

United Nations Development Programme

Human Development Report Office  
National Human Development Report Series

NHDR Occasional Paper 5

# The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports



5

By Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu Ray



© United Nations Development Programme

This paper is an independent publication commissioned by the United Nations Development Programme. It does not necessarily reflect the views of UNDP, its Executive Board or UN Member States.

# **The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports: A Review of Experiences and Current Debates**

By Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu Ray  
(Institute of Development Studies, Sussex)

United Nations Development Programme  
National Human Development Report Unit

May 2006



# Foreword

It is with great pleasure that the National Human Development Report (NHDR) Unit of the Human Development Report Office presents this NHDR Occasional Paper on Human Security. This study is part of a series that came about in response to the suggestion of national human development report teams from around the world who were seeking to apply a human development vision to policy-making in various sectors or themes, but found a paucity of concrete written guidance to support them in this task.

The purpose of the series is to provide theoretical background and practical support for development practitioners to address certain themes within a human development conceptual framework. Studies do not offer ‘blueprints’ or prescriptive recipes, as the work of making the human development approach operational in a local context must be rooted in the development challenges faced there. The following paper draws upon a thorough review of a number of NHDRs addressing human security as well as cutting-edge literature in this field. It also includes analysis from global Human Development Reports and other relevant international documents.

Previous Human Development Report Office Occasional Papers, produced in collaboration with UNDP’s Bureau for Development Policy, have addressed the topics of environment, gender, HIV/AIDS and conflict prevention. These papers are available online at [http://hdr.undp.org/nhdr/thematic\\_clusters/](http://hdr.undp.org/nhdr/thematic_clusters/). Producing the papers has presented a rare opportunity to discuss a variety of themes and their links to human development, and to exchange experiences and good practices in producing NHDRs and other forms of national level policy analysis and advocacy.



Sarah Burd-Sharps  
Deputy Director and Chief, NHDR Unit  
Human Development Report Office

# Acknowledgements

The NHDR Unit would like to thank Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu Ray for agreeing to undertake this study. The authors and the NHDR Unit would like to thank all those who contributed to the production of this guidance note. The authors are grateful to Aaron Schneider, Robin Luckham, Carron Taylor, Sarah Burd-Sharps and Tim Scott for their collaboration and substantive guidance. We would also like to thank the coordinators and participants of the DSA Workshop on 'Peace, Security and Sustainability', the Von Hugel Institute and St. Edmunds College at the University of Cambridge for providing substantial feedback on our paper.

Special thanks go to Shahrbanou Tadjbakhsh for initiating this series of thematic guidance notes, and to Gretchen Sidhu and Mary Ann Mwangi for their role in the editing, design, production and distribution process.

# Contents

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1**

## **SECTION 1: CONCEPTS AND CRITICISMS 3**

- Antecedents and evolution of the concept of human security 3
- The origins of human security 4
- Basic definition of human security 5
- Human security: a gender-sensitive and gender-conscious framework 5
- Linkages between human security, peace and development 6
- Criticisms and rebuttals 8
- The 'securitization' debate 10
- The risk of distortions 10
- Identifying misuse of the concept: tests of distortion 11
- The changing landscape of academic and policy debates 12

## **SECTION 2: HUMAN SECURITY—NATIONAL PERSPECTIVES 14**

- Overview of how the NHDRs have dealt with human security 14
- Individual reports—brief summaries and highlights 14
- Assessment and depth of analysis in NHDRs 17
- Special features of four NHDRs 18
- Afghanistan—a comprehensive analysis of human insecurities 21
- Human security in operation 24
- Other evidence 25
- Conclusions for our understanding of human security, its application at country level and its critiques 25

## **SECTION 3: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 29**

## **ANNEX 32**

- Review of NHDR Reports 32

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY 36**





# Executive Summary

The development of the human security framework by the global 1994 *Human Development Report* (HDR) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) was a pioneering step. The report shifted the focus of security from the protection of the state and its borders by military means to the protection of individuals from a wider range of threats to their well-being and security, and by a wider range of measures and policies, from the local and community levels to the national and international arenas. HDR 1994 defined human security as including “...safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression, and protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily lives, whether in homes, jobs or communities.”<sup>1</sup>

The strength and appeal of human security is not only in its new elements but in the growing inability of traditional concepts of security to generate adequate responses to many of the new causes of insecurity in the world today, particularly in the post-cold war situation. Recent reports for and by the UN—notably by the Secretary-General’s High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, and the Secretary-General’s own report, *In Larger Freedom*—have greatly enhanced the notion of human security as a useful tool of analysis, explanation and policy generation.

Nonetheless, there are still doubts about and opposition to the concept, especially among persons writing within the framework of international relations and political science. The primary bone of contention among the critics of the human security framework relates to the definition of the concept. The critics appear to focus on five difficulties:

- ◆ Human security, they argue, merely involves renaming problems that have already been recognized in other contexts and that already have perfectly good names. What is gained by combining them under a new label?
- ◆ Human security does not have any definite boundaries, therefore anything and everything could be considered a risk to security. This makes the task of policy formulation nearly impossible.
- ◆ Human security, when broadened to include issues like climate change and health, complicates the international machinery for reaching decisions or taking action on the threats identified.
- ◆ Human security risks engaging the military in issues best tackled through non-military means.
- ◆ Human security under the UN risks raising hopes about the UN’s capacity, which it cannot fulfil.

A different objection, shared by some who otherwise welcome human security, arises from the insidious co-option of the phrase ‘human security’ to justify the introduction of draconian and excessively harsh foreign and domestic policies, and to brand the exercise of unprovoked force as a measure of achieving human security.

Despite such criticisms and challenges, the application of the human security framework as a policy tool has increasingly been gaining currency within policy circles since 1994. This paper looks at evidence from UNDP’s National Human Development Reports, which have become an invaluable tool for socio-economic analysis. Human security has been a main theme in a dozen or so NHDRs, predominantly in countries that have either just emerged from conflict, or are still grappling with lingering but still major elements of national (and in some cases, regional) insecurity. In several of these reports, the strengths of the human security approach shine through, enabling contextualized multidimensional analysis of interconnected factors.

Through a detailed analysis of these reports, this paper identifies some interesting and useful applications of the human security framework. In particular, the reports of Afghanistan, Latvia, Macedonia and Bangladesh are reviewed in depth, as each makes strong contributions to the conceptualization of human security within a national context.

The first section of this paper provides a comprehensive analysis of the major antecedents that have, both intentionally and unintentionally, contributed to the emergence of the human security framework. The paper then considers the 1994 global HDR and subsequent documents and declarations that have helped to develop and refine the concept of human security, particularly in elaborating its connections with disarmament, peace and security, and development. This analysis is followed with a brief yet systematic overview of the major critiques and criticisms of the concept and methodology, and possible responses to these challenges. The final part of this first section considers the risks of distorted narratives on human security, particularly those seeking to reframe human security in favour of the dominant interests of states and institutional agendas.

The second part of this paper presents a brief overview of 13 NHDRs that have used a human security framework. This overview consists of careful analysis and evaluation of the human development concepts used, the key components, and the similarities and differences in methodology and classification of factors. The paper then uses a matrix of components in order to assess the ability of the reports to engage with concepts, classifications and specificities. The analysis focuses on definitions, key components, originality

of analysis, measures, statistics, methodology and policy conclusions. Through this exercise, a core list of considerations is identified that can be used in future reports as a focus for analysis and policy conclusions.

This paper uses the Afghanistan National Human Development Report 2004 as a strong example of a human security document. The paper finds that this report contains a high level of analytical clarity and utilizes a broad range of methodological and policy considerations to derive its conclusions. The fact that this report was led and drafted by Afghan nationals is a strong testament to the importance and centrality of national ownership of intellectual contributions. The strengths of the analysis and recommendations are made even more potent given that the data had to be gathered and analysed in frighteningly unstable and insecure conditions. This paper also gives a special focus to the reports on Latvia, Macedonia and Bangladesh, all of which include innovative elements.

Based on the analysis of the first two sections, the paper presents specific conclusions and recommendations that could serve as guidelines for future human security-oriented NHDRs, and other national studies. The focus is first on methodological issues in the identification of concepts and the preparation and collection of data, followed by points of action and policy—both in regards to operationalizing human security on the ground, as well as for further developing the analytical and assessment capacities of the concept itself.

The key conclusions and recommendations to emerge from this study include:

- ◆ The country level perspective on human security obtained from analysing the 13 NHDRs reinforces the value of human security as an operational approach to people-centred security that is able to identify priorities and produce important conclusions for national and international policy.
- ◆ The various objections to human security concerns and approaches elaborated in some recent academic literature hold little water when tested against the approaches and findings of the NHDRs reviewed for this analysis.
- ◆ The methodology of the Latvian NHDR is of particular relevance for analysing human security in other countries and situations. It investigated for a random sample of the population the most important insecurities they subjectively felt or objectively experienced, with a ranking and rating of the different insecurities according to how intensely they were felt to be a problem. This approach seems applicable in many other countries.
- ◆ Though the motivation of governments to implement policies relieving different forms of human insecurity will inevitably vary in different countries, human security analyses can still be of widespread importance and use even if not implemented. The information obtained and the analysis of human security needs can be used to critique the inadequacy or neglect of security issues in present policies, to build coalitions for change and to pressure policy makers to respond to specific needs.
- ◆ The recent UN agreement to establish a Peacebuilding Commission and a supportive secretariat provides a new challenge and opportunity to apply human security analyses. UNDP and other parts of the UN could support and make available human security analyses in all countries being considered for action in the Peacebuilding Commission. Such analyses, if prepared objectively by well-informed professionals, could help provide a frame of reference to ensure a broad approach to peacebuilding related to the wider issues of human security. This could help to mark a real advance in international action for peace and security.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> UNDP 1994, p. 23.

## Concepts and Criticisms

### ANTECEDENTS AND THE EVOLUTION OF THE CONCEPT OF HUMAN SECURITY

The United Nations was born into a world emerging from the shadows of war and hitherto unimagined destruction. The organization was founded on the ideals of peace and justice, with an international system of law and procedures that would replace military aggression and war with negotiation and collective security. Although the UN was fundamentally constructed around the concept of national sovereignty, it could also be argued that, from the very start, the security of people was of equal importance. The UN Charter's first words state, in no uncertain terms, that: "We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind...."<sup>1</sup>

The dominant concept of security at the time was state-centric, privileging the instruments and agents of the state, carrying forward the principles of state sovereignty as first articulated in the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. The UN principles for security were initially focused on ways in which the structures and practices of the modern state might address threats to its sovereignty. These threats encompassed compromises to territorial integrity, issues surrounding political stability, military and defence arrangements, and economic and financial activities.<sup>2</sup> The behaviour of states was understood 'rationally' as the pursuit of power.<sup>3</sup> To that extent, the security calculus was based on a zero-sum outcome, with gains on one side coming only as a result of losses on the other. This 'realist' approach to security was most sharply applied in relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics from the onset of the Cold War in the 1950s.

In the years that followed, attempts to mediate between the US and the former USSR probably presented the most difficult test for the UN and its mandate. Operating in a world perilously close to a devastating nuclear confrontation forced the organization to develop innovative and creative solutions to seemingly intractable problems, such as limiting the threats posed by the nuclear arsenals stockpiled by each superpower. The UN's role in disarmament led to the establishment of standards such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (1968),<sup>4</sup> the Anti-Ballistic-Missiles Treaty (1972),<sup>5</sup> the Biological Weapons Convention (1972)<sup>6</sup> and the Chemical Weapons Convention (1993).<sup>7</sup> Since the principle targets of these weapons were communities and, by extension, individuals, it could be argued that although states had the principal responsibilities for action, individu-

als and communities were ultimately the main beneficiaries of these UN-led initiatives.<sup>8</sup>

World military expenditures rose over most of the decades after the UN was founded, prompting a succession of proposals by member states to reduce military spending and to transfer a proportion of the resources saved into development in developing countries. France made the first such proposal in 1955, suggesting that 25 per cent of the resources released should be allocated to an international fund for development. This was followed by other proposals from the Soviet Union and Brazil. In 1973, the General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for a 10 per cent one-time reduction in the military budgets of the Permanent Members of the Security Council—with 10 per cent of the saved sum being allocated for economic and social development in third world countries. The UN special sessions on disarmament and development in 1978, 1982 and 1987 all came up with similar proposals.<sup>9</sup>

With the end of the cold war and the demise of the Soviet Union by 1991, the UN's strategy for dealing with conflict shifted from containment to prevention. In 1992, the UN Secretary-General issued 'An Agenda for Peace, Peacemaking, and Peace-keeping'.<sup>10</sup> Early optimism for a more peaceful world, however, was dashed by a rising number of conflicts in developing countries. These were overwhelmingly internal conflicts, though sometimes national groups received external support. Most of these conflicts were outside the inter-state mould espoused by the realists. The causes of these conflicts were seen to be linked to non-state and non-traditional factors such as internal socio-political conditions, rapidly deteriorating economic conditions, environmental threats, identity politics and powerful organized crime rings.<sup>11</sup>

In an attempt to address these transformations, the UN system once more engaged with alternative views of security, articulating the concept in terms of a re-framed emphasis on the empowerment of individuals by addressing systemic policies and practices that contributed to insecurity. Despite having embodied the concept of collective security since its inception and having witnessed the transformation of the concept beyond its original parameters during the cold war competition of superpower interests, the UN increasingly championed alternative approaches to development and security.

In fact, this alternative focus on people as the referent object of security is evident in the UN initiatives on human rights almost from the beginning. The unanimous adoption of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the

subsequent creations of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (1966), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (1979) and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) can all be seen as elements of alternative perceptions of security. Each of these conventions and covenants focused on various vulnerabilities and threats experienced by individuals. The entry into force of these regimes laid the groundwork for more fundamental questioning of dominant ideologies about security and for broadening the concept into new areas more directly linked to human rights and individual concerns.

By the start of the 1990s, the UN had substantively engaged with a plethora of new issues through its policies and programmes. Following the end of the cold war and the collapse of the existing East-West stalemate, the presence of decentralized and non-conventional threats to security had become more the norm than the exception. It thus became increasingly necessary to adopt an approach that attempted to be both holistic and contextual. History and experience had shown that although the notion of security was at the forefront of many debates, how this concept was interpreted and viewed differed greatly from region to region, community to community, and individual to individual. It was in this context that the concept of human security was first put forward.

## THE ORIGINS OF HUMAN SECURITY

The concept of human security emerged as part of the holistic paradigm of human development cultivated at UNDP by former Pakistani Finance Minister Mahbub ul Haq,<sup>12</sup> with strong support from economist Amartya Sen.<sup>13</sup> UNDP's 1994 global HDR was the first major international document to articulate human security in conceptual terms with proposals for policy and action.

Though this marked the most high-profile launching of the concept, ul Haq and several others involved in 1994 had explored the topic at a NorthSouth Roundtable called the 'Economics of Peace', held in Costa Rica in January 1990. The Roundtable produced a clear statement that the post-cold war world needed "a new concept of global security," with the "orientation of defence and foreign policy objectives changed from an almost exclusive concern with military security...to a broader concern for overall security of individuals from social violence, economic distress and environmental degradation." This would require "attention to causes of individual insecurity and obstacles to realization of the full potential of individuals." The report placed these challenges in the context of the post-cold war world along with an emphasis on reducing military spending and creating a peace dividend—to ensure greater human development, and ease economic and environmental imbalances.<sup>14</sup>

The 1994 global HDR argued that the concept of security has "for too long been interpreted narrowly: as security of territory from external aggression, or as protection of national interests in foreign policy, or as global security from a nuclear holocaust. It has been related more to nation states than to people."<sup>15</sup> This narrow approach was categorically widened to include the safety of individuals and groups from such threats as hunger, disease and political instability; and protection from "sudden and hurtful disruptions in patterns of daily life."<sup>16</sup> The report went on to further identify seven core elements that—when addressed together—reflect the basic needs of human security: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security and political security.<sup>17</sup>

The evolution of human security also had the support of Oscar Arias, former President of Costa Rica and winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, who linked human security with proposals for a Global Demilitarization Fund. Designed to provide support for disarming and demobilizing armed forces, re-integrating military personnel into society, and other measures to promote arms control and civic education for democracy, this effort would become an integral element for increasing human security in many countries.

After 1994, the concept of human security became a central theme of a number of governments through their foreign and defence policies. In particular, the Canadian, Japanese and Norwegian governments led the way in institutionalizing human security concerns into their respective foreign policies. According to a Canadian government report, "human security means safety for people from both violent and non-violent threats. It is a condition or state of being characterized by freedom from pervasive threats to people's rights, their safety, or even their lives."<sup>18</sup> In its foreign policy statement, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for Japan urges states, international organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society to work towards eliminating threats to each and every person.<sup>19</sup>

In 2001, the Commission on Human Security, chaired by Nobel Laureate Amartya Sen and the former UN High Commissioner for Refugees Sadako Ogata, was established to explore the concept of human security and to make recommendations for policy. The 2003 report of the Sen-Ogata Commission noted that human security complemented state security because its concern was focussed on the individual and the community—whose agency and well-being represented an integral part of state security. Achieving human security therefore included not only protecting people but empowering people to fend for themselves. The Sen-Ogata report focused on a variety of actors who were either insecure or faced the threat of insecurity. By devoting chapters to people caught up in violent conflict, migrants, people recovering from violent conflict and economic insecurity, the report aptly illustrated the endless plethora of cases and causes of human insecurity in the post-cold war era.

By 2005, human security had been made the organizing theme of two important UN reports—the report of the Secretary-General’s High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change issued in December 2004, and the Secretary-General’s own report *In Larger Freedom*, issued a few months later for the World Summit in September 2005. In spite of failures to agree on a number of issues, the Summit reached consensus on three matters of importance for human security:

- ◆ on the establishment of a Peacebuilding Commission, with details to be worked out by the spring of 2006;
- ◆ on a new Council for Human Rights, to restore credibility and legitimacy; and
- ◆ on the principle of the responsibility to protect and the right to intervene.

### BASIC DEFINITION OF HUMAN SECURITY

Human security represents an effort to re-conceptualize security in a fundamental manner. It is primarily an analytical tool that focuses on ensuring security for the individual, not the state.<sup>20</sup> Exploring options aimed at mitigating threats to the insecurity of individuals thus becomes a central goal of policy recommendations and actions. In line with the expanded definition of human security, the causes of insecurity are subsequently broadened to include threats to socio-economic and political conditions, food, health, and environmental, community and personal safety. Policy initiatives generated through the application of the human security framework have incorporated considerations far beyond the traditional focus on military force, greatly reducing the emphasis on armies, if not replacing them altogether. Human security is therefore:

- people-centred
- multidimensional
- interconnected
- universal

In principle, human security reflects the aggregate gains as a result of the mitigation of each and every factor that contributes to insecurity. In practice, as recognized by the report *Human Security Now*, there is a need to focus on a core of insecurities within each specific context.<sup>21</sup> A country-by-country approach, as with the NHDRs, helps to do this.

For example, realizing human security in Afghanistan can and should involve policies that address democratic governance, transnational crime, human rights, poverty and basic needs. The human security needs of the people of Mozambique could and likely would include protection from external regional conflicts, socio-economic exploita-

tion, civil unrest stemming from ethnic identities, poverty, and public health issues such as HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis. Each of these country cases therefore represent sub-sets of human security, linked together by the common condition of insecurity—which manifests itself in decidedly different terms in both Afghanistan and Mozambique. In each case, the drive to eliminate insecurity is informed by considerations of human development and human rights, and not strategic calculations of power and military gains/advantages. Through this framework, it would therefore be possible to develop a collection of policies that successfully address the specific insecurities in each country, while ensuring that the primary beneficiaries of these policies are individuals, not the state. As a result, state security becomes a direct reflection of the perception of the security of the state’s citizens.

It is important to recognize when the human security framework is most useful in its analysis. For instance, attempting to locate human security within the superpower rivalry of the cold war world order does not demonstrate the theoretical strengths of this framework. As such, in cases where security threats to the state are addressed through actions aimed at external state-based actors, traditional security studies appears better situated to undertake effective analysis. For example, the overthrow of Saddam Hussein’s Iraqi regime by the US-led coalition is far better understood through a traditional security lens. The resultant impacts of US Army actions on the population of Iraq, however, are much better understood through the human security framework. Although it is debatable whether a human security approach to engage with the Saddam Hussein regime may have yielded greater benefits in the long run, it is very clear that the implementation of a human security framework in post-conflict reconstruction could have greatly improved the situation of Iraqi citizens.

### HUMAN SECURITY: A GENDER-SENSITIVE AND GENDER-CONSCIOUS FRAMEWORK

History has shown that women’s experience of insecurity is fundamentally different than that of men. Gender-based violence has long been a major component of warfare. “Women are subjected to specific forms of violence in war because, as women, they are viewed as cultural bearers and reproducers of ‘the enemy’ . Rape, forced impregnation, sexual slavery and other forms of humiliation take on powerful political and symbolic meanings.”<sup>22</sup> Women are also at risk within the domestic economy, having to endure discrimination in employment, marginalization in the eyes of the law, and the rigid frameworks of socio-cultural expectations.

The consideration of gendered insecurities necessitates a broadening of the concept of security, and human security lends itself well to this conceptual task. “Through gender,

security becomes reconstructed on the basis of women's experiences of violence, interrelating violence on the local, national, and international levels, and eradicating structural violence instead of primarily focussing on the direct violence of war."<sup>23</sup> A gendered approach thus disaggregates the cultural, social, economic and political mechanisms for the distribution of power and control, and recognizes who is affected and how, and what specific forms of protection or assistance are needed by whom.<sup>24</sup> Through the utilization of a human security perspective, it is possible to generate policies that are at once sensitive to the insecurities of vulnerable women and integrate these concerns into a wider narrative of human threats. Gender is therefore a vital component of the human security agenda.

The institutionalization of gendered perspectives in peace and security initiatives has been a relatively new feature of the UN's work. The adoption of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women in 1979 was an important step in the UN process of recognizing and attempting to address gendered imbalances, but it took over two decades before there was any formal action on peace and security. In 2000, Security Council Resolution 1325 finally recognized the importance of integrating a gender perspective in peacebuilding and conflict resolution. The UN then issued a report in 2002 entitled *Women, Peace and Security*.<sup>25</sup> The study acknowledged that there was indeed much more work to be done in order to integrate women's security needs and foster gendered perspectives on international peace and security. The UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, states in his introduction that "women still form a minority of those who participate in peace and security negotiations, and receive less attention than men in post-conflict agreements, disarmament and reconstruction."<sup>26</sup> It must be noted that while these three specific initiatives represent major turning points, the work of the UN in ensuring the incorporation of gendered perspectives has greatly enhanced the impacts of peacekeeping; disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR); and peace negotiation initiatives.

### LINKAGES BETWEEN HUMAN SECURITY, PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT

It is possible to trace the roots of human security through the collective efforts of the United Nations' interventions in peace, security and development. The concept of human security is predicated on a premise of rights and entitlements, articulated and legislated through the adoption of the landmark Universal Declaration on Human Rights.<sup>27</sup> The Declaration was the first and most emphatic step in the articulation of basic socio-political and economic conditions guaranteed to every single human being by virtue of their birthright. Article 3 says, "Everyone has the right to

life, liberty and security of person."<sup>28</sup> Such statements have laid the foundations for human rights to be institutionalized into the structures of global governance. Human security builds on the universality and fundamental acceptance of these rights.

Disarmament continues to play a central role in the realization of human security. As already discussed, at a global level, treaties such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Anti-Ballistic Missiles Treaty were designed to lessen the threat of global nuclear, biological and chemical warfare. At a regional and country level, efforts such as the Ottawa Convention (1997)<sup>29</sup> and ongoing UN efforts to introduce measures against the proliferation of small arms and light weapons have the potential to take millions of weapons out of global circulation, greatly reducing the human damage caused by war.

Further elaboration of linkages between the concepts of human security, peace and development can be found in the reports of various recent commissions created to investigate a number of specific issues related to disarmament, governance and insecurity. These reports have explored ways to conceptualize the security problem and have offered some compelling alternatives to the mainstream understandings of these issues. Some of the most influential and important reports include:

#### ***The Report of the Palme Commission and the Thorssen Report (1982)***

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 these sessions, *The Report of the Palme Commission* (1982) and the *Thorssen Report* (1982)<sup>30</sup> also stressed the need to identify the relationship between these two areas. Both reports note security could not be attained through nuclear detente. 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. The *Thorssen Report* concludes that its "investigation suggests very strongly that the world can either continue to pursue the arms race with characteristic vigour or move consciously and with deliberate speed toward a more stable and balanced social and economic development. It cannot do both."

#### ***The Report of the Commission on Global Governance: Our Global Neighbourhood (1995)***

The proposals and principles contained in this report<sup>31</sup> continued to challenge the supremacy of the state-based system of global governance. As part of its guiding principles, the report

notes, “All people, no less than all states, have a right to a secure existence.”<sup>32</sup> The report states that “...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.”<sup>33</sup> The Commission’s report also contains a number of proposals aimed at re-inventing the UN and re-invigorating the organization’s agenda.

### ***The Brahimi Report on UN Peacekeeping Operations (2000)***

Among the most important UN mechanisms, tasked with the maintenance of peace and security, are its peacekeeping operations. Over the last two decades, peacekeepers have been increasingly called upon to engage in the more complex roles of peacebuilding and peace-enforcing. This has entailed not only a revision of operational policies, but also the consideration of a wider package of strategies that could help foster peace in conflict situations.

*The Brahimi Report on UN Peacekeeping Operations*<sup>34</sup> assesses the shortcomings of the existing peacekeeping system and makes specific recommendations for change. The 1990s saw the traditional model of peacekeeping repeatedly fail to bring about a lasting end to violence in conflict situations. As earlier identified, the change in the types of conflict necessitated a fundamental re-orientation of strategies necessary to cope with ‘new wars’. Therefore, in an attempt to address the institutional shortcomings, the Brahimi report identifies “the need to build the United Nations’ capacity to contribute to peacebuilding, both preventive and post-conflict, in a genuine-integrated manner.”

The report engages with practical operational issues such as the composition and mandate of a potential UN standing army, as well as policy level changes in the very consideration of the new format for conflict. These proposals would—in the near future—be part of a wider debate on UN reform in light of the challenges posed to the organization in the post-9/11 world.

### ***The Report of the Independent International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty: A Responsibility to Protect (2001)***

As a response to the increasing number of humanitarian emergencies that dotted the globe in the 1990s, the Government of Canada established an Independent International Commission with the mandate to produce a guide to action on responses by the international community to internal and man-made emergencies.<sup>35</sup> The Commission’s report<sup>36</sup> engages with the fundamental concept of sovereignty, and concludes that thinking about it as responsibility would place the onus of individual protection

and safety squarely in the hands of state authorities. 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.”<sup>37</sup> The report elucidates the three responsibilities embodied in this principle: the responsibility to prevent, the responsibility to react, and the responsibility to rebuild. It focuses on the principles of military intervention, including the just cause principle, the precautionary principles, and the right authority to sanction such action.

The importance of this report cannot be emphasized enough. While fundamentally shifting the focus of state actions away from the state in favour of the individual living within the boundaries of the state, the report also reinforces military action as a viable tool of international relations. The distortion of human security principles through the rationale of the arguments of this report has been evident in the actions and justifications of US foreign policy in the post-9/11 war on terror (to be discussed later in this chapter).

At the same time, the report represents a major advance in thinking about the responsibilities of states to protect their citizens and the rights of the international community to take action when states fail in these duties. When proposed in 2001, these principles were such an advance in international thinking that many informed observers thought they would never be accepted. In fact, the principles were accepted at the World Summit in 2005, albeit hedged by qualifications, notably the requirement that the right to intervene could only be exercised after approval by the Security Council.

### ***The Commission on Human Security’s report Human Security Now (2003)***

The Commission on Human Security argued in favour of integrating policy responses to address the interconnectivity of threats to security. Premised on the centrality of human rights, the Commission’s report<sup>38</sup> focuses on promoting democratic principles as a step towards attaining human security and development. It further notes that engaging with complex relationships within the policy environment is the best way to ensure the establishment of human security.

The report draws policy conclusions on a variety of subjects, including protecting people in violent conflict, the proliferation of arms, encouraging fair trade and markets to benefit the extremely poor, ensuring universal access to basic health care and universalizing basic education.<sup>39</sup> Throughout the report, the need to re-invent the concept of security by widening its characteristics to include a greater collection of socio-economic and political threats is ever present. Ultimately, the report describes the potential of

human security as a tool that “could serve as a catalytic concept that links many existing initiatives.”<sup>40</sup>

**The UN Secretary-General’s High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change’s report *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility* (2004)**

The report<sup>41</sup> of this panel explores the linkages between development and security by focusing on the changing nature of threats and challenges, and how a prevention-focused analysis may generate alternative strategies to mitigate insecurity. The report identifies key issues by developing six clusters of security threats. These include economic and social threats such as poverty, deadly infectious disease and environmental degradation; inter-state conflict; internal conflict, civil war and genocide; weapons of mass destruction; terrorism; and trans-national organized crime. The report states that “development has to be the first line of defence for a collective security system that takes prevention seriously. Combating poverty will not only save millions of lives but also strengthen States’ capacity to combat terrorism, organized crime and proliferation. Development makes everyone more secure.”<sup>42</sup>

**The UN Secretary-General’s report *In Larger Freedom* (2005)**

In no other report is the linkage between security and development more explicit than in this one by UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan. *In Larger Freedom*<sup>43</sup> stated, in no uncertain terms, that “all people have the right to security and to development.”<sup>44</sup> The report assesses the multitude of interconnected threats and challenges, and recommends eight specific areas where UN deliberations could and should focus on improving the organization. Under each area the report elaborates on meeting previously agreed commitments on poverty reduction, arms limitations, protecting and promoting human rights, developing a new consensus on defining terrorism, strengthening UN mechanisms such as the General Assembly and the Security Council, and creating a Human Rights Council.

All of these reports have focused on the links between security issues and other societal, economic and developmental challenges currently faced by millions of people around the world. The reports also discuss policy initiatives and strategies aimed at mitigating these conditions, which if taken on board could significantly improve the enjoyment of human security globally.

The linkages between the UN’s efforts to promote peace and continue disarmament initiatives are indeed strong. The track record of success, however, dampens enthusiasm in the potential these reports describe. Whereas the effectiveness of disarmament and development programmes have significantly improved the security condi-

tions in many parts of the world, at least in certain respects, many millions remain insecure, including those battling to escape the vicious uncertainties of crippling poverty. Actions to control and reduce non-traditional threats to security, as shown through UN initiatives on human rights, the environment and development, serve collectively to reinforce the notion that an individual’s security ought to be at the core of international programming and policies, and serve as a reminder that more needs to be done.

The glass is half full and half empty. The potential to improve significantly the way in which the majority of the world lives clearly exists, with specifics identified by each of the reports. Through the engagement of the human security perspective, it is possible to draw connections, make linkages and generate thorough policy alternatives. As the recommendations of *Human Security Now, A More Secure World* and *In Larger Freedom* clearly show, through the human security agenda, it is possible to institutionalize these policy alternatives. The only steps necessary for a wholesale implementation of human security ideals continue to be political motivation, and scholarly support and advocacy.

**CRITICISMS AND REBUTTALS**

Many eminent academics and practitioners in international relations retain reservations about the concept of human security.<sup>45</sup> Their doubts focus on at least five points:

- ◆ Human security, they argue, merely involves renaming many problems that have already been recognized in other contexts and that already have perfectly good names. What is gained by combining them under a new label?<sup>46</sup>
- ◆ Human security does not have any definite parameters, therefore anything and everything could be considered a risk to security. This makes the task of policy formulation nearly impossible.<sup>47</sup>
- ◆ Human security, when broadened to include issues like climate change, terrorism and threats from disease, complicates the international machinery for reaching decisions or taking action on the threats identified.<sup>48</sup>
- ◆ Human security risks engaging the military in issues best tackled through non-military means.<sup>49</sup>
- ◆ Human security under the UN risks raising hopes about the UN’s capacity, which it cannot fulfil.

These are important challenges—though ones to which there are cogent answers. It is important that the answers are presented, so as not to lose the innovative and significant contributions to thinking and action that the concept of human security holds—and that to some extent it has already brought to the table. Responses to the objections follow in the order listed above, in general in this section, and with



specific reference to the NHDRs in the following section.

*Does this bringing together of issues involve more than merely renaming other problems as issues of human security?* Yes, it does. The High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change puts it most clearly. “Today, more than ever before, threats are inter-related and a threat to one is a threat to all. The mutual vulnerability of weak and strong has never been clearer.”<sup>50</sup> “Development...is the indispensable foundation for a collective security system that takes prevention seriously.”<sup>51</sup>

The report elaborates: “Development and security are inextricably linked. A more secure world is only possible if poor countries are given the chance to develop. Extreme poverty and infectious diseases threaten many people directly, but they also provide a fertile breeding ground for other threats, including civil conflict. Even people in rich countries will be more secure if their Governments help poor countries to defeat poverty and disease by meeting the Millennium Development Goals.”<sup>52</sup>

This is much more than simply renaming. It is a recognition of the interrelated causes of threats, and the interrelated actions required to either prevent them from arising or to control them when they do. As already noted, it is this inherent interconnectedness that orthodox approaches to security are unable to address. Human security’s methodological framework is posited on analysis of causal processes, and thus retains the potential to address any given threat-based scenario because the limiting nature of specificities inherent in most analytical traditions within international relations is not present. Unless one wishes to argue there is no interconnectedness at all, the case for taking account of the interactions and consequences seems overwhelming.

Another common objection by the critics of human security focuses on the boundaries of the concept. It is argued that because *human security does not set any definite boundaries and parameters, anything and everything is considered a risk to security*, and as a result, leaves policy makers without direction, and academics without any analytical and comparative tools. This particular objection highlights both the rigidity with which the concept of security is understood in international relations, as well as the most fundamental strength that human security has to offer. In a state-centric model, security has very specific implications and connotations. Threats are assessed by their implications on structures, territorial boundaries and, most importantly, state ‘interests’. Invariably, and as history has repeatedly shown, state interests often mimic the interests of those with a firm grasp on power, and with vested economic and political interests. By securing the state, it is understood that by implication, the individual and their interests are protected.

Given the numerous challenges arising in the post-cold war world, the state-centric model appears to be critically flawed in its inability to respond effectively. The impacts of

terrorism, disease and pandemics, globalization and environmental disasters on the state-centric international system force us to consider alternative calculations of security. No longer can a threats-based approach—one in which threats continue to be defined according to the interest of the state—be considered adequate. In today’s world, the well-being of the individual requires a far more complex set of considerations than was considered necessary within the state-based definition of security. The very reason that for an Afghan citizen, the definition of security is drastically different than that of a Latvian citizen compels an immediate reformulation of the very definition of security.

The climate change phenomenon is a perfect example for illustrating the value-added of a human security agenda. Whereas scientific and economic arguments often fall into opposing sides of the debate, the human security perspective enables a more critical analysis of the potential multidimensional impacts of the problem. Aside from the scientific assertions (be they for or against the existence of climate change as a phenomenon), it is clear from events in 2005 that fragile livelihoods are at the mercy of volatile environmental changes. As the Asian tsunami, the drought in Niger and the change in the Amazon’s ecosystem have clearly demonstrated, the livelihoods of countless millions—inevitably the most vulnerable members of society—lie in the balance. Through a human security approach, contingencies for these types of dangers can be initiated, and aimed at safeguarding livelihoods as well as ensuring environmental sustainability.

The complexity of the causes of terrorism raises similar issues, though more sharply in the present global context. The causes are indeed complex, diverse and difficult to analyse. But is it possible to seriously suggest that the interacting causes should not be explored, either in the UN or outside, simply because they are highly complex?

*The idea that the concept of human security necessarily leads to the encouragement of military responses to whatever security problems are identified seems an overstated objection.* It is true that the current US Administration has—at least in its earlier phases of the war on terror and in its programme of Homeland Security—relied heavily on military solutions, internationally and nationally. This has led many to identify a risk of ‘securitization’ or ‘militarization’ of the global development agenda. Such approaches to human security have been strongly rejected by other parties, however, both analytically and in terms of policy. Many close to the UN have argued that the military approaches have been extremely counterproductive and must give way to broader non-military solutions, as is suggested in the agenda of actions outlined in the report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change, the Secretary-General’s report *In Larger Freedom*, the Sen-Ogata report, and the foreign policies of Canada and Japan.

The use of the term ‘collective comprehensive securi-

ty', rather than human security, may encourage a misplaced association with military solutions. Collective security has, for many years, been a fundamental concept in security studies, stressing the need for cooperation between states to mitigate threats to the collective. Regional security organizations such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) owe their existence to this concept. But the analysis of the High-level Panel's report and the use of the term human security move away from this state-based understanding of collective security to a people- and community-based understanding. This re-orientation enables collective comprehensive security to be understood as the sum of individual and community concerns. Consistent use of the term human security would make it even clearer.

Moreover, in the 1994 global HDR, human security was explicitly presented as part of the analysis and proposals for reducing military spending and shifting some of the resources to non-military actions directed to the prevention and control of threats to human security. In the same report, Oscar Arias set out detailed proposals for a Global Demilitarization Fund.<sup>53</sup> Such a fund would provide resources and incentives for the disarming and demobilization of armed forces, for re-integrating military personnel into society through retraining programmes, for promoting arms control and the shrinking of arms production facilities, and for encouraging civic education and participation in fully democratic political life.

*Does all this raise excessive hopes for the UN or about its capacity to translate these ideas into action?* No more than in other areas. Without doubt, the UN has a highly mixed record of responding to crises and challenges—with the positive responses mostly occurring when the dominant powers wanted to see action and the negative responses occurring when they did not. The UN's own capacity to follow through is independently important but generally not as important as the wishes and support of the major powers. Moreover, the UN's record in matters of economic and social development, including actions in support of health and disease control, has generally been much more positive than in political and military areas. This tendency is likely to persist with respect to the issues involved in human security.

What about decision-making? Human security does not imply centralized decision-making—or taking all issues to the Security Council. This is a plus. Decision-making outside the Security Council and the General Assembly is often better and less contentious. Decisions by regional bodies can sometimes assuage fears of global intervention. Decisions in the World Health Organization, UNDP, the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), the UN Population Fund or the World Food Programme have generally been more technical and less politicized than in the Security Council or the General Assembly. There is no reason to think that recognizing issues as part of an agenda for strengthening human security should change these traditions. In fact, they might be enhanced.

## THE 'SECURITIZATION' DEBATE

Securitization is a process that overrides autonomous traditions of research and analysis in non-security fields, and distorts conceptualization to meet a security agenda. It is argued that those who advocate in favour of the process of securitization have a specific agenda—to marginalize the concepts, ethos and theories of development and participatory governance. In reality, the process of securitization does not diminish the powers and subvert the processes of development; it instead forces the analysis of security into more dynamic considerations in order to respond to a changing world order. As a result, securitization should be seen as a process to begin engagement, debate and analysis, rather than a 'turf war' over concepts. The processes of securitization have the capacity to galvanize radical thinking within a very traditional theoretical community, and should be seen as an opportunity, not a threat.

## THE RISK OF DISTORTIONS

Although human security strives to eliminate barriers to the attainment of secure living environments, the concept—with its broad and malleable nature—can be distorted to suit agendas that may not be conducive to normative conceptualizations of security. The possibility of distortion lies in the fact that there is no one specific definition of human security. No one set of criteria has a monopoly on the definition of human security, and this leaves room for the distortion of human security to serve dubious purposes. This is particularly problematic in international relations in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks in New York and Washington, DC. Those very considerations that were aimed at ensuring human security began to infiltrate the language of state-based security efforts. The ethos of human security has been focused on engaging with the many factors of insecurity and diminishing their negative impacts on people. The cumulative gains attained through this approach have resulted in an overall improvement in the condition of human security. In the post-9/11 security environment, this concept has effectively been turned on its head. The need to ensure security is now driving the policy initiatives in engaging with factors of insecurity, thereby changing the calculus fundamentally. Whereas the goal of human security has been the empowerment of people and communities, the same cannot be said for initiatives undertaken in the name of human security in the post-9/11 world.

The war on terror led by the United States, United Kingdom and the 'coalition of the willing' countries is probably the clearest example. The war on terror seeks to address the problem of terrorism by using the right to human security of threatened populations as the necessary rationale for attacking the enemy. Often, given the very nature of terrorism, the enemy is not easily identifiable. As a result, large cross-sections of populations come under threat—as has

been the case in Afghanistan and Iraq. The number of civilian casualties in both countries has largely been a direct result of coalition forces retaliating against terrorist attacks. Countless innocent children, women and men have lost their lives in the war on terror—an unmitigated disaster in terms of its ethos.

The United States Department of Homeland Security also poses a significant challenge to proponents of human security. The Department's work is based on the "... capability to anticipate, pre-empt and deter threats to the homeland whenever possible, and the ability to respond quickly when such threats do materialize."<sup>54</sup> In this instance, the concept of human security is being mobilized to protect the security of US citizens and to promote the idea that this can only be achieved by directly projecting a military threat to others—using the logic of action based on pre-emption. The continuing consequences of the Iraq war have already shown the extreme limits, if not basic contradictions, of this approach.

When the human security of people in other countries is largely ignored, this approach to human security must be judged as seriously imbalanced and far from the basic concept of human security. Human security properly conceived is not a zero-sum calculation—the attainment of security by one party need not come at the expense of the security of another party. The notion of 'homeland security' coopts the concept of human security to suit the purposes of the American population, while ostensibly diminishing the security prospects of non-American populations.

The UK Department for International Development's report entitled *Fighting Poverty to Build a Safer World* also illustrates this distortion. Poverty has always been seen as one of the most debilitating conditions obstructing the enjoyment of human security. A pure human security approach would aim to give people agency over their economic conditions, thereby enabling them to mitigate the impacts of economic insecurity in their lives.

According to this report, it is in the interest of governments to ensure that the impacts of poverty are mitigated, because failing to do so would ultimately destabilize the world. Much of the focus, however, is not on enhancing the agency of the vulnerable to determine their participation in the global economy on their own terms, but rather on ensuring that their basic needs are met so the vulnerable do not feel disenfranchised and opt for violent expressions of their discontent.

The report put forth by Canada's Independent International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, which debates the responsibility to protect, is another example where concepts of human security have been selectively applied to suit another agenda. While the authors state, "We have no difficulty in principle with focused military action being taken against international ter-

rorists and those who harbour them," they qualify this by noting that "military power should always be exercised in a principled way, and the principles of right intention, last resort, proportional means and reasonable prospects outlined in our report are, on the face of it, all applicable to such action."<sup>55</sup> The US's actions in its war on terror clearly rely on the first part of this principle of intervention, but as has been seen by the ferocity of the offensives in Afghanistan and Iraq, the proportion of force—never mind the justification and principles of right intention—has been overwhelming in comparison with other considerations, such as development.

### IDENTIFYING MISUSE OF THE CONCEPT: TESTS OF DISTORTION

How can one avoid the reframing of human security on occasion to suit the interests of dominant states, institutional agendas and civil society? The merits of human security as a framework for analysis and a generator of benchmarks are clearly evident—but there must be criteria to prevent misuse. Great caution needs to be exercised in the utilization of this concept, particularly as the last examples have shown. The original rationale behind human security has been that of human development—to empower individuals and communities to exercise agency over their own choices. This ability to empower, however, has also proven to be easily corruptible, particularly in the hands of those who already possess the power to dictate global politics. It is therefore necessary to ensure that a comprehensive system of checks and balances is built into the analysis of human security to avoid distortions. The three main criteria can broadly be elaborated as follows.

The first criterion for testing against distortions checks to see if policies and initiatives strengthen people's capacities and abilities to make choices. If this is not the case, then such policies require much closer analysis.

Second, while human security enables the consideration of multiple threats, distortions can arise through 'securitizing' threats that do not apply to the target population. This may include making overwhelming military force the main mechanism for achieving human security—an approach unlikely to fall within the norms of a human development approach. In the case of the United States, the United Kingdom and some other Western countries at present, "the war on terror's constructions of threats and fear serve to individualize fear and atomize people based on the promise of a security that never materializes."<sup>56</sup>

Finally, distortions can appear in the end results of policies and initiatives. Questions would arise, for example, about an approach that strengthens human security measures in one country only to weaken the conditions of human security in another.

## THE CHANGING LANDSCAPE OF ACADEMIC AND POLICY DEBATES

As the discussion so far has illustrated, the human security approach presents policy makers and academics with a further opportunity to improve fundamentally the living conditions of many of the world's most vulnerable people. For the very reason that a human security framework presents a significant departure from previous approaches to the analysis of security, major gains could be realized through policy level changes. A key advantage of this new approach is that human security holds the potential to improve people's lives across a number of areas simultaneously. The methodology makes it possible to achieve multiple objectives through holistic engagement of one policy area. As a consequence, in recognizing that the perception of insecurity is necessarily a result of a number of socio-political/economic causal factors, this framework strives to realize qualitative and quantitative change across a number of interrelated factors. This is further reinforced by the concept's deep-rooted ideals of positive human rights and universal human development.

The value-added of this process is the degree of positive improvements and/or gains in many impacts. State-centric approaches occasionally reduce security to zero-sum calculations, whereby gains by one actor are possible only through losses by another actor. In these situations, a human security approach allows for a positive-sum game in which all actors can realize greater security. In effect, by changing the focus of its security calculus to individuals, states themselves have the potential to become more secure. It is these features that have increasingly given currency to the human security approach in academic and policy analysis.

The methodology of the human security approach has already been put to effective use in a number of policy settings. For instance, in a survey conducted in 2002/2003, Latvians identified economic/income uncertainty and access to health care as the two most pressing threats to their security. Policy conclusions contained in Latvia's 2003 NHDR on human security elaborate on a multi-stakeholder employment strategy consisting of both formal sector employment initiatives and a comprehensive government-led social security network.<sup>57</sup> Not only does such an approach substantively address the perception of income insecurity, it also reduces the fear of access to adequate health care at the same time.

Lesotho's 1998 NHDR also sheds light on cross-cutting issues when developing its policy recommendations. The report identifies issues such as democratic institutions and practices, government reform and decentralization, anti-corruption measures, women's empowerment and the rejuvenation of civil society. Based on these issues, the report provides a number of policy recommendations, including a framework on improving governance and empowerment by undertaking a comprehensive decentralization programme,

strengthening legal statutes on corruption, implementing an integrated environmental protection strategy and reallocating funds for social services expenditure.<sup>58</sup> The report notes that "these measures must be implemented in a holistic manner, as they are all related and complementary."<sup>59</sup>

These two examples illustrate the policy potential that the human security framework has to address substantively perceptions of fear and vulnerability. Individual perceptions of fear and vulnerability have presented significant challenges to policy makers. One of the main reasons for this impasse is the inability of most traditions of security analysis to differentiate between state concerns and individual perceptions, or between real as opposed to perceived threats, and to contextualize such analysis. International agendas often do not coincide with local perceptions of fear and insecurity, focussing instead on the interests of dominant states and institutional agendas. In total contrast, a human security agenda derives its policy concerns from individual concerns, and mobilizes the state apparatus to achieve these objectives. This has two significant consequences on the question of linking global debates to local concerns.

First, the human security approach exposes the inadequacy and misguided nature of domestic policies that have been largely guided by global trends. It brings out their lack of coherence with human perceptions of security needs at local levels. As the South Africa 2003 NHDR points out in its conclusion "...the government's share of national income needs to benefit the poor favourably in a number of ways: an improved social security system, expenditure on education, social infrastructure, land reform and the provision of social services, and the provision of a comprehensive response to HIV/AIDS."<sup>60</sup> As a result, the South African Government's decision to increase defence expenditure by five per cent to over US \$38 million is immediately called into question.<sup>61</sup> In this way, new thinking about security often leads to the conclusion that "territorial security is far less important, for example, than poverty and inequality; it is not consistent with present or conceivable future threats faced by the nation; and military expenditure hinders economic growth and thereby development."<sup>62</sup>

Second, human security allows for a more nuanced understanding of the impacts of globalization on particular national agendas. As the Latvian 2003 NHDR has shown, despite an increase in focus on terrorism among the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States, Latvian citizens continue to remain more concerned about internal social security policies than about strategies to combat terrorism in the region.<sup>63</sup> Government policy has not reflected this perception, choosing instead to focus on international political considerations in the formulation of national security policy.

This move to identify linkages between the global and local is finding a voice in the increasingly sympathetic landscape of academic and policy circles. The vigorous academic debate also demonstrates the potential of the human secu-

rity framework to challenge established traditions in theoretical security studies. The multitude of recent UN reports on the need to incorporate human security and development considerations at the global and local levels bear testament to this changing focus. The Secretary-General's report *In Larger Freedom* demonstrates this emphatically and incorporates

concerns arising in both global debates and local perceptions. The increasing number of governments incorporating human security into their foreign and international development policies adds further currency to the efficacy of the approach.

Human security is an idea whose time has come.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Charter of the United Nations [www.un.org/aboutun/charter/preamble.htm].
- <sup>2</sup> Walker 1997, pp. 61-81.
- <sup>3</sup> Burchill 2001, p. 85.
- <sup>4</sup> Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons 1968.
- <sup>5</sup> Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems 1972.
- <sup>6</sup> Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction, 1972.
- <sup>7</sup> Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction, 1993.
- <sup>8</sup> Krause and Williams 1997, pp. 43-44.
- <sup>9</sup> For a fuller summary, see Richard Jolly et al. 2004, pp. 239-244.
- <sup>10</sup> Boutros-Ghali 1992.
- <sup>11</sup> Buzan et al. 1998, pp. 22-23; Kaldor 2001, p. 9.
- <sup>12</sup> The late Dr. Mahbub ul Haq was the creator of the widely acclaimed Human Development Report first issued in 1990. See also ul Haq 1995.
- <sup>13</sup> See Amartya Sen 1999.
- <sup>14</sup> NorthSouth Roundtable 1990. The high-level participation in the Roundtable may account for some of the positive reception accorded to the analysis of human security presented in the 1994 global HDR four years later. The meeting in Costa Rica included Oscar Arias, then President of Costa Rica; Robert McNamara; President Obasanjo of Nigeria; Jim Grant, Executive Director of UNICEF; Maurice Strong, later Secretary-General of the Rio Conference on Environment and Development; Inga Thorsson, Minister of Disarmament in Sweden; and Brian Urquhart, former Under-Secretary-General responsible for Special Political Affairs. Richard Jolly chaired the conference. There were a number of high-level specialists like Mary Kaldor, Julian Robinson, Herbert Wulf, Anthony Sampson and Kennedy Graham.
- <sup>15</sup> UNDP 1994, p. 22.
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 23.
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid., pp. 23-25.
- <sup>18</sup> See Government of Canada, Human Security Programme.
- <sup>19</sup> The Ministry of Foreign Affairs for Japan 2004.
- <sup>20</sup> The state should be defined and understood herein as the collection of those elites, structures, mechanisms and institutions necessary to make a country function effectively.
- <sup>21</sup> Refer to The Commission on Human Security 2003, pp. 14-19 to review core issues of human security as outlined by the report authors.
- <sup>22</sup> Raven-Roberts 2001.
- <sup>23</sup> Hoogensen and Rottem 2004, p. 167; see also Tickner 1992; Sylvester 1994; and Peterson and Runyan 1999.
- <sup>24</sup> Raven-Roberts 2001.
- <sup>25</sup> United Nations 2002.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid., pg. ix.
- <sup>27</sup> United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, General Assembly Resolution 217A (III), U.N. Doc A/810 at 71 (1948) [www.udhr.org].
- <sup>28</sup> Ibid., Article 3.
- <sup>29</sup> Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, 1998.
- <sup>30</sup> See Richard Jolly et al. 2004, p. 239-244.
- <sup>31</sup> The Commission on Global Governance 1995.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>34</sup> The Panel on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations 2000.
- <sup>35</sup> See Evans n.d.
- <sup>36</sup> The Independent International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty 2001.
- <sup>37</sup> Ibid., p. viii.
- <sup>38</sup> The Commission on Human Security 2003.
- <sup>39</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>40</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>41</sup> The UN Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change 2004.
- <sup>42</sup> Ibid., p. 2 (executive summary).
- <sup>43</sup> Annan 2005.
- <sup>44</sup> Ibid., p. 5.
- <sup>45</sup> See for instance MacFarlane and Foong-Khong 2006, Ayoob 1997, Paris 2001 and Foong Khong 2001.
- <sup>46</sup> See Ayoob 1997.
- <sup>47</sup> Paris 2001.
- <sup>48</sup> Ayoob 1997, Paris 2001, Deudney 1991, and Owens and Arneil 1999.
- <sup>49</sup> See Knudsen 2001.
- <sup>50</sup> The UN Secretary-General's High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change 2004, p. 14.
- <sup>51</sup> Ibid., p. 3.
- <sup>52</sup> Ibid., p. viii.
- <sup>53</sup> UNDP 1994, p. 59.
- <sup>54</sup> US Department of Homeland Security.
- <sup>55</sup> The Independent International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty 2001, p. ix.
- <sup>56</sup> Stabile and Rentschler 2005, p. xx.
- <sup>57</sup> UNDP 2003a, pp. 120-121.
- <sup>58</sup> UNDP 1998b, pp. 40-52.
- <sup>59</sup> Ibid., p. 40.
- <sup>60</sup> UNDP 2003b, p. 209.
- <sup>61</sup> Government of South Africa, Department of Defence 2005, p. 40.
- <sup>62</sup> Harris 2002.
- <sup>63</sup> UNDP 2003a, p. 120.

## Human Security—National Perspectives

### OVERVIEW OF HOW THE NHDRS HAVE DEALT WITH HUMAN SECURITY

Since the 1994 global *Human Development Report* launched the concept of human security, some 42 NHDRs have dealt directly or indirectly with human security. There are more than 500 other NHDRs that have been prepared since 1990, some of which have touched on elements of human security. Other UNDP reports on governance have also dealt with human security issues, without being an NHDR or a report on human security as such.

The 2002 UNDP report *Human Security in Bangladesh: In Search of Justice and Dignity*,<sup>1</sup> falls into this category. It is not formally a NHDR, nor does it deal comprehensively with human security. But it contains interesting material on the legal framework for achieving human security and on policies for improving human security to strengthen national governance, including measures to promote better awareness of human rights, to improve the role of the police in investigating human rights violations and to improve the court system (both the formal national system, and the informal and village court systems). The Bangladesh report, like many others, also has a chapter dealing with violence and repression against women and children.

Our project has made a systematic review of 13 NHDRs dealing explicitly with human security. These include countries still in the midst of serious conflict, like Afghanistan, four recovering from civil war (Timor-Leste, Mozambique, Sierra Leone and the Solomon Islands) and several countries that have been through a decade or more of transition from socialist to capitalist systems (Bulgaria, Estonia, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Macedonia and Moldova). Lesotho and the Philippines are also included.

These countries are listed in the table in the annex of this study. Each report has been analysed in terms of the clarity given to the concepts and components of human security and human development, listed under Section 1 of the table. Section 2 deals with the dimensions of human security and human development in each report. Section 3 assesses the adequacy of the report's analysis and presentation of projections for the future, and Section 4 attempts an overall assessment of the report's quality and originality.

What emerges from this analysis? It is clear that the reports are of variable quality and originality. The report on Afghanistan stands out as a brilliant document, wide ranging in its analysis, clear in its use of the terms and concepts of both human security and human development, subtle and sensitive in its writing, with a clear sense of context and his-

tory. As a document, it is by far the best we have analysed—though its relevance for and impact on current policy in the difficult situation of Afghanistan today is a separate matter with which we will deal later. Second to Afghanistan is the report on Latvia, which is also interesting and conceptually more original, though narrower and more limited in range and coverage of the human security situation than the report on Afghanistan. The Latvian report introduces the concept of 'securitability'—"the ability of individuals to avoid insecure situations and to retain a sense of security when such situations do occur, as well as the ability to re-establish one's security and sense of security when these have been compromised."<sup>2</sup> Securitability—albeit a cumbersome word—is thus a recognition that security involves two interconnected dimensions: an *objective* state of security and a *subjective* sense of security. The report points out that in English, the term human security describes these two dimensions simultaneously, while in Latvian, security (*drosiba*) and a sense of security (*drosums* or *drosibas sajuta*) are two different words and distinct concepts.<sup>3</sup>

The other reports are more like the proverbial curate's egg—good in parts.

Sometimes the parts are really good, sometimes they are partial in their focus. Often there is room to strengthen human security analysis. Nonetheless, it is only fair to mention and important to stress that a report on human security that may be more limited by comparison with some human security reports of other countries may, all the same, have made or be making an important contribution to the understanding of human security in the country it deals with. Human security is still a new concept in many countries, only partially understood and often not much appreciated. Because of this, a report emphasizing the basic issues, even with little originality, may in fact be making a major contribution. In this sense, almost all of the NHDRs on human security should be welcomed and praised for making a pioneering contribution in their country.

### INDIVIDUAL REPORTS: BRIEF SUMMARIES AND HIGHLIGHTS

Below are summaries of the 13 NHDRs, listed in order of originality and quality as emerges from our assessment.

#### Afghanistan 2004

The Afghanistan report<sup>4</sup> builds a comprehensive analysis of the current state of affairs in the country through a detailed

human security perspective. The report argues that “because human security is a public good that belongs to all and cannot be exclusive, it entails a responsibility for the state to provide guarantees that people will not fall below an acceptable threshold, but also a corresponding duty among people to remain engaged.”<sup>5</sup> The report builds a very strong historical narrative, upon which the current needs of state-building are framed. It is a brilliant example of human security’s multidimensional analysis, with particular reference to post-conflict reconstruction. The report considers an extended list of insecurities and vulnerabilities, including a strong focus on minorities and the special case of women and children. The report concludes with a very comprehensive and impressive list of policy initiatives and recommendations.

### **Latvia 2003**

The original feature of the Latvia report<sup>6</sup> is its development of the concept of ‘securitability’—the aggregation of subjective and objective factors that impact a person’s sense of security. Through this framework, the report assesses the status of human security in Latvia, using the ratings of different levels of insecurity experienced by individuals, based on questionnaire findings from a sample survey of 1,000 adults. Strong analysis of a complex set of factors that affect human security is present throughout this report, and particular focus is given to economic, political, personal, food and health security issues. The report contains a particularly well-analysed section on vulnerable groups in the country, including women, children and low-income groups. A comprehensive list of ‘suggestions’ rounds out the analysis of this report, again focussed on improving the securitability of the Latvian people. It is argued that by utilizing this approach, individuals will have a greater chance to exercise agency over choices and opportunities.

### **Macedonia 2001**

Human insecurity and social exclusion are the themes of this NHDR.<sup>7</sup> The report engages with three clusters of insecurities, namely economic factors, including transition to a market economy; interpersonal and social and community relations; and political and institutional factors such as governance. In particular, the analysis of personal security, and the connections drawn between health and environmental security are very strong. The findings of the report suggest that the strongest source of insecurity among Macedonians is unemployment followed by low incomes from work. Others express fears of crime, impeded access to health care and education, and political exclusion. The report concludes that a comprehensive engagement with the practice of sustainable development could address acute insecurities felt by the population.

### **Philippines 2005**

The Philippine NHDR<sup>8</sup> of 2005 concentrates on the human insecurities arising from two armed conflicts: one arising from the “marginalization and minoritization of the Moros, an Islamized ethno-linguistic group, who are engaged in a conscious struggle to regain sovereignty over what they see as their own independent nation states; and another involving a communist struggle going back to the 1960s, which draws inspiration from the Cultural Revolution in China and seeks the replacement of the current regime with an “alternative of a national democratic society with a socialist perspective.”<sup>9</sup> The report analyses each conflict in depth, noting that the struggles have affected 91 per cent of all provinces in the Philippines over the period from 1986 to 2004. The report analyses the causes and costs within a human security perspective, and asks why the Government and counter-insurgency policies have fallen short. The report suggests how current peace efforts can be recast and reinforced, noting that measures of human deprivation, especially the lack of education, predict the occurrence of armed encounters. Low rates of land reform also serve as a predictor of the frequency of armed conflict. Policy inconsistency within and across the administration has characterized the Government’s counter-insurgency strategy, an inconsistency sustained by the public’s superficial involvement and lack of information.<sup>10</sup>

### **Estonia 1997**

The analysis in the Estonian NHDR<sup>11</sup> tackles the issue of social exclusion as a result of transition. The report notes, “Social cohesion is a constant feature in all disputes over the development of society. In order to achieve sustainable development, members of society must be connected in a way which enables them to grow, learn, work, relate and participate in the running of the affairs of society.”<sup>12</sup> Exclusion from these processes will create insecurities, and these insecurities are carefully and methodically analysed throughout the report. As such, the report focuses on labour and the labour market, the economic conditions and prospects for growth, poverty and social deprivation, crime and law enforcement. The report concludes with an assessment of four possible scenarios by 2010, all of which take into account a specific set of policy reforms in a given sector.

### **Sierra Leone 1998**

The Sierra Leone NHDR<sup>13</sup> on the theme of human security offers a broad overview of the human development conditions in the country. The report notes that “the contributing factors to the country’s long-term economic and social decline have been poor governance, the nation’s failure to harness its rich natural resources and considerable growth potential for broad-based development, and the devastating

civil conflict.”<sup>14</sup> The report engages with each of the seven main components of UNDP’s human security definition. This report’s strength, however, is in the range and diversity of its policy recommendations and proposals. The policy areas covered are diverse, and once more show the utility of human security’s interconnected framework in identifying and developing holistic approaches to sustainable economic, community, political and livelihood development.

**Moldova 1999**

The NHDR of Moldova<sup>15</sup> focuses on human security and the impacts of transition. The analysis of economic factors of insecurity in this report is very strong and aptly illustrates the many sources of insecurity for the population. The strength of a human security approach is also evident in this report. The report notes that “in order to assess human security in a transition country it is important to use indices that characterize economic security as a whole together with the indices typically used for monitoring human development processes.”<sup>16</sup> Strong economic analysis is conducted throughout this report, which also includes detailed analyses of vulnerable groups such as children, ethnic minorities, women and older persons. The report outlines comprehensive policy recommendations for health, education, food security and economic sustainability.

**Timor-Leste 2002**

The Timor-Leste report<sup>17</sup> highlights policy initiatives that could best promote a human development agenda. In contrast to most of the others, this report sets out right from the start what a strategy to promote human rights, human security and human development ought to include. This is followed by detailed analysis and projections in the key areas of public sector reform, empowering civil society, strengthening the education base, and developing an economic growth strategy premised on human development. The report goes on to note, however, that the “final test of all these decisions, whether on agriculture, or industry, or tourism, or the oil industry is whether or not they bring real benefits to poor families. This underlines the importance of investing in people—ensuring that they have the health, knowledge and capacity to take full advantage of these new opportunities.”<sup>18</sup>

**Mozambique 1998**

“Clearly there is an intimate relation of dependence between human security and human development. Absence of the former calls into question the ability to implement the latter, since it is virtually impossible for people to expand and realize choices in an environment of war, want, crime, rape, political repression, the absence of free expression and fear. For this reason, progress in human security is decisive

for achieving human development.”<sup>19</sup> The Mozambique report focuses its analysis on defining the linkages between freedom from fear and freedom from want. The report presents a strong and thorough analysis, and concentrates on identifying economic policies aimed at generating sustained human development. The report is further strengthened by a comprehensive historical analysis that feeds into developing priorities for policy initiatives to realize future peace and security in the country.

**Lesotho 1998**

The Lesotho report<sup>20</sup> builds its analysis through the human security perspective, using the framework of the 1994 global HDR. The analysis is contextualized in each of the seven areas of human security, with particularly strong engagement on food security, environmental security and health security. “The analysis takes account of the fact that individuals’ understanding and regard for security depends very much on their immediate circumstances. The main findings of the Report suggest that many areas of human security remain problematic, though it is noted that for (Lesotho’s) size, geographical location, endowment of resources and level of development, notable progress has been made in some instances.”<sup>21</sup> The report dedicates an entire chapter to policy recommendations, with a special focus on governance, environmental policy, and economic and health expenditure.

**Kyrgyzstan 2000**

The Kyrgyzstan NHDR<sup>22</sup> well illustrates the contextualizing capacity of the human security framework. Following on results of focus groups and interviews, the report builds a careful and detailed analysis of poverty, health, education and governance. As a result of the need to take into consideration numerous factors associated with human security, and the unpredictability of current political and economic processes, the report introduces the concept of ‘preventative development’. This is used throughout as a benchmarking tool for policy recommendations. The report concludes that although the initial euphoria of independence has worn off, and the burden of transition has been fully grasped, preventative development will result not only in positive changes, but will also serve to stimulate more rapid and progressive transformations.

**Bulgaria 1998**

The Bulgarian NHDR<sup>23</sup> was deeply influenced by political transformations occurring since 1996. As such, the report focuses on ways in which political processes and events affect human development, and the types of socio-economic policies that can contribute to sustainable human development. So drastic was the change that the report notes, “Last year, however, was not only a year of transition from sur-



vival to development but also a year of rediscovering the state.”<sup>24</sup> Revitalizing state institutions and processes is the main focus of this report, with a human security framework applied to analysis of priorities in governance, civil society, economic interventions, security sector reform, and regional and international engagement with the European Union. The report incorporates strong analysis of vulnerable groups and insecurities, and puts forth compelling recommendations.

### **Solomon Islands 2002**

The Solomon Islands NHDR,<sup>25</sup> entitled *Building a Nation*, focuses on human development challenges that have recently emerged. The report “attempts to project the concept of development beyond the means—which is economic growth—to the ultimate end—which is ensuring and safeguarding the quality of human life.”<sup>26</sup> The report identifies the specific insecurities that prevent the universal enjoyment of human development. These include poverty—affecting access to food, education and employment—as well as unstable and corrupt governance, inadequate education and demographic problems. The report focuses attention to the health sector as well, and identifies growing challenges such as malaria, tuberculosis and maternal health. The report makes a lengthy set of recommendations based on the principles of human development.

## **ASSESSMENT AND DEPTH OF ANALYSIS IN NHDRS**

### **Conceptual issues**

We have mapped out the scale and breadth of each report in the table in the annex. This table is a useful guide in illustrating the various themes and areas of analysis in each report. Based on this table, nearly all of the reports have conducted a comprehensive review of multiple cross-cutting factors, and have consistently applied a clear definition of human security. The Afghanistan and Latvia reports provide the most in-depth analysis of cross-cutting factors that affect security. Even though the Macedonia report does not cover all seven elements of the UNDP definition, the analysis in the report is comprehensive and stands out as a result. The Moldova, Mozambique, Lesotho and Kyrgyzstan reports are also very clear about the definitions of human security.

### **Dimensions of human security and human development**

The seven areas of human security defined in the 1994 global HDR are considered in most of the reports. Although this ensures a broad perspective, the approach, analysis and conclusions seem to produce little that is strikingly new. Whether tackling issues of economic analysis and policy,

health or the environment, what emerges is fairly predictable for anyone familiar with human development methodology. The analysis may well have served a valuable purpose within each country, both in raising awareness and in providing specific analysis of the components of a human security approach. But from the point of view of learning new lessons at the international level, and apart from the issues noted below in the section on original elements, national analyses of the seven components of human security do not seem to have contributed much that is new. The analysis of additional elements—such as education in the Solomon Islands, the components of securitability in Latvia and legal capacity in Bangladesh—leads to a far more intriguing narrative on the conditions of insecurity experienced by people.

### **Statistics, surveys and details of analysis**

For three of the reports, special statistical surveys were undertaken to obtain first-hand information about how people perceive the threats to their security and about their own experience of insecurities in their lives or communities. This information forms an original and important part of the reports of Afghanistan, Latvia and Macedonia. Most of the reports show no evidence of any special surveys undertaken—for instance, the reports of Mozambique, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste—although the Kyrgyzstan report did apparently collect information from focus groups and the Estonian report drew on a market research survey for information on the population’s feeling of insecurity from criminal assaults and a deteriorating economic situation.

One important issue in some of the surveys is shown by the differences between the surveys of Latvia and Macedonia. The Macedonia survey asked respondents which category of threat made them feel most insecure. This led to a ranking with “unemployment” or “low income despite being employed” at the top of the list, identified as such by nearly three-quarters of all respondents. Unfortunately, however, the Macedonian survey did not seem to ask about second, third or other causes of insecurity.

In contrast, the survey used in the Latvian report asked respondents about their perception of more than 30 specific threats—such as the threat of becoming seriously ill, of not being able to pay for medical care in the case of illness, of not receiving a pension large enough to live on, of falling victim to serious crime, and of being physically abused at home. Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they felt concern about each of these threats, and then to rate the degree of concern—whether they were not at all afraid, mostly not afraid, slightly afraid or very afraid. This multidimensional approach has two important advantages over the still useful, but simpler and more limited version used in the survey for Macedonia. It makes possible some ranking of the different threats, and some analysis of the relative degrees of concern felt by respondents.

The results from the Latvian report provide a quite interesting and very useful ranking of the public perception of these threats. By far the most general causes of concern—for nearly four out of five people—related to the risks of serious illness and being unable to pay for or receive adequate treatment. Next came fears of having an insufficient pension or being unable to support oneself. Two-thirds or more of those surveyed had these concerns. The third category related to being involved in an accident, or of being the victim of aggressive or unsafe driving practices. Over three-quarters expressed such concerns, with women indicating an even higher degree of concern than men. The fourth category related to being attacked on the street or being subject to theft—just over 60 per cent of respondents noted fears about this issue, though falling victim to organized crime registered a slightly lower percentage.

Interesting differences also emerged with respect to threats felt by a smaller proportion of the population. Some seem a bit surprising—two out of five people feared being emotionally abused by civil servants or police officers; one in five feared conflict with relatives or others over property. Two out of five women and one out of five men feared sexual assault. Nearly a third of women felt concern at being emotionally abused at work, about double the proportion of men—but a higher proportion of both feared losing the understanding and support of colleagues. Being a victim of a terrorist attack was a concern for half the population. A quarter worried about losing their savings in a bank.

To us, this shows the value of such surveys, both to understand the dimensions of human insecurity and as a way of guiding actions to diminish them. Such survey information also helps to rate relative threats in a way that could be useful in assessing alternative public actions and trade-offs in the use of resources.

In addition to personal threats, the Latvian report assesses public perception of general threats. These include threats arising from the spread of narcotics, organized crime and HIV/AIDS, along with economic threats like rapid inflation, environmental damage from dumping hazardous waste, forest clearing and environmental pollution. All these categories caused concern for over 80 per cent of the population. Two-thirds of those surveyed feared food poisoning and excessive preservatives in food. Global warming was a concern for over half the population along with nuclear threats. Ethnic or armed conflict in Latvia and the partial loss of Latvian sovereignty was less significant—though still a concern felt by more than a third of the population.

### **Policy conclusions and projections for the future**

None of the reports we examined gives much attention to projections for the future. The Estonian report presents four scenarios, but these were drawn from a different exercise and serve as no more than general background for the

final section of the report. All the reports include recommendations for future policy and action, however—although in many respects, especially those regarding economic matters, the analysis and proposals differ little from proposals already well rehearsed in relation to issues of human development (as opposed to human security). As a recommendation for future NHDRs on human security, it would seem desirable and possible to give more attention to ways of diminishing human insecurities in addition to more general moves towards human development. In countries with a strong analytical team and appropriate data, it might also be possible to make some projections for future trends in some of the dimensions of human security or insecurity.

Probably the most critical issue relates to the analysis of trade-offs in relation to policy recommendations. Most of the reports fail to deal adequately with this. This is seriously unfortunate, since trade-offs between sectors and activities in the use of resources to achieve greater human security are among the most important features of the human security methodology. This should be a major point made in all future reports dealing with human security.

This said, the report on Latvia does at least present data that would make possible comparisons in ranking different insecurities as declared by citizens. In principle, if combined with some assessment of the costs of different lines of action, this would provide the information needed to make some assessments of the costs and benefits of different approaches.

The report of Timor-Leste also seems to deal with trade-offs. It presents a comprehensive analysis of short-term, medium-term and long-term policies aimed at improving the governance capacity, education and civil society sectors in the country. The analysis takes into consideration budgetary constraints, and emphasizes particular policies that could gather international assistance in addressing the financial costs. The Sierra Leone report takes this approach as well, although not in the same level of detail. It is worth noting that both these reports were prepared at a time when international engagement was high and donor agencies were very active. The fact that these two reports in particular were, in essence, blueprints for future policy initiatives is therefore not surprising in light of the post-conflict reconstruction agenda at play in both countries at the time.

### **SPECIAL FEATURES OF FOUR NHDRS**

As indicated above, many of the reports are competent and innovative within their national context, even when they do not add much that is new internationally. There are, however, some important exceptions, which are dealt with in the following section. These points of innovation include:

- ◆ the concept of ‘securitability’ in the report on Latvia;
- ◆ the broad policy proposals for tackling crime in Bangladesh;
- ◆ the analysis of insecurities in Macedonia and other countries in transition; and
- ◆ the broad-ranging analysis of human security and insecurities in Afghanistan.

Each of these is summarized below. The section on Afghanistan is deservedly long and comprehensive, since this report serves, in our view, as a model of the comprehensive analysis of human security at the country level.

### The Latvian concept of ‘securitability’

The Latvian NHDR introduces the highly original concept of ‘securitability’, which involves two interconnected dimensions of security: an objective state of security and a subjective sense of security. The report defines the first as the actual state of being free from threat, while the sense of security is defined as the inner state of feeling secure. A sense of security, the report argues, is the “cumulative effect of a set of subjective and objective factors.”<sup>27</sup>

The Latvian report deals with both types of security and insecurity. The report obtained information on the objective aspects of human security by statistical analysis of such issues as unemployment in the economy, crime, disease, etc. The sense of security and insecurity of people was investigated using questionnaires, interviews and tests, including a major survey of 1,000 respondents selected through a stratified random sample designed to reflect the make up of the adult population according to sex, age, education level, nationality, employment status, religious affiliation, type of inhabited area and region.<sup>28</sup> The survey was conducted in September 2002, at the height of a parliamentary election campaign and a month before the terrorist attack in Moscow when Chechen militants held 700 hostages in the Maria Theatre. The report notes that on the whole, individuals did not express concern about terrorism in the survey—but a subsequent poll of students undertaken after the attack listed “terrorism/war/strained political relations as the second most highly rated insecurity factor.”<sup>29</sup>

### Tackling crime in Bangladesh

Human insecurity arising from crime and the seriously inadequate national institutions of courts and policing to prevent or control it is the theme of UNDP’s *Bangladesh Human Security Report 2002*. The analysis deals with the legal framework for human security, awareness of rights and legal aid facilities among poor people, the role of the police, and the functioning of the court systems, including village and other informal courts. Particular attention is given to violence and repression against women and children.

Although the Bangladesh report is not an NHDR, what makes it noteworthy is that it contrasts the views and assessments of different groups as to the adequacy and performance of the different institutions involved in strengthening—or weakening—the human security of poorer people. Thus, four out of five victims were reluctant to seek legal remedies because they feared bad treatment or harassment by the police, or that they would be accused of illegally trying to influence the police. More than two out of three feared that a trial would not be completed or that they would have to pay lawyers’ fees. Other causes of victim reluctance to seek redress were the belief that the victim would need to contact an influential person in order even to contact the police. Scarce wonder that two out of every five victims lacked confidence in the court system.<sup>30</sup>

The report also surveyed the police and asked why they thought the public had so little confidence in them. There was a high level of self-criticism—delays in investigation, lack of accountability, political interference from outside, corrupt practices and complex procedures. Though the police tended to stress lack of equipment, staff and transport in explaining why serious delays occurred, many also mentioned lack of morale, ineffective inspections and training, and lack of staff.<sup>31</sup> In contrast, members of the public were far more critical—pointing to harassment by the police, the frequency with which they had to pay bribes and the possibility of torture when in police custody. No less than 96 per cent of the general public perceived most police officers to be corrupt.<sup>32</sup>

The report presents the views of many others involved in prosecution and punishment of human security violations—complainants, witnesses, the accused, magistrates and judges, bench clerks, public prosecutors, lawyers and members of the general public. This broadens very considerably the range of causes of the problems of the judicial system. The report argues that the country’s system of justice was in many respects anti-poor—“most people in Bangladesh are simply priced out of the judicial system” by the enormous costs of going to court, the delays and the lack of legal aid facilities. The vulnerability of witnesses is also a problem, with witnesses often having to pay transport costs and being subject to police pressure to distort the facts.<sup>33</sup>

In Bangladesh as in other developing countries, there is a traditional system of informal and village courts, which handle some two-thirds of disputes without their ever entering a formal court. Given that settlement of disputes in the formal courts is both time consuming and expensive, the informal courts provide a welcome alternative, especially for small disputes cases affecting the poor and women. Though a third of officials involved in the formal court system thought that the powers of the informal courts were inadequate, only four per cent of citizens shared this view. However, two-thirds of the officials thought that the verdicts

of the informal courts were adhered to, while only a quarter of citizens held this view.

Gender violence, not surprisingly, is a major issue and the report analyses the legal framework and practices relating to victims of rape and sexual violence.<sup>34</sup> Cases of violence include physical torture and murder, dowry-related violence and acid throwing, and trafficking and the illegal trade in women and children. Despite the existence of constitutional guarantees, such forms of violence as well as harassment and degradation continue. Many difficulties arise in law enforcement. Involving the police often adds to the difficulties and oppression—with women and girls often held in ‘safe custody’ against their will, where they may in fact be subjected to further attacks and even rape.<sup>35</sup>

Although the causes and conclusions for policies to tackle crime will differ from country to country, there are often commonalities, some of which the Bangladesh report brings out.

- ◆ The poor experience a range of human insecurities, and criminal justice systems suffer from inadequacies and anti-poor biases.
- ◆ Poor people lack awareness of laws and their rights—and education systems and the media inadequately promote better understanding of the opportunities for recourse. Accordingly, issues of rights and human security need to be brought into the school curriculum as well as being promoted by the media and community institutions.
- ◆ The police force has mixed roles, on the one hand as the institution responsible for controlling crime, and on the other hand as a frequent source of corruption and oppression, often linked to inadequacies in pay and incentives for constables and senior management.
- ◆ Violence against women and children is widespread. There needs to be serious commitment at international, national and community levels to change deep-rooted perceptions, attitudes, laws, institutions and practices to diminish and in time to end it.
- ◆ Poor people have greater trust in informal mechanisms for resolving disputes.
- ◆ The ‘implementation gap’ between the many commitments and measures intended to reduce human insecurities, the efforts made and the results achieved needs to be addressed.

### **Insecurity in Macedonia and other transition countries**

The transition from socialist to capitalist systems in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union was a cause of much human insecurity in many of the countries concerned. A number of NHDRs have dealt with this issue. The 2001

NHDR of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia provides an example.<sup>36</sup> The scene is well captured in an opening paragraph:

“Over the ten year period since 1991, the country has been passing through, and continues to undergo, a painful and deep transition to a market economy that has led to a massive rise in unemployment, a sharp fall in family incomes, diminution in official support services, and a rise in general poverty levels—widely based and extremely troubling for a large proportion of the population. Along with this has been, not unexpectedly, a marked increase in the real and perceived levels of fear and stress on the individual and families.”<sup>37</sup>

The economic setbacks were indeed serious. From 1991 to 1995, GDP fell to under 60 per cent of its 1990 level, and after 1996 rose by only two per cent per year. Unemployment in the late 1990s had risen to almost one-third of the labour force, increasing the number of poor in the population and widening social gaps. An estimated 40 to 50 per cent of the population was below the poverty line.<sup>38</sup>

The Macedonia report draws heavily on an opinion poll that ranked the various insecurities according to how people themselves judged their importance. Some 57 per cent of the population polled rated unemployment as their biggest cause of insecurity, with low incomes their second biggest. All other causes of insecurity were accordingly much less—whether poor social assistance (six per cent), ethnic tensions (five per cent) or threats from neighbouring countries or from the international community, from crime, from environmental pollution or other causes. Respondents were asked only what makes them feel most insecure—ruling out more than one cause and making it impossible for individuals to consider or rank different causes, which surely is the common experience of most people. This limitation of the survey makes it more difficult to use the data to consider how people might rank trade-offs in actions to prevent or diminish different causes of insecurity.<sup>39</sup>

At the same time, the report contains interesting data on the health consequences of the transition, showing, for example, how the incidence of cardiovascular diseases rose over the early phase, and how low incomes and unemployment have added to malnutrition. Notwithstanding these difficulties, it is noteworthy that infant mortality rates continued to decline during the 1990s.<sup>40</sup>

Some other unusual elements in the Macedonia report might be mentioned. Insecurity and personal safety was a focus of the survey, which reveals the interesting finding that higher rates of insecurity were felt and more victimization experienced in urban areas by richer groups of the population than by poorer ones.<sup>41</sup> Insecurity also resulted from unsettled ethnic relations—especially experienced within the Romany population, which forms just over two per cent of an overall population of nearly two million. The survey revealed that four out of five members of the Romany pop-

ulation could not afford to buy sufficient food and nearly two-thirds felt insecurity because of their economic position. Not surprisingly, some 40 per cent of the Romany respondents felt they received fewer services from the state than they needed, over double the proportion of the Macedonian population. Nearly three out of five members of the Romany population had been asked for bribes by officials—compared to well under one in five members of the Macedonian population.<sup>42</sup>

The Macedonian report identifies several priorities for actions to reduce the various insecurities. High on the list is a new approach to socio-economic policies of adjustment to give much more attention to the priorities of employment and sustainable growth, and much less to the economic orthodoxies of low inflation, free trade and fixed exchange rates.<sup>43</sup> As the report comments, the outcomes of the process of transition show that ‘the new’ social and economic system, in addition to being very inelastic with respect to the social security of the population, shows exceedingly bad results with respect to economic efficiency. Real growth rates of GDP even after they turned positive after 1996 still were below population growth rates (at least until 1999). A high proportion of young people under 30 have never been employed.<sup>44</sup>

## **AFGHANISTAN—A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF HUMAN INSECURITIES**

### **Overview**

The Afghanistan NHDR<sup>45</sup> is undoubtedly the best example of the 13 or so reports we have analysed. The report is careful and accurate in defining the concepts of human development and human security, and in applying these concepts throughout the analysis and in the conclusions. The structure of the report is also comprehensive, moving from a clear opening statement of the concepts to an assessment of the state of human underdevelopment and people’s insecurities in Afghanistan. Following this is the core of the report in three chapters on special themes: a threat-based analysis of people’s wants and fears, an analysis of the causes and consequences of these insecurities, and an evaluation of Afghanistan’s state-building process from a human security perspective. After this come two chapters outlining, in terms of human security and development, the development vision needed for Afghanistan and the priorities for the international community in providing aid and supporting peacekeeping. A final chapter summarizes the recommendations.

As one reads the report, it becomes increasingly clear that Afghanistan provides an important case study in human security. The report is all the more significant because Afghanistan at present has such a high profile politically, being on the cross-roads of international concern, and rich

and complex in its internal, regional and global connections. The report is exceptionally well-informed in its wide-ranging and historical treatment of these interconnections, as well as direct and critical in explaining how for the last 40 or 50 years, the driving concerns of the major donors have been their own interests and objectives rather than those of the people in Afghanistan—the interests of both East and West during the cold war, of the Soviet Union from 1979 to 1989, and of the US and others in the West in the 1990s and since.

In the 1950s and 1960s, cold war competition meant that Afghanistan was the highest aid recipient per capita in the world, receiving more or less equal amounts of aid from the United States and the Soviet Union. The era of Russian occupation shifted much of the support from development aid to arms, and from central government to the Mujahideen and other rebel movements. Following the ousting of the Taliban by the coalition forces in 2001, donor efforts have formally shifted to reconstruction and democracy. But even with this agenda backed by some US \$13 billion in aid commitments, the rush to spend, the ideology of the Washington consensus, the interests of international corporations, and the interests of the warlords and those involved in the narco-industry has meant that local consultation has been extremely limited.

Another big challenge is to displace opium production and to replace it with alternative crops or other means of livelihood. The report indicates that opium production accounted for some 40 per cent of Afghanistan’s GNP in 2004—an estimated US \$6.6 billion in 2002.<sup>46</sup> Although the UN and donors have been supporting programmes to encourage alternative crops, the report makes clear that the financial incentive for moving to these crops is minimal. Moreover, there are big mafia interests, national and international, which protect the status quo and fight fiercely against alternatives.

This pessimistic situation underlines the importance of devising an alternative approach—and the NHDR spells out in detail what would be involved, in content as well as in process: action to lay the foundations for democracy, human development and human security; an accountable state, which achieves both a centralization of power and a decentralization of decision-making to the regions; genuine participation; and a supportive international community.

Put so briefly, this greatly underplays the richness and detail of the report, let alone the frankness with which it puts forward the challenges of its recommendations, many of which confront what it acknowledges to be real dilemmas facing the country, the government, the donor community and the UN. Few of the recommendations will be easy to implement. Many, indeed, are daunting. At the same time, the report makes clear that the approach presently being followed—for all the progress made since December 2001, when the Transitional Islamic State came into being—is

unlikely to succeed in its objectives of achieving real democracy, reducing poverty and restoring security for people throughout the country. So the report's recommendations for an alternative approach deserve to be taken very seriously.

In his foreword to the report, the President of Afghanistan, Hamid Karzai, expresses his hope and belief that it will help contribute to the development of a coherent strategy for the years ahead. In our view, the report—or a shortened summary version—should be compulsory reading for all engaged in that effort.

### Special features

Six features of the Afghanistan report stand out as new to the analysis of human security—or at least greatly underemphasized in more general presentations. These are:

First, the report points out that complex national and international interactions have created many human insecurities and continue to sustain them. These are not simply violations of sovereignty by a foreign party, which have caused human insecurities, but an intricate web of continuing interactions between national groups and foreign governments and other parties (the coalition forces, the international mafia, NGOs and the UN itself). These determine the present political-economic situation of Afghanistan. In terms of both analysis and conclusions for policy, it becomes clear that the military, police, and coalition and NATO forces must be analysed together.

Second, different viewpoints on human security are related to the interests and positions of the different parties concerned. Human security needs and the aspirations of the Afghan people are at the centre of the analysis of the Afghanistan NHDR—although it recognizes that even among the ordinary people (as opposed to the elites) there are some regional and ethnic differences. But around this core of concerns are many others presented in the name of human security or security: those of the coalition forces and the International Security Assistance Forces and the donors, who are pursuing a view of security in the name of the global war on terror. There are also regional players meddling in the affairs of Afghanistan by backing various ethnic or language groups in power struggles that have become a matter of regional security. All of these factors get compressed and oversimplified in most accounts of the situation and its security issues. As the report states, “The international narrative on Afghanistan sees bombings, terrorism, kidnapping and physical insecurity as undermining the peace process, hindering democratic processes, and forcing the withdrawal of aid organizations from the southern and eastern regions of the country.”<sup>47</sup>

Third, mental illness and psychological disturbance are a consequence of post-conflict human insecurity. Post-conflict surveys in the country have revealed very high levels of

mental illness. The World Health Organization estimates that some 95 per cent of the Afghan population has been affected psychologically; one in five people suffers mental health problems. A survey of women in Kabul found that 35 per cent reported mental health problems that interfered with their daily work and 40 per cent of them met the criteria for post-traumatic stress, major depression or severe anxiety.<sup>48</sup> A UNICEF study of children aged eight to 18 in Kabul found that 72 per cent had experienced the death of a family member between 1992 and 1986, and 40 per cent of these had lost a parent. Almost all had witnessed acts of violence during the fighting, while two-thirds had seen dead bodies or body parts. Ninety per cent of them thought that they would die.<sup>49</sup> Suicidal tendencies were shown to be common. A survey by Physicians for Human Rights found that 65 per cent of women in Kabul who were widowed or heads of household had suicidal tendencies, and 16 per cent had attempted it—though often the cause was linked to gender violence and other extremes of discrimination.<sup>50</sup>

Fourth, the report delves into migration and displacement. Although migration formed a chapter of *Human Security Now*, the report of the International Commission on Human Security, the subject has often been neglected in human security analyses. (There are, in fact, two excellent articles on global mobility and trafficking in the *Journal of Human Development* of July 2003).<sup>51</sup> In the case of Afghanistan, the displacement of Afghans as refugees reached staggering proportions in the last two decades. In 1988, at the height of the displacement related to Russia's invasion, Afghan refugees accounted for two-thirds of the entire world refugee population. As recently as 2002, there were some 5.6 million Afghan refugees, 2.3 million in Iran and 3.3 million in Pakistan, with another million internally displaced.<sup>52</sup> The report brings out the importance of migration for human security, not only as a major cause of human insecurity for the migrants, but because migrants become linked with violence and other causes of instability that affect people throughout the whole country.

Fifth, justice, reconciliation and the restoration of trust are essential for human security in the long-run. The Afghan report underlines these as conditions for the achievement of a secure, stable and humanly secure Afghanistan.<sup>53</sup> It is recognized that their achievement is a long way off. But it is an essential step, the report argues, to combine central authority and the “monopolization of power” with a genuine decentralization of decision-making and true participation at the regional, local and community levels. Participation is a central feature of the report's recommendations, both as an end in itself and a major means to move towards the achievement of reconciliation, justice and trust.

Finally, the report brings out several interesting features of methodological analysis. As noted above, the causes of human insecurity are analysed within a “threat-based analy-

sis of wants and fears” in chapter 3, using “a greed and grievance framework” to analyse motivations and opportunities in chapter 4 and by “evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of Afghanistan’s current state-building process in terms of human security” in chapter 5. Each of these frames of analysis are important, original and of demonstrable value in examining the situation and reaching practical policy conclusions.

The purpose in underlining these six points of originality is not to suggest that they are the most important points of the whole analysis—though some are, notably the need to combine the centralization of authority and power with decentralization and true participation.

### **An alternative strategy for human security and human development in Afghanistan**

The promotion of an integral approach to human security and human development sets the frame for the strategy presented in the Afghanistan report. At the core of this is a focus on growth and more equitable distribution, of “a pattern that directs resources disproportionately to sectors in which the poor work (such as small-scale agriculture), the areas in which they live (such as the underdeveloped regions) or the factors that they possess (such as unskilled labour or land).<sup>54</sup> This leads the report to its major difference with the strategy set out in Afghanistan’s National Development Framework. The Framework has many of the right goals and intentions, but it fails to carry these through into strategy by emphasizing an acceleration of growth *rate* rather than growth with changes in the structure of the economy to give much higher priority to income and employment generation, and to righting horizontal inequalities. Meeting the Millennium Development Goals throughout the country would help by reducing child and maternal mortality, expanding education and literacy, extending access to health and ensuring environmental protection. A special emphasis is laid on strengthening human security as part of achieving these goals, for instance, by ensuring greater income and food security in difficult times and for older people. Priority is given to direct measures to reduce horizontal inequality as a step towards the conditions for long-run political stability between the regions.

### **Gender**

The report treats gender discrimination and gender violence under the general issue of human rights, rather than under a separate heading. As is well known, by most indicators, the situation of women in Afghanistan is not only bad—but relatively bad in relation to men. Forbidden to attend schools under the Taliban, women have made a rapid and welcome recovery, but the report indicates that the rate of illiteracy of women is still 85 per cent compared with 56 per cent for

men. Female enrolments in primary school in 2002 were half those of boys, one-third in secondary school, and, in 2003, one quarter in universities.

Less well known is the fact that progress for women in Afghanistan began as long ago as the 1880s, when Amir Abdur Rahman forbade child and forced marriages, and supported inheritance and divorce rights for women. His grandson, King Amanullah, “further improved the status of women by establishing girls’ schools, granting rights for men and women to choose their own marriage partners, encouraging women to establish their own women’s associations, and offering women a choice with regard to wearing the veil.”<sup>55</sup> In the 1950s, women were entering government and other employment, had access to universities and parliament, and took many senior positions as judges, diplomats and army generals. The 1964 Constitution granted women equal rights with men. By the 1980s, women made up 70 per cent of the country’s teachers, 40 per cent of the doctors and half of the government workers. There were further advances in the 1980s under Russian influence—for instance, in special literacy programmes for women—although women also suffered seriously from the war and by becoming refugees. It was this long record of advance that was so set back by the Taliban in 1996, when women’s rights were suppressed altogether, including even the right to see a male doctor in life-threatening situations.

The new Government has brought many important changes, including guarantees of a quota for women in the constitutional process, and rights of access to education, employment, and participation in public life, decision-making in the peace process and the reconstruction of the country. The most remarkable advance in women’s position, states the report, is the prohibition of any kind of discrimination between citizens of Afghanistan. Men and women now have equal rights and duties before the law.<sup>56</sup> Notwithstanding, women still suffer from gender-based violence—early and forced marriages, domestic violence, kidnapping and harassment, and intimidation. In impoverished rural areas, families have been reported to sell their daughters to escape desperate conditions or to settle bad blood between families. An International Organization for Migration report states that Afghanistan is an important source for human trafficking, including in the form of forced prostitution and sexual exploitation.<sup>57</sup>

### **Community security and rural strategy**

The report identifies the need to deal with such issues as pastoral and land disputes, restoration of the traditional social order, and community participation in political and development processes.<sup>58</sup> Political security, in the report, is used to raise issues related to the warlords, and how their political power is reinforced by financial resources from foreign countries whose interests they are perceived to serve

or support. The report notes that the sphere of influence of the warlords continues to be “imposed on the people of Afghanistan, backed by weapons, market control, the narcotics trade and control over precious stones. The response to the first problem lies in an unwavering commitment to (the disarmament, demobilization and re-integration) process; to the second, in market and public service reforms; to the third, in law enforcement on the demand side of narcotics; and to the fourth, in the strengthening of the central Government’s capacity and extension of its authority.”<sup>59</sup>

### **Donor problems, debt and corruption**

Many lessons are drawn for donors, with specific recommendations. Attention is paid to the special role of aid in conflict and the way, in the last decade or so, views have shifted from aid’s role in conflict prevention to the current preoccupation with the ‘securitization’ of aid. The report notes some of the negatives—the ways aid can harm (for instance, when a sudden and massive surge in aid exacerbates conflict), how it can help (by providing additional resources and in other ways) and how it can prolong dependence.

In relation to the specifics of Afghanistan, the report notes the relative imbalance of military support to development support; the excessive reliance on expatriates for planning, implementing and monitoring aid; and the uncertainty of long-term donor commitments to the reconstruction and development of Afghanistan.

The report also notes the many donor links with other countries in the region, and the need to develop peaceful and cooperative regional agendas. This covers both the political dimensions of strategies and also such regional imperatives as roads and transport networks, mafia and drug traffic control, proliferation of arms, militarization of the region, refugee flows and fears of extremism.<sup>60</sup> Links with more general policies and actions on debt and the control of corruption are also emphasized.<sup>61</sup>

### **Reconciliation**

The report argues that reconciliation as a part of state building is essential—to serve justice, send a message to victims and culprits, and help marginalize the perpetrators of human rights violations.

### **Development vision**

The report has a strong historical sense of the beginnings of modernization in Afghanistan in the late 19th century and the early 20th—reforms carried further after the Second World War and indeed into the 1980s. With the new Constitution and Government, the stage is set for a new vision—which goes beyond existing commitments and the Securing Afghanistan’s Future exercise. The NHDR out-

lines how and why a human security/human development approach could provide such a vision. It would combine responsiveness to people and community participation with processes and plans for a strong, thriving and more inclusive Afghanistan.

## **HUMAN SECURITY IN OPERATION**

What impact on policy and action have the NHDRs had in the countries concerned? This is an obvious point of evaluation that deserves more attention. A brief questionnaire has been distributed to the UNDP resident representatives in the 13 countries and a reply was received from Latvia. Replies have also been received from Colombia and Somalia, but they are not among the 13 countries whose reports have been reviewed.

The report on follow up to the Latvian NHDR recognizes that the main impact will be in the spread of ideas—with the concept of ‘securitability’ at the core. The report states that “the securitability approach is setting the paradigm for individual-centred policy debate in the country.” If this proves true, this will indeed be an impressive achievement.

Certainly, the Latvian evaluation summarizes a wide range of outreach efforts that likely helped to promote the human security approach and paradigm. The report was launched in two of Latvia’s main universities, with attendance by three ministers, senior government officials, ambassadors and UN officials. Less common for an NHDR launch was the fact that it began with a film revealing popular opinion about human security in Latvia, and that subsequent seminars were held in the four major regions of Latvia and in the capital city to introduce the human security concept to local government officials, educators and social service workers. In addition, the Sub-Committee of Parliament (Saeima) held a lively session on the findings of the NHDR. Copies were widely distributed to libraries, universities and government officials.

Beyond Latvia’s borders, the report also seems to have had some influence. It was presented at an international conference on security and human development in mid-2004, with participants from six other countries in transition. It was also presented at sessions in Geneva and the United States, and has been the topic of international broadcast. Of great potential importance is the fact that the new European Union states have discussed the need for analysing their level of human security today and after five years, and have suggested similar studies in the 15 ‘old’ EU countries. The former Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development has endorsed the importance of including human security among the issues to be evaluated as a consequence of EU accession.

This said, the Latvian follow-up report underlines the correct point that until a new government budget for Latvia is prepared, it will not be possible to assess the real impact



of these new ideas in terms of the hard decisions of government expenditure and action.

## OTHER EVIDENCE

### Human security in the PRSPs

John Page, Director of Poverty Reduction at the World Bank, has reviewed the poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs) of 35 countries to see what references have been made to security and conflict. Some 25 of these were countries that the World Bank considered to be affected by conflict, and many others were at risk of conflict. Security in this sense is of course a narrower concept than human security, though he included references to the restoring of the rule of law, combating crime and ensuring the security of persons through the protection of civil and political rights.

This said, only about half of the PRSPs describe objectives related to security and conflict resolution. Some, like those for Mozambique and Uganda, make no reference. Others, like those for Albania, Sri Lanka and Ethiopia, make reference to combating crime and strengthening the judiciary, reducing conflict-related poverty, and bolstering peace and stability as necessary conditions for investment. To us, these seem far short of what a human security analysis would require and suggest that most of the PRSP documents are prepared within a more or less conventional economic frame.<sup>62</sup> It would be useful for the PRSPs to draw more on the NHDRs where they are available and to include specific measures to deal with human insecurity.

## CONCLUSIONS FOR OUR UNDERSTANDING OF HUMAN SECURITY, ITS APPLICATION AT COUNTRY LEVEL AND ITS CRITIQUES

Finally, we come to the questions raised in the first section of this paper.

- ◆ Does concern with human security in the NHDRs on human security, especially perhaps in the Afghanistan report, do little more than rename as security problems issues that already have been recognized in other contexts and that already have perfectly good names? Do these reports show that there is ‘analytical traction’ in combining these issues as elements of human security, rather than treating them separately?
- ◆ Is it possible to generate policy initiatives from a human security framework given that there are no definite parameters? Does this mean that anything and everything could be considered a risk to security?
- ◆ Does the broad approach to human security complicate the international machinery for reaching decisions and taking actions in relation to the threats identified?

◆ Do the NHDRs, again perhaps particularly the Afghanistan report, suggest an inclination to treat solutions as military ones rather than as those involving other sectors and approaches? Do the reports demonstrate the added value in a holistic human security analysis and suggest the key elements of such an approach?

◆ What are the particular contributions of a human security approach in a post-conflict situation and for developing a post-conflict strategy?

◆ Does the human security approach encourage the UN to explore broad and complex causes, far beyond what can be easily analysed or tackled? Does a human security approach tend to raise excessive hopes about the UN’s capacity to deliver?

◆ What do the NHDRs show about the interests involved in adopting—or opposing—a human security approach? Is a human security agenda politically realistic? What coalitions of interest might support it? What could be done to weaken those opposed?

*Does concern with human security in the NHDRs on human security, especially perhaps in the Afghanistan report, do little more than rename as security problems issues that already have been recognized in other contexts and that already have perfectly good names? Do these reports show that there is ‘analytical traction’ in combining these issues as elements of human security, rather than treating them separately?*

In answer to the first question, it seems that most of the NHDRs do much more than give new names to old problems. As indicated, the problems identified have a number of dimensions that are new or original in the approach to security and often to human security. Almost all the reports develop links between security, human security and development as an integrated whole. The Macedonian report shows the special need to give attention to a broad range of security issues as part of the transition to a market system. The Latvian report demonstrates how in the minds of citizens a complex range of insecurities are felt and identified. These require action, many not as single elements or sectors but in an interrelated way, certainly as part of an integrated strategy. Perhaps most clearly, the whole report on Afghanistan brings out the need for a broad approach to security issues as an essential component of peace, reconstruction and development. No doubt something of this is true of all countries emerging from a conflict situation.

Implementation of such a broader approach is neither easy nor the conventional wisdom. Notwithstanding the report’s careful analysis on this point, the current strategy in Afghanistan falls seriously short of the recommended strategy through its failure to approach the issues with a sufficiently comprehensive and holistic view of human security.

What are the key elements in a broader approach? We would name four: 1) in the very definition of the goals and objectives of human security, there is a need to recognize the complex national and international interactions affecting human security, taking account of the different viewpoints of the main groups involved, nationally and internationally; 2) some analysis of how these viewpoints do or do not relate to the people of the country as a primary focus of concern; 3) consideration of motivations as well as objectives and strategies; and 4) explicit consideration of any new and direct threats to national stability and human security. (In Afghanistan, these would include warlordism, the narco-mafia and international groups committed to destabilizing the country.)

There are other essential points for a broader strategy brought out in a number of the reports. These include: 1) an economic strategy for achieving human development along with human security; 2) justice and reconciliation as essential components for achieving long-term human security; 3) attention to gender and other human rights as important components of human security and human development, along with steady progress towards the fulfilment of human rights and development goals; 4) a coordinated donor strategy that considers international political trends to support a genuinely sustainable national environment; and finally, of course, 5) monitoring progress commensurate with a broader approach to human security and human development. All of these elements go far beyond any simple re-naming of accepted issues of development strategy.

*Given this broad strategy, what policy actions can be generated through this framework? What insights do the NHDRs provide? The human security approach strives to contextualize the understanding of security and enable the development of appropriate policy responses. As evidenced by the NHDRs, this process is entirely possible, and tends to reveal a far more comprehensive picture of the experience of individuals than a state-based approach could ever hope to do. In surveys conducted as part of the NHDR exercises, Latvians revealed that the inability to pay for medical care and insufficient health systems are of primary personal importance, and more important than fears of terrorism or armed conflict.<sup>63</sup> That is not to say that the latter issues ought to be totally neglected. Nonetheless, if a ranking of insecurities reveals that terrorism and armed conflict are not of primary personal concern to citizens in a democratic country, is it not the responsibility of the government to give even more attention to the factors that their citizens feel affect their daily lives?*

Through similar exercises conducted for the NHDRs, the following concerns were highlighted by people when asked what affected their personal security. It is important to remember that many of the respondents live in highly unstable and conflict-prone environments.

The Solomon Islands NHDR finds that the most press-

ing cause of insecurity is a combination of poverty—affecting access to food, education and employment—and unstable and corrupt governance. The report also notes the growing challenge of containing health-related insecurities linked with malaria, tuberculosis and maternal health.<sup>64</sup>

The civil war in Sierra Leone offers a good example of the added value of using the human security approach. Traditional security analysis of Sierra Leone has, among other factors, focused on conflict mediation, disarmament, peacekeeping and the role of donor agencies in facilitating the rebuilding process.<sup>65</sup> A human security perspective can provide a far more comprehensive picture of both the causes of the conflict and a focused plan for the re-building of the country—all while addressing the central question of security. The Sierra Leone NHDR, entitled *From Conflict to Human Security*, notes the following:

Economic security has been lost through loss of income and employment. Food security has deteriorated due to decreased food production in conjunction with loss of income, which connotes lack of economic access to food. The increased incidence of diseases and reduced access to health facilities have implied reduced health security. Environmental security has suffered as a result of damage to the environment. Personal security has been affected in diverse ways including exposure to violence from the fighting and increased crime rates. Deterioration in community security has occurred when members of entire communities have been threatened. Lastly, political security has also suffered as basic human rights have been violated.<sup>66</sup>

Highlighting linkages in the context of policy responses is made possible through a human security analytical framework. This process also enables another important feature of analysis—the setting of benchmarks. Because of the deep linkages between human security and human development, it is possible to create policies to mitigate insecurity that simultaneously ensure sustainable human development. The key recommendations of the Afghanistan NHDR take into account these fundamental connections. For instance, when discussing security sector reform and reintegration of former combatants in Afghanistan, the report notes, “Disarmament, however, needs to be carried out within a context of employment creation and alternative livelihoods. An ill-planned (disarmament, demobilization and reintegration) approach, involving no long-term plan for employment of disarmed persons and no training for security personnel to replace them, may be more dangerous than no strategy at all.”<sup>67</sup>

As mentioned earlier, the strength of the human security framework is the ability to engage with discussions of non-state security, and focus the analysis on those specific issues critical to the understanding of insecurity in a particular case. Both Sierra Leone and Afghanistan have the challenge of rebuilding state and society. The path each needs to take, however, is drastically different. Given the conditions

in each country, policy initiatives require a major degree of flexibility; the capacity to measure and assess progress and success; and targeted solutions to specific developmental and security challenges. The ability to ‘securitize’ particularly relevant agendas is crucial in these cases. For instance, the need to substitute livelihoods from agriculture in place of opium production is particularly important in Afghanistan, whereas this is not a crucial threat to security in Sierra Leone. On the other hand, effective environmental control and natural resource mobilization is of far more strategic importance to Sierra Leone than Afghanistan.

Whereas the objectors to human security are right to point out that there are no definitive parameters of the concept, experience continues to show that the ability to mould this concept to address specific security-related needs is paying greater dividends than following rigid definitions of what constitutes a threat to security. By broadening the concept of security and allowing for specific experiences to be addressed within a framework of action and analysis, human security enables a substantive and comprehensive engagement with factors of insecurity as experienced by individuals around the world.

*What are the particular contributions of a human security approach in a post-conflict situation and for developing a post-conflict strategy?* Some of the above points are especially relevant to countries in post-conflict situations. These include especially the need to cope with the differing interests and objectives of the various parties involved, nationally and internationally. But in addition, a number of special problems have been identified that are likely to be present and increase human insecurity in post-conflict countries: landmines, mental illness, feelings of mistrust, inadequate and chaotic administration, excessive reliance on expatriates, little attention to capacity development for the longer run, and complications from dealing with injustice and inequality among many local groups. Several of these issues are exacerbated by vast differences in salaries paid to expatriates and those few nationals lucky enough to be associated with the international aid and reconstruction efforts.

*What do the NHDRs, especially the Afghanistan report, show about the interests involved in adopting—or opposing—a human security approach? Is a human security agenda politically realistic? What coalitions of interest might support it—and what could be done to weaken those opposed?*

In the case of Afghanistan, some of the difficulties in taking a new approach to human security seriously are shown by expenditures: The coalition forces and NATO are spending some US \$13 billion a year on the war on terror and military actions in Afghanistan—on what these parties see as their priorities for achieving security in Afghanistan (and worldwide). Related to this are the still large but much lower expenditures on reconstruction and development in Afghanistan, at present some US \$4 to 5 billion per year, a large part of which goes to expenditures on expatriates and contracts for international companies, presumably largely American.

As with many aspects of human security and human development, one must ask whether all this effort is achieving its stated objectives or even fulfilling key national objectives and interests of the United States, other coalition countries or the main allies in the region. The analysis of the Afghanistan NHDR gives many reasons to believe that these objectives are not being fulfilled: Stability is not being achieved, demobilization is lagging, much power remains with the warlords, narco-trafficking continues, and, perhaps worst of all, many ordinary people are frustrated and disillusioned. When does a tipping point occur? Will it be, for instance, when it becomes clear that some important changes of strategy and approach are required? At that point, we believe that many of the elements of the alternative strategy set out in the report will be seen to be in the enlightened interest of the coalition and of more democratic elements and groups within Afghanistan itself. Afghanistan might then, perhaps, become more of a place of stability, and less of a threat to global and national human security.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> UNDP 2002a.

<sup>2</sup> UNDP 2003a, p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>4</sup> UNDP 2004.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p.10.

<sup>6</sup> UNDP 2003a.

<sup>7</sup> UNDP 2001.

<sup>8</sup> UNDP 2005.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 82.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. viii-ix.

<sup>11</sup> UNDP 1997.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pg. 5

<sup>13</sup> UNDP 1998d.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 45.

<sup>15</sup> UNDP 1999.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22.

<sup>17</sup> UNDP 2002b.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 69.

<sup>19</sup> UNDP 1998c.

<sup>20</sup> UNDP 1998b.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

<sup>22</sup> UNDP 2000.

<sup>23</sup> UNDP1998a.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

- 25 UNDP 2002c.  
 26 Ibid., p. 3.  
 27 UNDP 2003a, p. 19.  
 28 Ibid., p.123.  
 29 Ibid., p. 27.  
 30 UNDP 2002a, p. 70.  
 31 Ibid., p. 72.  
 32 Ibid., p, 61.  
 33 Ibid., p. 41.  
 34 Ibid., p. 78.  
 35 Ibid., pp.101-112.  
 36 UNDP 2001.  
 37 Ibid., p. 4.  
 38 Ibid., p. 123.  
 39 Ibid., p. 121.  
 40 Ibid., pp. 73-74.  
 41 Ibid., p. 84.  
 42 Ibid., p. 88.  
 43 Ibid., p. 17.  
 44 Ibid., pp. 22, 25.  
 45 UNDP 2004.  
 46 Ibid., p. 29.  
 47 Ibid., p. 8.  
 48 Ibid., p. 60.  
 49 Ibid., pp. 37-38.  
 50 Ibid., pp. 40-41.  
 51 See Bach 2003 and Clark 2003.  
 52 UNDP 2004.  
 53 Ibid., pp. 7, 90.  
 54 Ibid., p. 192.  
 55 Ibid., pp. 78-81.  
 56 Ibid., pp. 79-80.  
 57 Ibid., p. 80.  
 58 Ibid., p. 241.  
 59 Ibid., p. 242.  
 60 Ibid., pp. 234-236.  
 61 Ibid., pp. 189-190.  
 62 See John Page, 2004, 'Three Issues in Security and Development: Comment on Francois Fouinat's Paper', *Conflict, Security and Development*, 4(3), December, pp. 299-308.  
 63 UNDP 2003a, pp. 30-33.  
 64 UNDP 2002c, p. 6.  
 65 For further material analysing the various elements of the Sierra Leone conflict, see Lotta Hagman, 2002, 'Security and Development in Sierra Leone', a working paper for the International Peace Academy; J. Andrew Grant, 'Diamonds, Foreign Aid, and the Uncertain Prospects for Post-Conflict Reconstruction in Sierra Leone', 2005, Research Paper No. 2005/49, United Nations University; Eric Berman, 2000, 'Re-Armament in Sierra Leone: One Year After the Lomé Peace Agreement', *The Small Arms Survey*, December; and Shalini Chawla, 2000, 'United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone: A Search for Peace', *Strategic Analysis*, 24(9), December.  
 66 UNDP 1998d, p. 36.  
 67 UNDP 2004, p. 228.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

### GENERAL CONCLUSIONS ON THE HUMAN SECURITY APPROACH

The country level perspective on human security obtained from analysing the NHDRs reinforces the value of human security as an operational approach to people-centred security that is able to identify priorities and produce important conclusions for national and international policy.

The various objections to human security concerns and approaches elaborated in some recent academic literature hold little water when tested against the approaches and findings of the NHDRs:

**Human security does more than merely rename as security problems issues that have already been recognized in other contexts and that already have perfectly good names.** The NHDRs bring in new issues and a fresh approach to security, and often show the need to tackle the elements involved in a new and integrated manner.

**A human security approach does not necessarily encourage military solutions to issues deserving other actions and approaches.** Undoubtedly, in Afghanistan, military action and approaches represent three-quarters of the resources and much of the political pre-occupations of the coalition countries in the war on terror. But the analysis of the Afghanistan NHDR shows that this strategy is far from succeeding and argues strongly that a broader approach more directed towards human security would deal with many of the elements being neglected. Such an approach would give much less priority to military action and much more to non-military initiatives.

**The human security approach may encourage the UN and others to investigate broad and complex causes—this is feasible given the availability of appropriate analytical skills.** The Afghanistan NHDR reaches back into earlier history to elucidate the causes and consequences of human insecurities. In doing this, the NHDR adds depth and subtlety to its analysis and recommendations. In this respect, the Afghanistan report stands out from most of the others. The professional skills, quality and boldness of those involved in preparing the report made this possible—the analysis was not intrinsically easier in Afghanistan than in other countries. The moral is that other NHDRs on human security need to continue to ensure people of appropriate quality, imagination and intellectual courage to lead the analyti-

cal work. This is no more than the conclusion from other NHDRs, whether on human security or more generally on human development.

**A human security approach can be politically realistic.** The NHDRs show there is value and interest in adopting a human security approach. Undoubtedly, the political involvements and complications of the Afghanistan situation make the recommendations of this particular NHDR very difficult to implement at the moment. As the report brings out, however, the present strategy does not appear to be succeeding. And in the longer run, many of the report's recommendations will need to be tackled. In the case of many of the other NHDRs, the strategies proposed appear to involve fewer conflicts of interest. The policy approaches presented in the Latvia and Macedonia NHDRs include many elements that could be implemented without arousing great opposition or stirring great conflicts of interest.

**A human security approach offers many political contributions in a post-conflict situation.** The report of Afghanistan demonstrates many relevant elements, as do the reports of Timor-Leste and the Solomon Islands. This broadening of the agenda in post-conflict situations would seem to have wide use and applicability.

**Would such a broader approach to human security complicate the international machinery for reaching decisions and taking actions in relation to the threats identified?** This was indeed the argument a year or two ago. But in the last 12 months, the UN Secretary-General has made the framework of human security the integrating concept for his *In Larger Freedom* report and for his proposals for UN reform. Some of the most important of his proposed new UN initiatives were accepted in principle at the UN Summit in September 2005. These included the proposal for a Peacebuilding Commission and for acceptance of the principle of the 'responsibility to protect and the right to intervene'.

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NHDR AND OTHER NATIONAL LEVEL STUDIES

More specific conclusions and recommendations are now provided as potential guidelines for future human security-oriented NHDRs and other national level studies. The focus is first on methodological issues in the identification of concepts and the preparation and collection of data, followed by points of

action and policy—both in regards to operationalizing human security further on the ground, as well as for developing the analytical and assessment capacities of the concept itself.

The human security approach has proven useful for analysis and policy-making in the three groups of countries for which NHDRs have been reviewed:

- ◆ Countries emerging from conflict, notably the reports of Afghanistan and Mozambique, but also of Sierra Leone, the Solomon Islands and Timor-Leste
- ◆ Countries in transition—notably the reports of Latvia and Macedonia, but also of Estonia, Moldova, Kyrgyzstan and Bulgaria, and others like Lesotho
- ◆ Countries like Bangladesh, for which the report, though not strictly prepared as a human security or human development report, is of considerable interest and perhaps one that gains extra significance in a country that could move rapidly towards instability.

Though the human security approach demonstrates real value, the 13 reports examined are of very variable quality in their analysis and policy relevance. The best are those of Afghanistan, Latvia and Macedonia. All the reports, however, may well have made an important impact on thinking and potentially on policy in the country concerned by presenting a new approach to security and raising issues of human security neglected or not even seen before to be issues of national security policy.

Based on the results of this study, several recommendations can be made about methodology for the preparation of future NHDRs and other national studies on human security. A number of lessons have already been noted, but among the most important are:

- ◆ There is a need to undertake special surveys of public opinion to clarify the attitudes of people to different types of threats and the ranking they give to how these affect them. Special surveys have produced interesting and apparently reliable information at relatively modest cost. Such surveys should be made a recommended part of all NHDRs dealing with human security, and could be used to support other related national initiatives. The methodology of the Latvian NHDR is of particular relevance for analysing human security in other countries and situations. It included investigating for a random sample of the population the most important insecurities that they subjectively felt or objectively experienced—with a ranking and rating of the different insecurities according to how intensely they were felt to be a problem.
- ◆ Methodologies need to be developed at the country level to analyse and comparatively assess the costs and benefits of different actions to deal with or dimin-

ish the various types of threats to human security, and to explore trade-offs, especially in terms of the issues emerging from surveys or analysis that present the gravest threats to people. Some experiments with different approaches to cost-benefit analysis in this area would be useful. Trial and error in exploring trade-offs and in applying well-considered methodology could be useful for some future human security studies or NHDRs.

- ◆ There would be value in a more pragmatic approach to analysis and action, especially one giving less attention to each of the seven areas of insecurity identified in the 1994 HDR. Instead, attention should be concentrated on whichever dimensions of insecurity are identified in the surveys of public opinion and other analyses of the experience of people in the country. Attention to gender insecurities almost certainly should be one area of concern, but detailed focus on others should be varied depending on the situation and the extent to which earlier NHDRs and other national level assessments have dealt with other causes of insecurity as part of a more general human development analysis.

- ◆ Combining a human security and human development analysis in many areas of concern and action would often seem useful. Some projections of future problems and trends likely to lead to human insecurity would also be useful, along with analysis of measures to pre-empt or moderate them.

Assessments of the impact of the various NHDRs and complementary initiatives on the human security situation at a national level will be important, along with on-going monitoring. Aspects of this could include the following.

- ◆ Monitoring and evaluation frameworks could be constructed. Most NHDRs have used secondary sources for statistical information. While much of the information is useful in a human security context, it may be necessary to collect data on more specific indicators. Surveys (such as the ones conducted for the Latvia and Afghanistan reports) are a useful tool to generate this type of qualitative data. Multiple surveys, conducted over a period of time, will likely be able to show trends and changes in people's perceptions of insecurity. These might also be useful indicators to assess the success of human security policy.

- ◆ By building into the initial Terms of Reference for future NHDRs a required impact analysis component, it may be possible to derive trends in the institutionalization of human security in a national context. This process is a necessary 'final step' in the preparation of NHDRs on human security.

- ◆ The long-run impact on security conditions cannot be properly understood until considerable time has passed. It would be desirable to encourage follow-up reports or have future NHDRs reserve a section for comprehensive analysis of the impacts of policy recommendations and suggestions from previous reports. Besides maintaining continuity, this exercise will allow critical reflection on policy choices and could inform future decision-making.
- ◆ It would be useful to explore the human security concept in other countries. Such reports might be reviewed, encouraged or commissioned, for instance, in Brazil, Egypt, Guatemala, Pakistan, Tunisia, South Africa and Sri Lanka. It would be useful to review the treatment of human security in a small number of other reports before reaching firm conclusions about the best way to prepare reports on human security at country level.
- ◆ There are also good grounds for including some element of human security in future NHDRs and other national studies dealing with general issues of human development.

The recent UN agreement to establish a Peacebuilding Commission and a supportive secretariat provides a new challenge and opportunity to apply human security analyses. UNDP and other parts of the UN could support and make available human security analyses in all countries being considered for action in the Peacebuilding Commission. Such analyses, if prepared objectively by well-informed professionals, could help provide a frame of reference to ensure a broad approach to peacebuilding related to the wider issues of human security.

Though government motivations to implement policies for relieving different forms of human insecurity will inevitably vary in different countries, human security analyses can still be of widespread importance and use. The information obtained and the analysis of human security needs can be used to critique the inadequacy or neglect of security issues in present policies, to build coalitions for change, and to pressure policy makers to respond to specific needs. This could help to mark a real advance in international action for peace and security.

## Human Security and the NHDRs: Concepts and Dimensions of Analysis

|  | Afghanistan | Latvia | Macedonia | Philippines |
|--|-------------|--------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>SECTION 1. CONCEPTUAL CLARITY</b>                                 |             |        |           |             |
| <b>Definitions of human security</b>                                 |             |        |           |             |
| Is human security defined?   | ✓           | ✓      | ✓         | ✓           |
| Is human security defined in a contextual setting?                   | ✓           | ✓      | ✓         | ✓           |
| Contextual analysis of the seven UNDP-defined human insecurities:    |             |        |           |             |
| Economic security  | ✓           | ✓      | ✓         |             |
| Food security  | ✓           | ✓      |           |             |
| Health security  | ✓           | ✓      | ✓         |             |
| Environmental security   | ✓           | ✓      | ✓         |             |
| Personal security  | ✓           | ✓      | ✓         | ✓           |
| Community security   | ✓           | ✓      | ✓         | ✓           |
| Political security   | ✓           | ✓      |           | ✓           |
| Is the definition integrated into the report structure?              | ✓           | ✓      | ✓         | ✓           |
| <b>Definitions of human development</b>                              |             |        |           |             |
| Is human development defined?  | ✓           | ✓      |           | ✓           |
| Is human development defined in a contextual setting?                | ✓           | ✓      |           | ✓           |
| Is the definition integrated into the report structure?              | ✓           |        |           | ✓           |
| <b>SECTION 2. DIMENSIONS OF HUMAN SECURITY AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</b> |             |        |           |             |
| Is the analysis quantified in some way?                              | ✓           | ✓      | ✓         | ✓           |
| Are there conclusions for policy?                                    | ✓           | ✓      | ✓         | ✓           |
| Are there proposals for monitoring?                                  |             |        |           | ✓           |





|  | Afghanistan | Latvia | Macedonia | Philippines |
|--|-------------|--------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>SECTION 3. ANALYSIS AND PROJECTIONS OR SCENARIOS FOR THE FUTURE</b> |             |        |           |             |
| Is the methodology used to generate projections explained?             | ✓           | ✓      | ✓         |             |
| Does the analysis include projections?                                 | ✓           |        |           |             |
| Is there analysis of trade-offs and resource use?                      | ✓           |        |           | ✓           |
| Costing analysis for each human security dimension?                    | ✓           |        |           | ✓           |
| Budget analysis for each human security dimension?                     | ✓           |        |           |             |
| <b>SECTION 4. BREAKDOWN OF ANALYSIS</b>                                |             |        |           |             |
| <b>Focussed analysis</b>   |             |        |           |             |
| Analysis of insecurities?  | ✓           | ✓      | ✓         | ✓           |
| Analysis of vulnerabilities?   | ✓           | ✓      |           | ✓           |
| Analysis of poverty?   | ✓           | ✓      | ✓         | ✓           |
| Analysis of inequality?  | ✓           |        |           | ✓           |
| Special analyses of children?  | ✓           | ✓      |           | ✓           |
| Special analysis of women?   | ✓           | ✓      |           |             |
| Special analysis of older persons?                                     |             |        |           |             |
| Special analysis of ethnic minorities?                                 | ✓           |        | ✓         | ✓           |
| Special analysis of vulnerable groups?                                 | ✓           | ✓      | ✓         |             |
| Special analysis of special interest groups?                           |             |        |           |             |
| <b>Comparative analysis of human security in other countries?</b>      | ✓           | ✓      |           |             |
| <b>Impacts analysis</b>  |             |        |           |             |
| Specific examples of policy actions?                                   | ✓           |        | ✓         |             |
| Specific examples of policy recommendations?                           | ✓           |        | ✓         | ✓           |
| Specific examples of policy successes?                                 | ✓           |        |           |             |



# Bibliography

## JOURNALS/ARTICLES

Bach, R. L. 2003. 'Global Mobility: Inequality and Security'. *Journal of Human Development*, 4(2), July.

Burchill, S. 2001. 'Realism and Neo-realism'. *Theories of International Relations*, edited by S. Burchill et al. Hampshire: Palgrave.

Clark, M. A. 2003. 'Trafficking in Persons: An Issue of Human Security'. *Journal of Human Development*, 4(2), July.

Deudney, D. 1991. 'Environment and Security: Muddled Thinking'. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 47(3), April.

Foong-Khong, Y. 2001. 'Human Security: A Shotgun Approach to Alleviating Human Misery?'. *Global Governance*, 7.

Harris, G. 2002. 'The Irrationality of South Africa's Military Expenditure'. *African Security Review*, 11(2).

Hoogensen, G., and S. V. Rottem. 2004. 'Gender Identity and the Subject of Security'. *Security Dialogue*, 35(2), June. Sage Publications.

Knudsen, O. V. 2001. 'Post-Copenhagen Security Studies: Desecuritizing Securitization'. *Security Dialogue*, 32(3).

Paris, R. 2001. 'Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air'. *International Security*, 26(2), Fall.

Raven-Roberts, Angela. 2001. 'Human Security: A Gender Perspective'. *DifferenTakes*, 14, Fall. Population and Development Program, Hampshire College, Massachusetts.

Stabile, C. A., and C. Rentschler. 2005. 'States of Insecurity and the Gendered Politics of Fear'. *NWSA Journal*, 17(3), Fall.

Walker, R. B. J. 1997. 'The Subject of Security'. *Critical Security Studies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

## BOOKS

Ayoob, M. 1997. 'Defining Security: A Subaltern Realist Perspective'. In K. Krause and M. C. Williams, eds., *Critical Security Studies: Cases and Concepts*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Buzan, B., O. Wæver and J. de Wilde. 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. London: Lynne Reinner Publishers.

Jolly, R., et al. 2004. *UN Contributions to Development Thinking and Practice*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Kaldor, M. 2001. *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*. Polity Press/Stanford University Press.

Krause, K., and M. C. Williams. 1997. *From Strategy to Security*. Critical Security Studies. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

MacFarlane, S. N., and Y. Foong-Khong. 2006. *Human Security and the UN: A Critical History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Owens, H., and B. Arneil. 1999. 'The Human Security Paradigm Shift: A New Lens on Canadian Foreign Policy? Report of the University of British Columbia Symposium on Human Security'. In Majid Tehranian, ed., *Worlds Apart: Human Security and Global Governance*. London: I. B. Tauris.

Peterson, S., and A. S. Runyan. 1999. *Global Gender Issues*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Sen, A. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sylvester, C. 1994. *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tickner, A. 1992. *Gender in International Relations*. New York: Columbia University Press.

ul Haq, M. 1995. *Reflections on Human Development*. Oxford University Press.

## REPORTS

Annan, K. 2005. *In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All*. United Nations General Assembly, A/59/2005. New York.

Boutros-Ghali, B. 1992. *An Agenda for Peace, Peacemaking*

- and Peacekeeping*. A report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the statement adopted by the Summit Meeting of the Security Council on 31 January. United Nations, DPI/1247. New York.
- The Commission on Global Governance. 1995. *Our Global Neighbourhood*. Oxford University Press.
- The Commission on Human Security. 2003. *Human Security Now*. New York.
- Government of South Africa. 2005. *Department of Defence Annual Report 2004-2005*. Pretoria: Military Printing Regiment.
- The Independent International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. 2001. *A Responsibility to Protect*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.
- NorthSouth Roundtable. 1990. *The Economics of Peace*.
- The Panel on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations. 2000. Report to the United Nations Security Council, A/55/305-S/2000/809. New York.
- United Nations. 2002. *Women, Peace and Security*. [www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/public/eWPS.pdf].
- UNDP. 1994. *Human Development Report 1994*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1997. *Estonia Human Development Report 1997: Social Cohesion and Social Exclusion/Deprivation*. Tallinn [www.undp.ee/nhdr99/en/contents.html].
- . 1998a. *Bulgaria Human Development Report 1998: The State of Transition and Transition of the State*. Sofia [www.abs.bg/undp-hdr98/html\_eng/contents.htm].
- . 1998b. *Lesotho Human Development Report 1998*. Maseru.
- . 1998c. *Mozambique Human Development Report 1998: Peace and Economic Growth, Opportunities for Human Development*. Maputo [www.unsystemmoz.org/nhdr1998/default.asp].
- . 1998d. *Sierra Leone Human Development Report 1998: From Civil Conflict to Human Security*. Freetown.
- . 1999. *Moldova National Human Development Report 1999: Transition and Human Security*. Chisinau [http://un.md/key\_pub\_documents/pic/1999/e1.pdf].
- . 2000. *Kyrgyzstan Human Development Report 2000*. Bishkek [www.undp.kg/english/publications/2000/nhdr.zip].
- . 2001. *Macedonia Human Development Report 2001: Social Exclusion and Human Insecurity in FYR Macedonia*. Skopje.
- . 2002a. *Bangladesh Human Security Report 2002: In Search of Justice and Dignity*. Dhaka.
- . 2002b. *East Timor National Human Development Report 2002: The Way Ahead*. Dili [www.undp.east-timor.org/National\_Human\_Development\_Report\_2002.htm].
- . 2002c. *Solomon Islands Human Development Report 2002: Building a Nation*. University of Queensland, Australia.
- . 2003a. *Latvia Human Development Report 2002/2003: Human Security*. Riga.
- . 2003b. *South Africa Human Development Report 2003*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- . 2004. *Afghanistan National Human Development Report 2004: Security with a Human Face; Challenges and Responsibilities*. Islamabad: Army Press.
- . 2005. *Philippine Human Development Report 2005*. Manila.
- The UN Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. 2004. *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility*. New York: United Nations Press.

## CONVENTIONS/TREATIES

Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and their Destruction (1972)

Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction (1993)

Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (1998)

Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (1972)

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (1968).

### **WEB SITES**

Evans, G. n.d. 'The Responsibility to Protect: Humanitarian Intervention in the 21st Century'. International Crisis Group [www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=2288&l=1].

Government of Canada, Human Security Programme. 'Human Security: Safety for People in a Changing World' [www.humansecurity.gc.ca/safety\_changingworld-en.asp], 27 May 2005.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs for Japan. 'Chapter 3C— Efforts to Tackle Various Global Issues to Promote Human Security'. Diplomatic Bluebook 2004 [www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/2004/chap3-c.pdf], 27 May 2005.

US Department of Homeland Security. 'Threats and Protection' [www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/theme\_home6.jsp].





**United Nations Development Programme**  
**Human Development Report Office**  
**National Human Development Reports Unit**  
**304 East 45th Street, 12th floor**  
**New York, NY 10017**  
**email: [hdro@undp.org](mailto:hdro@undp.org)**

This Occasional Paper draws upon experiences and practices for addressing human security issues based on a review of current literature and 13 National Human Development Reports (NHDRs). The paper explores the linkages between human security and human development. It offers a discussion of current debates on human security and practical guidance to assist NHDR Teams, UNDP Country Offices and others looking at human security challenges within the framework of the human development conceptual approach.

**<http://hdr.undp.org>**