There have, indeed, been quite a large number of efforts at conceptualising human security in the ways as described above. For
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the purpose of our study, let us evaluate some of the attempts made at conceptualisation of human security, especially the ones that have had considerable influence on the evolving concept and scope of human security. In doing so, we will focus our attention on a number of questions/issues that will include the rationale behind such definitions/concepts of human security, their epistemological foundations, substance/content and usage. We will also inquire into the question on where these could lead the ongoing debate to. Such a procedure would facilitate our quest for exploring, if not, identifying the evolving concept and scope of human security.

The quest to find a commonly acceptable concept of human security remains at the heart of the ongoing efforts at synthesising numerous concepts belonging to two diverse schools. Such a concept is required for analytical clarity and policy relevance. It is also designed to deprive the opponents of human security of the opportunity of taking the advantage of the ongoing disunity among the ranks of its proponents regarding the very meaning of the term.  

A commonly acceptable concept is also required for providing “a working definition of human security, and to show how it can form the basis for operational responses by many different institutions.”

In search of the epistemological basis of such a concept of human security, consensus among the institutions concerned has been put forward as a logical possibility, since any adequate human security operation will involve the cooperation of diverse institutions. In the process of developing a commonly acceptable concept, human security analysts have relied more on the already prevailing concepts developed by the most authoritative institutions along both sides of the dividing line, such as the United Nations, on the one hand, and the Canadian Government, on the other. Even the scholarly works consulted for this purpose belong to these two diverse, but authoritative, schools of thoughts.

However, the definition proposed by the Commission on Human Security in its 2003 Report, Human Security Now occupies the central position in the subsequent definitions of human security. Explaining its definition of human security, the Commission on Human Security asserts that human security is intended “to protect the vital core of all
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human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfilment. Human security means protecting fundamental freedoms—freedoms that are the essence of life. It implies protecting people from critical (severe) and pervasive (widespread) threats and situations. It involves using processes that build on people’s strengths and aspirations. It also requires creating political, social, environmental, economic, military and cultural systems that together give people the building blocks of survival, livelihood and dignity.”

“The vital core of life” has been explained as “a set of elementary rights and freedoms people enjoy”. However, it has also been emphasised that what people consider to be “vital”—what they consider to be “of the essence of life” and “crucially important”—varies across individuals and societies.

The same principle implies to most of other terms used in explaining human security. In other words, the concept of human security needs to be dynamic and capable of accommodating a host of diverse views on the subject. Hence, the Commission on Human Security has refrained from proposing an itemised list of what makes up human security.

Relying on the definition proposed by the Commission on Human Security and ideas expressed in the UNDP’s Human Development Report 1994, Taylor Owen, for instance, proposes a threshold-based conceptualisation of human security. While considering a wide range of both violent and non-violent threats to the well-being of the individual and people, he attempts to define what is and is not a security threat. In this regard, he argues that threats should be included not because they fall into a particular category, such as violence, but because of their actual severity. What he advocates is a definition that limits threats by their severity rather than their cause, that allows all possible harms to be considered, but that selectively limits those prioritised with the ‘security’ label. He further emphasised that only those that surpass a threshold of severity could be labelled threats to human security.

He divides his definition into two parts. The first part is derived from the definition proposed by the Commission on Human Security: ‘human security is the protection of the vital core of all human lives from critical and pervasive threats.’ There are an unlimited number of

50 Sadako Ogata and Amartya Sen, op.cit., p.4.
51 Ibid.
possible threats but only the most serious, that is to say, those that take or seriously threaten lives, are included. The definition sets the parameters and lets the conditions on the ground determine what is and is not included. Out of an infinite list of possible threats, some will cross a threshold and become human security concerns, while others will be dealt with through existing mechanisms.\(^5\)

While in this conception, human security is not defined by an arbitrary list (either broad or narrow), but by the threats actually affecting people, the second part of the definition indeed includes six categories of threats viz., environmental, economic, food, health, personal and political threat. All but the community security mentioned in the UNDP 1994 Report are included here. Owen completes his definition as follows: “human security is the protection of the vital core of all human lives from critical and pervasive environmental, economic, food, health, personal and political threats.”\(^5\)

Owen’s definition is broad-based, tentative, flexible and accommodative in nature. As he explains, these categories are not threats themselves, but are rather conceptual groupings and provide a degree of disciplinary alignment to what is an overarching concept. Categories are, therefore, established under which all human security threats are ordered. Owen reiterates that the idea of human security as a threshold beyond which a wide range of issues become something similar and something requiring the unified policy response granted to security threats that can be applied to any of the existing conceptualisations.\(^5\)

Sabina Alkire, who has been involved in the preparation of the 2003 Report of the Commission on Human Security as a researcher and writer, makes an attempt to provide a working definition of human security that is designed to form the basis for operational responses by many different institutions dealing with a wide variety of threats to human security. As defined by Alkire, the objective of human security is “to safeguard the vital core of all human lives from critical pervasive threats, in a way that is consistent with long-term human fulfilment.”\(^5\)

Her definition of human security is based on the definition provided in the Report of the Commission on Human Security. She has, however, gone beyond the definition given by the Commission in the sense that
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she has come out with detailed interpretation of the following five terms used in the definition: safeguard, vital core, all human lives, critical and pervasive threats and long-term human fulfilment. In Table 2.2, ‘Explanation of terms’ reproduces the encapsulated version of the explanation/interpretation of the five terms provided by Sabina Alkire.

As evident from the discussions of the five terms viz., safeguard, vital core, all human lives, critical and pervasive threats, long-term human fulfilment, summarised above, while every effort is made to explain human security and its proposed definition in the light of the these five terms, no effort has been made to identify the threats by name.

While both the definitions were built on the premise of the definition provided by the Commission on Human Security, their approach to the UNDP’s Human Development Report 1994 has not been the same. In search of a threshold-based conceptualisation, Taylor Owen emphasises on going back to the UNDP roots. He relies on six of the seven categories of threats outlined in the UNDP definition.57 Sabina Alkire, on the other hand, stresses that “the operationalisations of human security necessarily narrow the conception from the 1994 (UNDP) description of it.”58 A review of other similar attempts at conceptualisation of human security would also suggest certain differences despite so many commonalities. In her attempt at reviewing the concept and definitions of human security, D. Mani, for instance, has paid considerably more attention to the Canadian perspective than Alkire or even Owen.59 She has also paid considerable attention to the categories of threats listed in UNDP, the Commission on Human Security and the Canadian version of human security.60

However, notwithstanding some minor differences, most of these attempts at conceptualisation of human security have some common characteristics. A broader approach is, perhaps, the most remarkable characteristics of all these definitions. A closer look at these definitions would suggest that any and every threat to the individual and people, if and when required, could be brought to or excluded from the category
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Table 2.2: Explanation of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Terms</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safeguard</td>
<td>Provide and promote Human Security by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identification (of critical pervasive threats)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prevention (so that risks do not occur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mitigation (so that if risks occur the damage is limited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- response (so that victims or chronic poor survive with dignity and maintain their livelihoods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vital Core</td>
<td>Respect Human Security by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identification, Prevention and Mitigation of predictable side effects that threaten human security, regardless of the primary objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A rudimentary but multidimensional set of human rights and human freedoms based on practical reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Human Lives</td>
<td>Spans the freedom from fear and freedom from want to be specified by appropriate procedures in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“People centred”—focused on individuals and their communities, universal and non-discriminatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Pervasive Threats</td>
<td>Critical threats cut into core activities and functions; pervasive threats are large-scale, recurrent dangers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threats may be direct, such as genocide or civil war; threats may also be indirect, for example, under-investment or financial collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Human Fulfilment</td>
<td>Human security is not sufficient for human fulfilment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human security processes should be consistent with ongoing human development by supporting participation, freedom, institutional appropriateness, and diversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


of threats to human security. Such an approach can ensure a high degree of flexibility in terms of identifying concrete threats to human security, depending on the severity and/or scholarly/popular perception of severity of the threats. It can also ensure that the concrete categories of threats retain their tentative nature. As a consequence, numerous definitions of human security that are constructed through synthesising the two divergent definitions—one emphasising on the 'want' dimension and the other emphasising on the 'fear' dimension—remain constantly susceptible to accommodation.
As our exploration of the evolving concept and scope of human security suggests, a large number of actors—the United Nations and a number of UN bodies, other international organisations, governments research and academic institutions, NGOs and civil society organisation as well as individual scholars—have been making valuable contribution to the articulation of a concept of human security that could become the norm or the standard one. In the process, however, there has come to exist a large number of definitions of human security. We have already categorised them into three groups. The first one with a narrow approach bases its conception of human security by focusing on the ‘freedom from fear dimension’. The second one with a broader approach bases its conception of human security by emphasising the ‘freedom from want dimension.’ A third group, however, has been making efforts at reconciling the two apparently divergent approaches.

As we have already noted, the proponents of narrow conceptualisation, who emphasise ‘freedom from fear’ have sacrificed non-violent threats for analytical rigour and policy relevance. On the other hand, the proponents of broad conceptualisation, who emphasise the ‘freedom from want’ have sacrificed part of analytical rigour and policy clarity for inclusiveness. In the circumstances, the challenge facing the ‘synthesisers’, is how to conceptualise human security with the inclusion of both the ‘want’ and ‘fear’ dimensions of human security without sacrificing analytical usefulness and policy relevance. As the preceding discussions reveal the issue still remains unresolved. It is unlikely that any one of them could be the norm or the commonly accepted one.

However, for the purpose of this study it is necessary, if not an imperative, to articulate a concept of human security and define its scope to avoid methodological bewilderment that could affect the quality, validity and reliability of the study. Such a concept would rely upon the UN publications already mentioned and the relevant scholarly works consulted for the purpose of the study.

In our attempt to conceptualise human security, we will assert that human security is the protection of the vital core of all human lives from critical and pervasive threats in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfilment. In this regard, like the Commission on Human Security, we remain aware that perception of ‘the vital core’, ‘all human lives’, ‘critical and pervasive threats’, ‘human freedoms’ and ‘human fulfilment’ varies across individuals and societies, in certain
cases, considerably. More important, perceptions on these and similar terms are not static even in a given society. Instead, these continue to change depending on the changes in the factors and actors shaping these perceptions. That is why, while being positive about the interpretation of similar terms by Sabina Alkire, we have not provided a set of our interpretation of the terms listed above. For the same reason, we have also not come out with an itemised list of threats to human security in our definition of human security. However, from a practical point of view, various issue areas of human security can be explored to facilitate construction of the human security index for South Asia.

2.3 EXPLORING ISSUE AREAS IN HUMAN SECURITY
As already discussed, considerable attention has been paid to the exploration of the issue areas in human security in the very first effort at the articulation of the concept by UNDP in its Human Development Report 1994. Since then, a wide variety of rather disparate institutions, organisations, collectives as well as individuals whether scholars or practitioners in the field of human security have contributed to the further exploration of issue areas in human security. In this regard, the UN Commission on Human Security's 2003 Report Human Security Now remains, perhaps, as the most authoritative of such efforts in the field. While the Human Development Report 1994 paid much attention to the ‘freedom from want’ dimension of human security, the Canadian perspective put almost exclusive emphasis on the ‘freedom from fear’ dimension. In this regard, the UN Commission on Human Security's 2003 Report Human Security Now seems to be an attempt at striking a balance between the two. The position of other scholars and practitioners in the field coincide with either of these perspectives or fall somewhere in between.

In the process, vast areas of human security have come up for consideration. Seven issues in particular were considered in the HDR 1994:

i) economic security;
ii) food security;
iii) health security;
iv) environmental security;
v) personal security;
vi) community security; and

vii) political security.

In a way of explanation, economic security requires an assured basic income—usually from productive and remunerative work, or in the last resort from some publicly financed safety net. Food security means that all people at all times have both physical and economic access to basic food. This requires not just enough food to go round. The overall availability of food in the world is not a problem. But this does not imply that everyone gets enough to eat. The problem often is the poor distribution of food and a lack of purchasing power. Health security suggests a safe environment that will ensure low exposure to disease and, in case of exposure to disease, access to health care.

Environmental security envisages a safe physical environment and reduced vulnerability to natural and manmade environmental threats. The concept includes mitigation strategies to cope with disasters along with the means to reduce environmental degradation. Large sections of populations have had to resettle because of degraded environments or development strategies such as large dam projects.

While all the issues mentioned above pertain to the 'freedom from want' dimension of human security, personal security pertains to the 'freedom from fear' dimension. While HDR 1994 emphasised more on the 'freedom from want' dimension, it also recognised the fact that "no other aspect of human security is so vital for people as their security from physical violence." In poor nations, human life is increasingly being threatened by sudden and unpredictable violence. The forms of threats to be dealt with as listed in the Report are as follows:

- Threats from the state (repression/physical torture);
- Threats from other states (war);
- Threats from other groups of people (ethnic/sectarian tension);
- Threats from individuals or gangs against other individuals or gangs (crime, street violence);
- Threats directed against women (rape, domestic violence);
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• Threats directed at children based on their vulnerability and
dependence (child abuse); and
• Threats to self (suicide, drug use).66

Community security includes both dimensions of human security. Most people derive security from their membership in a group—a family, a community, an organisation, a racial or ethnic group that can provide cultural identity and a reassuring set of values. Such groups also offer practical support. The extended family system, for example, offers protection to its weaker members, and many tribal societies work on the principle that heads of households are entitled to enough land to support their families. Land is distributed accordingly. But traditional communities can also perpetuate oppressive practices: often employing bonded labour and slaves, and treating women harshly. In Africa, hundreds of thousands of girls suffer genital mutilation each year because of the traditional practice of female circumcision.67 Political security is one of the most important aspects of human security. It implies that people should be able to live in a society that honours their basic human rights.68

Among these seven elements of human security, there are considerable links and overlaps and often, one element is dependent on the other.

In addition, HDR 1994 reflects upon global human security. This concerns a number of global challenges to human security that arise because threats within countries rapidly spill beyond national frontiers. It is emphasised in the reports that the real threat to human security in the next century will arise more from the actions of millions of people than from aggression by a few nations. In a rather tentative way some forms of threats were listed. They are as follows:

• Unchecked population growth
• Disparities in economic opportunities
• Excessive international migration
• Environmental degradation
• Drug production and trafficking
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- International terrorism.  

The necessity of cooperating at the global level with a view to exploring fresh ways of cooperation to respond to these six emerging threats (and others, should they arise) constitute the global framework of human insecurity.  

Canada, however, has remained critical about the UNDP approach to human security. It has come out with its own version of human security that puts significantly more emphasis on the ‘freedom from fear’. The concrete issues that Canada has emphasised are two:

i) The protection of civilians in time of war (legal and physical protection of people in war zones); and

ii) The prevention and resolution of violent conflict (conflict prevention, resolution and post-conflict peace building).

In terms of protection of civilians in time of war, Canada emphasises on the issues, like addressing the humanitarian crisis caused by anti-personnel landmines, the means to hold accountable those responsible for violating humanitarian law, particularly those individuals responsible for genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity, welfare of war-affected children and related issues.

In terms of the resolution of violent conflict, Canada emphasises issues, such as conflict prevention, resolution and post-conflict peace building. It would like to address the consequences of small arms and light weapons. It would like to negotiate with non-state actors and deal with war economies. Canada is also a proponent of controversial ‘humanitarian intervention’. While the Canadian agenda includes a wide number of issues, all these are designed to respond basically to one concern, ‘freedom from fear’.

The Commission on Human Security, launched at the 2000 UN Millennium Summit to articulate the concept of human security, came out with a Report in 2003, Human Security Now, that has been an attempt to strike a balance between the UNDP and Canadian positions.
regarding the 'freedom from want' and 'freedom from fear' dichotomy. The Commission on Human Security has identified six broad areas to advance human security:

i) People caught up in violent conflict;
ii) People on the move;
iii) Recovering from violent conflict;
iv) Economic security—the power to choose among opportunities;
v) Better health for human security; and
vi) Knowledge, skills and values for human security.

People caught up in violent conflict
It has been stated in the Report that the consequences of these violent internal conflicts are devastating, from the collapse of states and their institutions to surging poverty. To protect people in violent conflict, five policies were suggested in the Report:

- Placing human security on the security agenda
- Strengthening humanitarian action
- Respecting human rights and humanitarian law
- Disarming people and fighting crime
- Preventing conflict and respecting citizenship

People on the move
Most people move to improve their livelihood, seek new opportunities or escape poverty. Another reason for moving is forcible displacement or coercion because of war, violent conflict, human rights abuses, expulsion or discrimination. For many people, therefore, migration is vital to protect and attain human security, although their human security may also be at risk while they are migrating. Therefore, the Report proposed both, migratory opportunity as well as legal and institutional protection while migrating. This also included refugees and internally displaced people.

Recovering from violent conflict
Post-conflict situations provide opportunities to promote change, to fundamentally recast social, political and economic bases of power and
thus, to offer opportunities for including the excluded, healing fragmentation and erasing inequalities. Therefore, the emphasis on adopting a human security approach and incorporate human security issues under each of the following five clusters have been identified as the prime concern:

- Ensuring public safety
- Meeting immediate humanitarian needs
- Launching rehabilitation and reconstruction
- Emphasising reconciliation and coexistence
- Promoting governance and empowerment

**Economic security—the power to choose among opportunities**

A fifth of the world's people—1.2 billion—experiences severe 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. Thus, while dealing with poverty and human security, the emphasis has been on adopting a human security approach. In this regard, four priorities have been identified for policy action to promote human security:

- Encouraging growth that reaches the extreme poor
- Supporting sustainable livelihoods and decent work
- Preventing and containing the effects of economic crises and natural disasters
- Providing social protection for all situations

**Better health for human security**

It has been argued that good health is both essential and instrumental in achieving human security. In this regard, the main requirements have been identified as follows:

- Urgent action is needed to combat HIV/AIDS and other human security-threatening diseases
• Intellectual property rights should build in incentives for advancing human security
• National disease surveillance and control systems should be formally linked into a global system
• Every country should build a core public and primary health care system, shaped to national priorities
• Community-based health-insurance should protect otherwise vulnerable people from diseases

Knowledge, skills and values for human security
In this regard, the focus has been on the adoption of a human security approach. In developing knowledge, skills and values for human security, the following four priorities have been identified:
• Promoting a global commitment to basic education
• Protecting students’ human security at and through school
• Equipping people for action and democratic engagement
• Teaching mutual respect

Finally, the Commission has recommended that the tasks of advancing human security on all fronts start by addressing some of the basics and then building on early successes. The basics have been identified as follows:
• Protecting people in violent conflict
• Protecting people from the proliferation of arms
• Supporting the human security of people on the move
• Establishing human security transition funds for post-conflict situations
• Encouraging fair trade and markets to benefit the extreme poor
• Providing minimum living standards everywhere
• According high priority to universal access to basic health care
• Developing an efficient and equitable global system for patent rights
• Empowering all people with universal basic education through much stronger global and national efforts
• Clarifying the need for a global human identity while respecting the freedom of individuals to have diverse identities and affiliations
For each of these agenda items, alliances of key actors should be supported—networks of public, private and civil actors, who can develop norms, embark on integrated activities and monitor progress and performance. To overcome persistent inequality and insecurities, the efforts, practices and successes of all these groups should be linked in national, regional and global alliances. The goal of these alliances could be to create a kind of horizontal, cross-border source of legitimacy that complements that of traditional vertical and compartmentalised structures of institutions and states.

As has been indicated, the 2003 Report of the Commission on Human Security has been an attempt to strike a balance between the UNDP and Canadian positions on the subject. In the UNDP categorisation, first four of the seven categories—economic security, food security, health security, environmental security—completely and one additional category—community security—partially belong to the ‘freedom from want’ dimension of human security. The remaining two categories, personal security and political security, belong to the ‘freedom from fear’ dimension of human security.

As we can see from the Commission on Human Security categorisation, the first three of the six categories fall clearly within the purview of the ‘freedom from fear’ dimension of human security, while the remaining three come within the ‘freedom from want’ dimension. While the fifty-fifty division seems to be an attempt to strike a balance between the two opposite views, putting the three categories that belong to the ‘freedom from fear’ dimension of human security first indicates at least a tacit inclination towards the ‘freedom from fear’ dimension.

Little attempt has been made to justify such a qualitative departure from the UNDP position, though in the Forward, the Co-chairs, Sadako Ogata and Amartya Sen, have made an attempt to explain that three years later since the Commission was launched in 2000, “the fears are larger and the apprehensions greater.”75 While in the aftermath of 9/11, fears indeed came to figure more prominently in the global arena, in terms of their magnitude as well as consequences for the well-being of the billions of world’s under-privileged people, wants still continue to overwhelm fears. No less important, in most cases, violent conflicts are rooted in socio-economic and politico-cultural deprivation. In operational
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term, 'freedom from fear' would be meaningless, if 'freedom from want' is not ensured. On the other hand, 'freedom from want' is impossible to achieve or sustain without achieving 'freedom from fear'.

From the preceding discussions on the issue areas of human security based significantly on similar endeavours by the UNDP, Canada and the UN Commission on Human Security, it is evident that a process of 'securitisation' of a wide range of issues is in the offing. A careful scrutiny of the scholarly literature reviewed for the purpose of this study will lead to a similar conclusion. Thus, the ever-expanding human security agenda have come to include issues as diverse as economic security, personal security, violence, intra-state conflict, ethno-religious conflicts, landmine, terrorism, democracy, human rights, gender, crime, consequences of underdevelopment, poverty, hunger, deprivation, inequality, diseases and health hazards, unchecked population growth, human development, education, market, water, energy, migration, environmental degradation and so on. As a matter of fact, a process of 'securitisation' of a wide range of issues is continuing unabated, while simultaneously, a degree of caution persists with regard to how far the process can proceed.