<u>**Human Security: The Evolution of a Definition and the Failings of the State**</u>

By: R. Tanner Bivens

<u>**Introduction**</u>

More than twenty years have passed since the conception of human security and the ensuing discourse on the topic. The 1994 Human Development Report and subsequent acceptance of the neologism by security study scholars has opened discussion in international relations that has strayed away from the pre-Cold War norm of inter-state conflict to focus more on the subject of non-militaristic, day-to-day threats that affect humanity at large. However, the definition of human security and it subsections have remained just as ambiguous and amorphous since its inception. This said amorphous nature of the definition has reached such an apex that the topic of human security is often construed less of a debate and more of an unachievable goal that can never be reached, yet should always be strived to achieve (Paris 2001). Regardless, the debate continues to circulate on the fundamental structure of human security: how it is obtained, who is responsible for cultivating it for a mass politic, in what theoretical framework it should be viewed, and whether the definition is in need of reworking and streamlined in order to be adapted to a more logical and obtainable goal (Conteh-Morgan 2005; Grayson 2009; King & Murray 2001; MacArthur 2008; Newman 2005; Paris 2001; Taylor 2004; Tsai 2009).

Human security is a neologism built upon altruistic principles, yet vaguely obtainable means (Paris 2001). It offers a picturesque view of the future in which humanity would focus less on state based national security, less on the threat of nuclear war after the end of the Cold War, less on the encroaching threat of extremism such as terrorist tendencies, and focus its attention on increasing the quality of life for all peoples. Human security calls upon a variety of

state, inter-state, and non-state actors, which include, however, not are limited to intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), as well as an individual on individual basis (Human Development Report 1994). In particular, though is the premium placed on the role of the state in providing human security. This said premium was placed on the state apparatus was exacerbated after the events of the 9/11 Terrorist Attacks. This paradigm shift altered the political landscape which also included the ideals of human security (Carmody 2005; Welch 2009).

Discussion on the amorphous nature of human security and the ever-evolving definition of human security is nothing new in the field. The subject has been researched by a plethora of scholars that challenge and attempt to provide a more concise definition of human security and its sub-divisions (Acharya 2001; Aldis 2008; Conteh-Morgan 2005; Faridi & Wadood 2001; Græger 1995; King and Murray 2001; MacArthur 2008; Newman 2005; Paris 2001; Taylor 2004; Tsai 2009). However, there has been little in terms of discussion on the subject of the role of the state in providing human security. Particularly, on the subject of the developed world states providing human security to their own body politic. The subject, from both scholars and policy makers, instead, falls to providing human security in the developing world. This focus, while not incorrect, potentially neglects to discuss what these states should be doing to provide both the developing world as well as the developed world human security to fall more in line with the cosmopolitan ideals that the initial United Nations Human Development Report (1994) set to achieve.

The aim of this paper is to expand upon preexisting research on the subject of human security. Its goal is to provide a concise definition of human security in addition to challenging the evolution of human security and its sub-divisions that have deviated from their cosmopolitan

roots to be "pigeon-holed" into discussions of national security and humanitarianism in regards to the developing world. In other words, what is meant to be a collective good for the universal body politic, is limited to only a discussion of particular aspects of varying societies. This paper will offer a qualitative analysis and wider discussion on the evolving role of the state in providing human security, as well as how developed states have potentially failed certain groups of their body politic in providing human security in lieu of national security against terrorism in the post 9/11 world.

In order to accomplish this, I will first construct a definition of human security based on previous research in the field. I will offer a brief overview of the assumption of the state during the pre-9/11 era and how its alteration in the post war on terror climate has failed at providing human security for the body politic, particularly in the developed world. I will then reiterate the initial definition of the subdivision of human security as originally stated in the 1994 Human Development Report. I will then display how the state has been unsuccessful at providing human security to its population. I will finally conclude my paper as well as respectfully address a number of potential critical differences to my research as well as potential further research on the subject of the state and human security.

What is Human Security

The definition of human security, even twenty years after its inception, is a topic of debate among human security scholars and a concise definition is hard to obtain. The subject is considered to be altruistic in principle, but amorphous and ambiguous in its definition and, by extension, its implementation (Conteh-Morgan 2005; MacArthur 2008; Oberleitner 2005; Paris 2001; Taylor 2004; Tsai 2009). As the definition can be just as ambiguous as human security's aims, this paper will adopt facets of previous works in order to construct a concise and

streamlined definition of human security as well as the theoretical framework that best connects with these principles. Since previous research in the field of human security has tended to focus its debates through the lens of a constructivist perspective (Conteh-Morgan 2005; Tsai 2009), and combined with the idea that human security is meant to focus on the individual as well as domestic analyses of solving these potential life crises, this paper will adopt a constructivist/identity perspective at analyzing the definition of human security and the role of the state. Thus, a premium is to be put on culture, societal norms, and identity of individuals when discussing the state's role in human security.

 While the precise definition of human security tends to waiver, there are some agreed upon commonalities. The first of which being that the purpose of human security is to discuss the concerns of the individual that are often overlooked when discussing security at a systemic or domestic level of analysis. Second, human security is a nonmilitary and non-state discussion that narrows its focus on the subject of the individual (Acharya 2001; Conteh-Morgan 2005; Human Development Report 1994; MacArthur 2008; Oberleitner 2005; Paris 2001; Taylor 2004; Tsai 2009). Third, scholars tend to agree upon the seven categories of human security proposed by the HDR (1994) which include economic security, health security, food security, environmental security, personal security, community security, and political security respectfully (Acharya 2001; Conteh-Morgan 2005; MacArthur 2008; Oberleitner 2005; Paris 2001; Taylor 2004; Tsai 2009).

 Beyond the focus on the HDR (1994) report, the emphasis on non-military based security, as well as a focus on the individual political actor instead of the state political actor, scholars remain divided on a concise definition of human security. The first of which is the emphasis put on security instead of the human as well as the failings, and deviation from, state

centric security (MacArthur 2008; Tsai 2009). In particular, MacArthur (2008) challenges the state and state centric security as a potential causal factor to human security. To be more specific, the failings of state centric security not focusing on the needs of the ordinary citizen spawned the need for discussions of human security (MacArthur 2008).

Other scholars tend to see human security as something that is an extension of the state and is less about the individual and more about the concept of human security as a tool for the state to implement its interests (Acharya 2001; Taylor 2004). This definition lends itself to state involvement and views human security as more of a strategy for states to address the basic needs of the human as well as a means of reducing human cost in violent conflicts (Acharya 2001; Taylor 2004).

Conteh-Morgan (2005), Oberleitner (2005), and Paris (2001) each offer different approaches that encompass a much wider array of human security that also is related to concepts of humanitarian thought. While Conteh-Morgan (2005) primary focus is on the humanitarian aspects of human security and the assistance of the less fortunate individuals of society, Oberleitner (2005) and Paris (2001) offer a more encompassing discussion of human security as an overarching means of political thought. Oberleitner (2005) offers three potential approaches to human security while Paris (2001) focuses on two. Paris (2001) discusses the separation in approaches to human security as either one that focuses on the lens of humanitarian action needed through the state and the second being the focus on the hurtful disruption in the pattern of daily life.

Oberleitner (2005), of the previous definitions, offers the most streamlined and overarching definition of human security which focuses the discussion into one of three different approaches. The first of these three approaches is a narrow and natural approach that is

connected to theoretical ideas of natural laws along with the rule of law. This is anchored to the concept of basic human rights (Oberleitner 2005). The second of these approaches is the aforementioned humanitarian approach (Paris 2001). Under this approach, human security is seen as a tool used to deepen and strengthen efforts at challenging global issues such as war crimes and genocide (Oberleitner 2005). The final of the three is attached to aforementioned statements of state involvement (Acharya 2001; Taylor 2004). This sees human security as a tool to be used by the state to justify humanitarian intervention in other parts of the world to better combat the issues in the fields of global economy, development projects, and globalization (Oberleitner 2005).

Each of these previous discussions on the definition of human security offers an adequate understanding of the subject. However, each of the definitions may or may not offer an adequate universal understanding of human security that was originally exposited by the 1994 Human Development Report. Instead, the definitions potentially represent different aspects of human security as being intricate pieces of a much larger human security puzzle.

The first issue taken with these definitions is that they come from concepts of a western developed actor approaching nonwestern issues, particularly the discussion of humanitarian action. The overall consensus places the focus on the nonwestern world instead of addressing security in the developed world as well. None of these definitions address the idea of human security as a universal collective good. If this is to be the case, which is stated in the initial report (Human Development Report 1994), then that would mean that those who live in the developed world are just as susceptible to human security complaints and troubles as those in the developing world. While, granted, those who live in the developed world have an exponentially better standard of living than those living in the developing world on average, each state,

developed or developing, has a percentage of the population whose human security is threatened by poverty, health issues brought on by environmental problems, more health issues brought on by a lack of health care access, political corruption, and prejudice that is based on race, sexual orientation, and/or gender. The focus of on humanitarian action in the developing world (Acharya 2001; Conteh-Morgan 2004; Oberleitner 2005; Paris 2001; Taylor 2004) is relevant in the discussion of human security. However, it only represents a small aspect of a much wider, more universalistic view of human security that encompasses the developed and developing world (Human Development Report 1994).

The second issue focuses on the concept of human security as a state tool to be implemented either to increase the quality of living or to use as justification for state action (Archaya 2001; Oberleitner 2005; Paris 2001; Taylor 2004). While human security can be used as an apparatus for the state to implement policy on either of these topics, this discussion, to reiterate, is only a small aspect of a much larger narrative. More often than not, the issues that potentially create a human security violation are those that are created by the state's action or inaction. This focuses on the ideal that human security is less of an issue in the developed world as it is in the developing world. Instances of political corruption, lack of adequate health care, racial discrimination, and people living in poverty can all be caused by state neglect in the developed and developing world (Human Development Report 1994). While a state can use it as a means of justifying humanitarian action, this definition does not encompass the human security violation that occurs as a result of developed states neglecting their own populace.

In order to offer a complete definition of human security, this paper will combine aspects of the definitions provided by Oberleitner (2004), Paris (2001), and MacArhtur (2008) and Tsai (2011), as well as the initial Human Development Report (1994).

From Oberleitner (2004), human security is intrinsically connected to natural rights and the concepts of human rights. Through this lens, a human has the right to an adequate food source, to live their life as they see fit without economic or political strife brought on by the ruling sovereign, a human has access to a standard of living that gives them access to basic healthcare needs, and a human has the right to life without a means of persecution of another person by their way of living.

From Paris (2001), that human security is meant to address the challenges and tribulations of daily life. Human security does not, or should not, focus on a broader concept of a picturesque utopia, nor does it focus on the interest of states or any other political actors beyond the individual. Human security is meant to protect society from challenges of economic strife, poverty, persecution, basic health care, and other microaggressions to an individual's day to day living situation.

Finally, human security is best assessed through a constructivist lens in order to adequately cover the different facets of society that can affect it (MacArthur 2008; Tsai 2011). In this instance, norms, identity, and society matter to the individual when discussing human security, which is shaped by the societal structure and collective identity built around them (Wendt 2005). Human security can change dependent upon a person's cultural identity, racial identity, gender, the norms inherent in their society, the moral views held by the state in which they reside, and so forth.

The combination of these three principles removes human security discourse from that of a strictly western or state centric influence. This does have the side effect of the topic backsliding to a more ambiguously defined concept by stripping potential streamlined definitions in order to return it back to its original state. However, it allows a more robust discussion on cosmopolitan

aspects of human security and situations that affects an individual's day to day existence which,
potentially, realigns itself with the original goal and ideals of the initial 1994 Human
Development Report.

The Assumption of the Role of the State and Its Alteration Post 9/11

Assumptions from the 1994 HDR and Assumptions of the Role of the State

Human security, at its core, is a discourse on increasing the security of the individual
(Human Development Report 1994; Paris 2001). The purpose of the discussion is both an
individual level analysis as well as the day to day challenges to human life and the resources
needed to facilitate a healthy standard of living (Oberleitner 2004; Paris 2001). By this logic, the
focus of human security is on the role that the state plays in increasing the security of a human's
day to day life. In particular, the state's role in providing security, or failing to provide security,
to individuals within its sovereignty (Human Development Report 1994).

However, previous discussion of human security has shied away from the responsibility
of the state in increasing the security of those living within its borders in particular, those of
developed states, and instead has co-opted a discussion of human security to a discussion of
humanitarianism and/or human rights discourse. In other words, the discussion tends to focus on
a developed state assisting a developing state in increasing the security of its own constituents
instead of also offering attention to the betterment of those living within its own borders whose
human security is threatened (Conteh-Morgan 2005; Grayson 2009; King & Murray 2001;
MacArthur 2008; Roberts 2001; Taylor 2004).

This concept strays away from the original ideals of human security purported by the
Human Development Report (1994) which discusses that the security of a person in the United

States is just as important as the security of a person in Syria, Libya, China, and so forth. HDR (1994) takes a cosmopolitan stance on this subject by not limiting itself to just the political challenges of the developing world. While the reason for this insecurity differs dependent upon your life and social standing, a person living in Europe still has to face the insecurity of political corruption as does one living in South America or Africa. A person living in poverty in the United States may be significantly better off than a person living in poverty in Sudan. However, this does not detract from the point that the person in the United States is insecure about their position in society due to their economic and personal strife, same as in other parts of the world. A person facing potential racist tendencies is just as prevalent in the United States as it is in the developing world (Human Development Report 1994; Taylor 2016).

The assumption of the role of the state is one that is misplaced and misrepresented in international relations research. The discussion assumes that the role of a state in providing security to its constituents is a given and, thus, discussion turns away from the needs of those who are suffering insecurity from their own borders and, instead, focuses its attention to discussions of humanitarian law and human security. Thus, it becomes a western developed state tool to be used on nonwestern developing states.

This line of thought is consistent with a liberal bias in western philosophical discussions. It follows the logic that a developed state has no need to focus on the security issues within its own borders. That security is assumed and, thus, a non-issue or the issue is so miniscule that the issues of others become higher priority. Because of this, discussion turns to lesser developed states who are perceived as weak and needing of aid. This thought process not only mislabels the role of the state in human security discourse, it assumes that the state, because it is developed, is not in need of providing security to its people when that may not be the case. While a developed

state is in a significantly better position as opposed to those who are still developing, each state has a population of those who live below the poverty line, are susceptible to government corruption, are worried about the potential harm the community around them can cause, or could be persecuted due to the fact that their race or gender is not in line with the societal norms of that particular society's culture (Human Development Report 1994; Mills 1997; Pateman 1988; Taylor 2016). Those who suffer from insecurity within the developed world are just as in need as those in other aspects of the international world at large. However, due to a western focus of imposition on developing nonwestern worlds, they are put on the metaphorical "back-burner" under the assumption that the state is adequately handling their security.

This assumption is not static. It has evolved and become co-opted by other aspects of international relations discourse. In particular, in connection with the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centers, human security has taken on a different role that once more assumes the role of the state as it focuses on concepts of terrorism as opposed to the needs of its constituents.

The 9/11 Attacks and the Co-Option of Human Security

The attacks on the World Trade Centers represented a critical moment in world history and world politics. After the attacks occurred, the world that once was, was no longer and a new world came to be: a post 9/11 world. In this post 9/11 world, there were alterations to how the state perceived security as well as the ways in which they approached history (Welch 2009). One of the concepts that became altered was security, more importantly, the human security of those living in the western world (Carmody 2005). However, the change was not to strengthen the human security as a means of better protecting its citizens. Instead a blended quasi-security came to be. Human security, national security, and military security were merged, in a sense, to become a single security entity that meant to extend its influence to nonwestern states that

threatened the national security of the United States and the other members of the western world (Carmody 2005; Conteh-Morgan 2005; Martin & Owen 2010; Taylor 2004; Thede 2008). The general consensus, reverting back to an offensive realist and security dilemma (Cashman 2004; Mearsheimer 2003) point of view, being that the best way to increase the security of the American citizen is to increase the state's national security.

This is, by no means, meant to be a critique on the foreign policy decisions of the United States at the time. In instances where a state's security is threatened, it is rational to respond to an enemy that has taken the first move advantage as a means of increasing one's own security (Cashman 2004; Mearsheimer 2003). However, what 9/11 did accomplish was a decrease in the security of the United States and, as such, the altruistic ideals of the post-Cold War human rights and human security discussions were replaced with discussions of terrorism as well as resurgence of the debate of a state's security against a new, less organized threat (Carmody 2005; Welch 2009). In extension to this resurgence of national security, the concept of human security did not become dormant. Instead it was absorbed and co-opted into the discussion of national security. Thus, human security became an off branch of humanitarianism and west imposition on the east as opposed to an all-encompassing discussion on an individual's betterment of quality of life which strays farther away from the original Human Development Report (1994)(Conteh-Morgan 2005; Martin & Owen 2010; Taylor 2004; Thede 2008).

Just as the end of the Cold War saw a mass resurgence on the discussion of the human as well as adopting a more active discussion on human rights law, the post 9/11 world is one that was a paradigm shift on the discourse of security. However, as opposed to the freezing of discussion, in lieu of national security discussion and nuclear discussion, human security and human rights law was co-opted by this new discussion of terrorism, insecurity, and national

security. As such, the ideals originally purported by the Human Development Report (1994) seven year's prior were morphed in order to fit these national security ideals which extended to the role of the state and used as a means to legitimize militaristic humanitarian efforts (Acharya 2001; Barnett 2005; Taylor 2004).

The Sub-Divisions of Human Security, the Misconception of the State's Role, and the Intentions of What Could Be

The Seven Subsections of Human Security and the Definitions Given by the 1994 Human Development Report, and the Role of the State

In its initial release in 1994, chapter 2 of the Human Development Report detailed seven sub-divisions to human security. These seven sections are respectfully: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security, and political security. Each of the seven subsections was given a general definition, description, and examples to which these subsections could be applied to the needs of the day to day lives of human beings.

In order to further dissect the misconceived role of the state as it is viewed in the post 9/11 world, this article will offer a brief definition of each of these subsections based on the original definitions given the 1994 Human Development Report as well as recent scholars who have contributed to the field of research.

It needs be stated, though, that the topic of "economic security" will be omitted from these definitions, even with its inclusion in the Human Development Report (1994). The reason being is thus: The subject of economic security, or freedom from poverty, is a subject that has rarely been touched upon by political scholars studying human security. Those in the field that

have touched upon economic security (Newman 2005; Paris 2001; Tsai 2009) have only touched upon the subject in a broad overarching subject of human security and its sub-divisions. Instead, the subject of economic security seems to have been adopted by economists, political economists, and sociologists. While the topic of economic security and the concept of freedom of poverty is a subject that is in need of further elaboration, this subject of "economic security" is best left to those with a focus on economics as opposed to those that focus on the topic of human security. As such, a further expansion and examination will be given to the six other sub-divisions sans economic security.

Food Security

The subject of food security is the continued access to food to the extent that one's life and well-being is not threatened by a shortage of food. This concept extends to having access to healthy food, adequate access to non-spoiled food, the ability to cultivate one's own food, or having a food distributor within a reasonable distance to handle all food related necessities (Human Development Report 1994). What constitutes food security is more concrete than other amorphous definitions of human security. However, the definition is still open to a more precise nature of how food security is obtained (Maxwell and Smith 1992). While still a topic for debate, a more generally agreed upon set of guidelines, as outlined Rushad Faridi and Syed Naimul Wadood (2010) classify it as thus: "Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social, and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food which meets the dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life." (Faridi and Wadood 2010 p. 101).

On the subject of food security, the use of this definition is cosmopolitan in its description and does not limit itself to any one particular region or regions of the world. The

concept being that all people, at all times have access to enough food to sustain a healthy well-being. However, when discussions of food security are brought to focus, the subject tends to lean towards the food security woes of the developing world; in particular, Asian countries with dense populations, the Middle East, and Africa (Faridi and Wadood 2010; Jiang 2008; Kannan, Mahendra, and Sharma 2000). While this is, by no means, attempting to claim that these issues are not in need of discussion and worthy of extensive and robust debate, the subject of food security in the developed world is still an area of contention that is ignored in lieu of the problem of the starving child afar instead of the starving child at home.

Statistics published by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) (2016) and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations (2015) illuminate the problem of food hunger in the developed and developing world. The numbers offered by the FAO reveal statistical data on the subject of food security comparing it from the 1990-1992 samples and the 2014-2016 samples. From the samples given, the numbers fall into favor of the developed world with only 1.8% of the developed world in a state of hunger as of 2015. This is in contrast to the other areas of the world, Southern Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, and Eastern Asia which each represent 35.4%, 27.7%, and 18.3% respectfully which is in line with the current field of study on the subject of food security.

However, the numbers do open up a problem left unchallenged by research on human security in the developed world. The 1.8% of the developed world, roughly, equates to 15 million people in the developed world who suffer from food hunger. By the USDA statistics, even 20.4% of Americans live in food insecure households or households with "very low food security" (USDA 2016). With focus going to areas of the world in dire need of food security,

those who are still left without food security in the developed world are left in a state of relative voicelessness.

This falls back to the role of the state and the act of providing food security. Unlike other aspects of human security, food security is one that is just as focused in the interior sphere as much as it is focused in the humanitarian sphere. The concept of food and the aspects of hunger, playing into the politics of visibility, is a collective good that can be viewed and seen. Statistics have also seen an exponential decrease in food insecurity in the developed and developing world with the noticeable exception to Sub Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia (FAO 2016).

Health Security

Health Security encompasses the concepts of the well-being of a person. It is the security of knowing that the health needs of the individual will be met if illness or injury might affect them. If a person becomes ill, they have means of getting better instead of choosing to accept death when there are treatable means available to them. If they are injured, they have the ability to seek treatment as opposed to living life with the scars of said injury. Health security is security in knowing that the water that said person drinks is clean and the food they eat are free of viruses, bacteria, fungi, and so forth (Human Development Report 1994 27-28).

On the subject of health security, it is one that is discussed in great detail when discussing security issues in the developing world. In particular, on the subject of malnutrition, the need for clean water, and the need for adequate hospitals and health care facilities to those who may not have access to those institutions. William Aldis (2008) and Laurie Garrett (2007) are two scholars that add to the topic of global health and global security. In Aldis' (2008) piece, he discusses the, once more, vague definition given to health security and its changing nature that is

dependent upon whether or not the discussion is taking place for the developed world or the developing world. The crux of his argument being that these inconsistencies in definition have caused strife, confusion, and consequences from a lack of cohesion.

The related topics of Aldis' (2008) piece lies in the definitions given by the developed and developing world. On the subject of the developing world, the discussion is related to standard discussions of humanitarian assistance and the need for adequate healthcare for its populace. UN workers and policy makers see the concept of health security as a broad topic that covers a wide array of subjects which includes access to adequate facilities and food and water that is untouched by pollutants (Aldis 2008).

The developed world, similar to the aforementioned discussion of human security co-option with national security, focuses on the threat of exterior menaces. For instance, the developed world policy makers put an emphasis on the protection from pandemic situations and outbreaks of communal diseases such as Ebola, Zika Virus, Malaria, and so forth. In addition to the fear of pandemics from exterior threats, there is also the threat of terrorist attacks threatening the health and well-being of those in the developed world (Aldis 2008).

Laurie Garrett's (2007) article connects with Aldis' (2008) piece in the area of developed world interests. Garrett's (2007) article is a critical analysis of the distribution of wealth in the area of global health security. She critiques the fact that most funds raised for the sake of global health are meant to combat high profile disease and cases, though they do not often see the funds permeated to the overall health concerns of the general populace. This creates a "stovepipe" type of system where money is funneled through one channel, but does not see any money given to the larger subject of public health.

The concept of developed world health security is one of protecting the security and well-being of those in its borders, no matter how miniscule the threat may be. The odds of a person in the developed world being the victim of a terrorist attack or contracting an illness that has reached pandemic levels in the developing world are relatively slim. However, a premium is placed on the subject of the developed world protecting itself from external threats as opposed to the general welfare of those living within its borders which is perceived to, at least, be at adequate levels for the general politic (Aldis 2008; Garrett 2007).

An example of a stated in the developed world focused on external threats while paying less attention to the needs of its own populace is the subject of the United States and public option healthcare systems. The subject of public option healthcare is a divisive topic in the United States that prefers the more capitalist friendly subject of privatized healthcare (Wehterell, Reyna, and Sadler 2013). While discussed to a broader extent in talks on the subject of public option healthcare debate, the subject of the noninsured or poorly insured American in the United States is a subject that is relatively left silent on discussion of health security and human security. The 2015 United States Health Report, published by the Center of Disease Control and National Center for Health Statistics, offered statistical data that stated that 13.3% of all Americans under the age of 65 do not have health insurance as of 2014. 22.7% of that 13% includes the population between the ages of 25 and 34 and 23% of those living under the poverty line have no health insurance (National Center for Health Statistics 2016). These statistics do not cover those who might not have adequate healthcare to maintain an adequate level of security from concepts of disease or injury.

While the subject of public option healthcare may or may not offer a solution to the subject of health security (Wetherell, Reyna, and Sadler 2013), the subject of the uninsured and

poorly insured in the western developed world like the United States displays a need for health security of people within the developed world that is ignored by the state in lieu of subjects of national security which is to protect its borders from pandemics as well as potential terrorist threats.

Environmental Security

Environmental security is the focus on the healthy physical environmental surrounding the individual. The HDR (1994) details threats such as pollution, industrial waste, carcinogens, and environmental catastrophes as potential causes to environmental insecurity. While the focus of the environment and the protection of the environment is at the heart of "environmental security," the definition remains as challenging to define as the other aspects of human security. Nina Græger (1996) opens this discussion, placing it in two separate camps. The first of which labels environmental security as an area of "high politics" and brought to light the urgency for the human race to protect the environment from human progression (Græger 1996). The other subject, while still focusing on the protection of the environment, worries of the privatization and secularization of environmental issues, thus limiting what can be accomplished to a strictly privatized individual basis (Græger 1996). The conclusion of Græger's (1996) claims is that, while the definition remains ambiguous, the discussion of environmental politics in the area of human security brings to light issues of environmental problems brought on by pollution, overpopulation, and overconsumption of resources.

Despite the ambiguous nature of the environmental security definition (Græger 1996), the generally agreed upon aspect of environmental security is a healthy environment means an increase in environmental security. Similar to political security, environmental security is attached part and parcel with the state action and inaction: while secularized concepts of

environmental protection exist, most of which are attached to how the state and interstate organizations implement policy geared towards protecting the environment (Græger 1996; Newman 2010).

While historically environmental security has been an issue of state policy making since the Montreal Protocol and the more ambitious Kyoto Protocols, environmental security has suffered recent backsliding with the rise of neo-conservatism and populist movements. Current political leaders, such as President Donald Trump, have begun implementing executive orders backsliding on former President Obama's environmental executive orders and enforced regulations on the Environmental Protection Agency, including a media blackout on the agency (Davenport 2017; Dennis and Eilperin 2017).

If the definition of environmental security is in line with the initial Human Development Report (1994), it is the role of the state, and by extension interstate organizations, to ensure a clean and healthy environment to its body politic. Rollbacks on environmental policies and silencing of those with environmental expertise could potentially mean a breach in environmental security to the general populace.

Personal Security

Personal security, as stated by the HDR as one of the more *sui generis* aspects of human security, is the security of the individual from acts of violence. A point is made that, no matter the geographical location of the individual, all individuals faces the threat of violence on a day to day basis that include "threats from the state, threats from other states, threats from other groups of people, threats from individuals, threats directed against women, threats directed at children

based on vulnerability or dependence, and finally the threat to the self (Human Development Report 1994 pg. 30).

The subject of personal security has evolved over the course of the years as other societies have continued to modernize, stripping away the concepts of genital mutilation and other cultural practices that may be physically mutilating (Human Development Report 1994). While the subject of personal security is covered to great extent by political scholars in order to ascertain the threat that the individual faces from exterior forces (Acharya 2001; Caromody 2005; Khong 2001), the subject has not, however, extended to the role of the state or how the state responds to personal security threats. The general consensus from the developed states, particularly, after 9/11 has been one that focuses on the elevation of personal security through means of increasing national security (Carmody 2005).

While the threat of exterior state, and by extension terrorist organizations, represents an aspect of personal security, it does not encompass all aspects personal security. As Acharya (2001) and the HDR (1994) detail, personal security is the security of the individual from violence that includes exterior and interior threats. While national security does attempt to alleviate these threats, thus an accomplishment of the state, to deny the failings of the interior on members of its own population is a failing at providing personal security to the population.

Populations in the developed world that do not fall into the category of the "cisgender white male" face personal security threats from the exterior of the state as well as threats from the interior. Those classified as members of the black community face threat of racial discrimination and threat of violence from police presence on a day-to-day basis as well as having their rights stripped away under the disguise of meritocracy, egalitarianism, and silently enforced white supremacy (Alexander 2012; Taylor 2016). Women, of all races, are still subject

to misogyny and forced into a patriarchal system that puts a premium on the concept of masculinity as opposed to femininity (Pateman 1986; Taylor 2004). Those who are transgender or are a gender identity that is not perceived as one of the societal norms face a myriad of persecution and prejudice from society that includes threats of violence, physical attacks, verbal abuse, non-public acceptance, and even murder (Connell 2012).

The definition of personal security is the security of the individual from external forces. (Human Development Report 1994). This lends itself to a broad cosmopolitan understanding that all people who suffer from insecurity due to external forces have their personal security infringed upon. While state apparatuses in the developed world push the concept of national interest as a means of enhancing personal security, they do not challenge the societal structure of racism (Mills 1997), sexism (Pateman 1986), and homophobia/transphobia, and fail to provide personal security to those who do not fit in the dominant white patriarchal system.

Community Security

Community security, as described by the Human Development Report (1994), is security maintained through the membership of a group such as a family unit, an ethnic group, a racial group, cultural identity, and/or national identity. As such, the HDR offers a plethora of various community security violations that includes both the developing and developed world. These examples include genital mutilation enforced by cultural norms and family members in Sub-Saharan Africa as well as persecution of indigenous people in Canada who are six times more likely to be murdered than other Canadians. They also include ethnic strife and turmoil within state borders as another threat to community insecurity. These discussions include such as inter-ethnic conflict in Yugoslavia and Sri Lanka as a threat to community security.

Community security and the failings of the state is a subject of interest in political rhetoric and discourse today. It is, however, shielded and co-opted under the discussion of diaspora and national security. The Syrian Refugee crisis has come part and parcel with concepts of right wing nationalism and populism. In the instance of the failings of the state, the subject of community security is not only failure to protect the wellbeing of Muslim followers within the developed states, it is now certain states that are actively causing community insecurity. Right wing populist movements such as Brexit, the election of President Donald Trump, the rising interest of Marine le Pen in France, Viktor Orban's government in Hungary, and Beata Szydło's Poland have treated the concept of Muslim refugees and Muslim populations as invading ethnic tension and thus it is in the interest of national security to remove the ethnic tension to protect the community security of their populations. By doing so, this also decreases the community security of the Muslim community. In the case of present day community security, the state not only fails to provide community security, it is the primary cause of community insecurity for those that do not fall in line with the right wing populist movements.

Political Security

The final sub-division of human security is the subject of political security. Political security is, considered by the Human Development Report (1994), as "one of the most important aspects of human security is that people should be able to live in society that honors their basic human rights." (Human Development Report 1994 pg. 32). In the topic of political security, the HDR lists repressing state apparatuses as the leading cause of political insecurity. It, not only includes, repressing individuals in the North Africa, Western Asia, and Southern Asia as areas that suffer from repressive state apparatuses, it also included institutions such as the police in

both Eastern and Western Europe that can act as an oppressor over certain groups of people, in particular those of differing ethnicity (Human Development Report 1994).

Political security, while being considered one of the more important subjects of human security (Human Development Report 1994), it is an area of strong contention, particularly due to the fact that political insecurity is inherently connected to the failings of a state to offer security to its population. Unlike the other forms of human security that can be caused by the failing of a state directly or indirectly, the presence of the state and its appendages is the sole culprit to why someone's political security might be threatened.

As such, the typical topic of debate has not wavered in its definition that assumes a state's fault in providing an environment that creates and protects the human rights of its populace. The subject of political insecurity turns towards the concepts of those who do not hold power over those who do have power in the political society. As such, in the developed world, challenges to racial issues and gender issues are the subjects that carry the most weight behind the subject of how the state is failing to provide security to its population (Alexander 2012; Lopez 2006; Taylor 2016).

On the subject of racial relations, the riots in Ferguson and Baltimore and the overarching Black Lives Matter movement has marked a moment in American history that pushes back on the political insecurity perpetrated by the American police system (Taylor 2016). While reactionary movements such as the Blue Lives Matter and All Lives Matter movements have been established as a means of enforcing the status quo of white supremacy, Black Lives Matter has been a display of a political apparatuses apathy against the concept of protecting its civilians from potential human rights abuses (Taylor 2016).

The subject of the political insecurity of the American black individual is not a recent phenomenon. While popular rhetoric would state that systemic racism died during the civil rights movement and now racism is only resigned to fanatical groups such as the KKK, the historical narrative tells a different tale of a political system built on racial domination and a premium placed on what it means to be white (Lopez 2006; Mills 1997; Roediger 1991). The historical narrative of civil rights and black rights has seen the American political system decrease the security of the black population through means of racial discrimination and legitimizing legal processes meant to put a premium on the concept of whiteness (Lopez 2006; Roediger 1991). This is compounded with a justice system and "War on Drugs" designed to target and maintain segregation of the black population from the white population, keeping nearly 30% of the black male population circulating through the prison structure (Alexander 2012).

An even more recent example of political security violations by developed states is the Syrian Refugee Crisis. With refugees fleeing the war-torn Syria, they have chosen to seek asylum in Europe as well as North America. While certain states have been accepting of the refugees while other states have seen a rise in right wing populist rhetoric. The recent election of Donald Trump, the rise of Marine le Pen in France, and Viktor Orban's Hungary have all taken strong stances against those who are Muslim. This has taken the disguise of national security concerns meant to protect the well-being of the politic. While this rise may be intended to increase the political and personal security of the individual in these countries, it also decreases the political security of Muslims who are in citizens of that particular state as well as those who are attempting to seek asylum from the Syrian Civil War.

The Alterations Made by 9/11 and the Excluded Other

The previous section has been a discussion on the expected role of the state as detailed by the definitions given by the 1994 Human Development Report, how that view has changed since the initial publication, and how these states have failed at providing aspects of human security in each subsection. A premium has been placed upon developed states, in particular, due to the fact that the subject of human security in the developing world is one that is discussed in significant extent, however the subject of human security violations in the developed world remains a study in need of some discussion.

While it can certainly be claimed that the subject of human security and the initial roots of the subject of human security were followed to a significant extent, the 9/11 Terrorist Attacks and the need for an increase in national security to combat terrorist threats abroad has either shelved the discussion among policy makers or has been co-opted by policy makers so that human security and national security go hand in hand with one another, particularly in community, personal, and political security (Carmody 2005; Welch 2009).

While the subject of national security and the need for protection against external threats is an aspect of human security that should, and is discussed, it represents only a small piece of a much larger puzzle. By focusing on such a streamlined and minor picture of human security, a larger piece of the contextual puzzle is lost to the discussion. There are those in the developed world that do not have adequate food security (FAO 2016; USDA 2016); There are those in the developed world without sufficient healthcare to maintain a healthy lifestyle free from insecurity (CDC 2016); Muslim communities are threatened in the developed world under the disguise of national security; environmental protection is at risk by developed state policy making; non-white, non-males, and those who do not adopt a heteronormative identity in developed worlds

suffer persecution and prejudice that decreases their personal and political security (Connell 2012; Taylor 2004; Taylor 2016).

Human security is not just a problem of the developing world or a problem that is connected to the welfare and national security of the state apparatus. It is a blanket term to encompass all aspects of human life and is a subject that can go unchecked or unquestioned for those who suffer in the developed world as well as the developing world. While this paper does not attempt to make a normative claim of what could be or what should be, it is a qualitative historical narrative of what has been done, what hasn't been done, and what was supposed to be done in regards to human security.

Addressing Critical Differences

Discussions of a more universalistic/cosmopolitan identity of human security as well as the role of the state in human security are not without its critics nor those of different scholarly thought. This section is meant to admit to the faults of the paper and respectfully respond to some of the critiques that may be raised by this paper.

The first of these critiques is the role of nongovernmental organizations and intergovernmental organizations in providing human security. The Human Development Report (1994) called upon a plethora of actors in the international system to adopt and champion policies that benefit the security of the individual as well as challenge societal norms that might be harmful to the security of others. However, this paper has offered little discussion on the role that NGOs and IGOs play in assisting human security discourse and implementation. The importance of both of NGO and IGO actors in providing human security to the general body politic cannot be denied or passed over. However, this paper has been a discussion and challenge

of the assumptions that states, particularly in the developed world, already adequately provide

human security to their politic which may or may not necessarily the case. While this discussion

of IGO and NGO influence could offer a plethora of valuable information, it is a subject that was

not covered in this paper.

The second of these critiques comes with the understanding of human security as a

universal definition. A universal definition of human security comes part and parcel with the idea

of conceptual stretching (Sartori 1970). The problem being the possibility of human security

becomes such a broad topic that it could potentially incorporate other facets of political thought

to the point that the question of: "Well, what is not involved in human security?" is raised. In

other words, that its definition is too large to accomplish any goals (Paris 2001). A second

argument towards this universal aspect of human security is some of the conceptual flaws

inherent in human security, more importantly, that securitizing issues and human beings do no

help the victims of these human security violations and instead just creates ideas of false hope

and misplaced priorities (Oberleitner 2004; Khong 2001). This article does acknowledge the

definition and understanding of human security is broad and does potentially run the risk of

descriptions such as conceptual stretching (Sartori 1970). This could reach a point that the

concept may be too broad to be relevant. Thus, the topic of discussion shifts instead to focus on

other discussions of human rights/humanitarian action as opposed to human security. A

challenge to this would be the discussion exposited in the aforementioned sections that human

rights discussion as well as humanitarian action both only represent two small pieces to an

overarching discussion of human security. In addition, both human rights and humanitarian

action have an inherent mentality of the western world assisting or imposing themselves upon the

nonwestern world (Barnett 2011; Carpenter 2010). Little action is paid those who might suffer

from human security issues that live in the western developed world as a result of other institutions putting a premium on helping the developing world instead of those in the developed world.

A universal understanding of human security assures that discussion of human security is not meant as a means of developed world influence on the developing world or altruist principles of those with helping those who do not have. Instead, human security encompasses all people whose security and lack of the fundamentals of life are protected and built upon. In regards to Khong's (2001) discussion of the securitization of human beings and issues bringing about false hope and poor priorities. While this article does not attempt to dissect the moral implications or quandaries of hope and misplaced priorities, it does not seem to be the case that bringing a subject such as human security provides any sort of false hope.

There is also the discussion of human rights, humanitarianism, as well as human security being an altogether liberal and western enterprise that might not be applicable to other cultures and their way of living. While human security is certainly a western created concept that came to be after the end of the Cold War by, predominantly, western actors (Human Development Report 1994); human security's broad and universalist understanding can become more applicable to a more universal culture as opposed to ideas and desires of western sensibilities. The concepts that every human has the right to food, life, health, a safe environment, and other basic collective goods does not remove it from liberal domination, however it does potentially mitigate the effects of liberal domination of nonwestern cultures.

The last area of contention, to be discussed in this paper is the potentially normative aspect of the discussion. This paper does not shy away from the fact that it takes on a normative narrative. This paper does focus on the idea of what has or has not been accomplished by the

entity of the state, it does also offer a brief description of what could be done in its place. While the normative aspects of what could be is certainly a point of discussion, the primary subject of the paper is the role that the state has played in providing, or not providing, human security to its politics, which remains the first and foremost discussion on the matter.

Conclusion

This article has challenged simultaneously the definition of human security, the definition of its subdivision as well as the state's role in providing human security. While the initial United Nations Human Development Report attempted to define human security as the need for security from the everyday trials and tribulations, the majority of scholarly research on the subject of human security as well as the policy put forth by states and state leaders has co-opted human security almost solely into discussions of humanitarianism and humanitarian aid directed at the developing world. Due to this co-option with western influence on the developing world, which gained significant relevance after the 9/11 Terrorist Attacks, scholars and policy makers focused on providing human security have obfuscated the population in the developed world that still suffer from human insecurity. While this article, by no means, is attempting to belittle the security and insecurity felt in the developing world, its non-cosmopolitan focus has excluded a significant part of the human population from its discussion by focusing on one section of the world. It is akin to the idea that if the focus is solely on helping the five million people across the ocean or in the global south, the five thousand people living next door are left out of the picture.

Human security, at its roots, was imbued with a universal definition that incorporates both the developed world as well as the developing world. While this cosmopolitan definition could mean a lack of precise definition, excessive streamlining leads to the loss of the

definition's original aims that all humans have the right to feel secure in their day to day

activities, regardless of the geographical location they were born to.

Work Cited

Acharya, Amitav. 2001. "Human Security: East versus West." *International Journal.* 56. 3. 442-460.

Aldis, William. 2008. "Health Security as a Public Health Concept: a Critical Analysis." *Health and Policy Planning.* 23. 6. 369-375

Alexander, Michelle. 2012. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness.* The New Press. New York. NY.

Barnett, Michael. 2011. *The Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism.* Cornell University Press. Ithaca. NY.

Cashman, Greg. 2004. *What Causes War? An Introduction to Theories of International Conflict.* Rowan & Littlefield Publishing. Lanham. MD.

Carmody, Pádraig. 2005. "Transforming Globalization and Security: Africa and America Post-9/11" *Africa Today.* 52. 1. 97-120

Carpenter, R. Charli. 2010. "Governing the Global Agenda: "Gatekeepers" and "Issue Adoption" in Transnational Advocacy Networks." *Who Governs the Globe.* 202-237.

Connell, Raewyn. 2012. "Transsexual Women and Feminist Thought: Toward New Understanding and New Politics." *Signs.* 37. 4. 857-881

Conteh-Morgan, Earl. 2005. Peacebuilding and Human Security: A Constructivist Perspective." *International Journal of Peace Studies.* 10. 1. 69-86.

Davenport, Coral. 2017. "Trump Plans to Begin EPA Rollback with Order on Clean Water." *New York Times.* Web. Published: 2/28/2017 Accessed: 3/1/2017

Dennis, Brady and Juliet Eilperin. 2017. "Trump Administration Tells EPA to Freeze All Grants, Contracts." *The Washington Post.* Web. Published: 1/24/2017 Accessed: 3/1/2017

Faridi, Rushad and Syed Naimul Wadood. 2010. "An Econometric Assessment of Household Food Security in Bangladesh." *The Bangladesh Development Studies.* 33. 3. 97-111

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. 2015. "The State of Food Insecurity in the World."

Garrett, Laurie. 2007. "The Challenge of Global Health." *Foreign Affairs.* Internet.

Græger, Nina. 1996. "Environmental Security?" *Journal of Peace Research.* Vv. 1. 109-116

Grayson, Kyle. 2009. "Critical Perspectives on Human Security." *International Studies Review.* 11. 3. 626-628.

Jiang, Tingsong. 2008. *Agriculture and Food Security in China.* "WTO Accession and Food Security in China." ANU Press. 183-202

Kannan, KP, S Mahendra Dev, and Alakh Narain Sharma. 2000. "Concerns of Food Security." *Economic and Political Weekly.* 35. 45. 3919-3922

King, Gary and Christopher J.L. Murray. 2001-2002. "Rethinking Human Security." *Political Science Quarterly.* 116. 4. 585-610.

Khong, Yuen Foong. "Human Security: A Shotgun Approach to Alleviating Human Misery?" *Global Governance.* 7.3. 231-236.

Lopez, Ian Haney. 2006. *White by Law.* New York University Press. New York. NY.

MacArthur, Julie. 2008. "A Responsibility to Rethink? Challenging Paradigms in Human Security." *International Journal.* 63. 2. 422-443.

Martin, Mary and Taylor Owen. 2010. "The Second Generation of Human Security: Lessons from the UN and EU Experience." *International Affairs.* 86. 1. 211-224

Maxwell, Simon and Marisol Smith. 1992. "Household Food Security: a Conceptual Review." *Household Food Security: Concepts, Indicators, Measurements: A Technical Review.* New York and Rome: UNICEF and IF AD.

Mearsheimer, John J. 2003. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics.* Cornell University Press. Ithaca. NY.

Mills, Charles W. 1997. *The Racial Contract.* Cornell University Press. Ithaca. NY.

National Center for Health Statistices. 2016. *Health, United States, 2015: With Special Feature on Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities.* Hyattsville, MD.

Newman, Edward. 2010. "Critical Human Security Studies." *Review of International Studies.* 36. 1. 77-94

Oberleitner, Gerd. 2005. "Human Security: A Challenge to International Law?" *Global Governance.* 11.2. 185-203.

Paris, Roland. 2001. "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?" *International Security.* 26.2. 87-102.

Pateman, Carole. 1988. *The Sexual Contract.* Stanford University Press. California. CA

Roediger, David. 1991. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class.* Verso Press. New York. NY.

Roberts, David. 2005. "Empowering the Human Security Debate: Making It Coherent and Meaningful." *International Journal on World Peace.* 22. 4. 3-16

Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *The American Political Science Review.* 64. 4. 1033-1053

Thede, Nancy. 2008. "Human Security, Democracy, and Development in the Americas: The Washington Consensus Redux?" *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies.* 33.54. 33-56.

Taylor, Keenga-Yamahtta. 2016. *#BlackLivesMatter to Black Liberation.* Haymarket Books. Chicago. IL.

Taylor, Vivian. 2004. "From State Security to Human Security and Gender Justice." *Empowering Women for Gender Equity.* 59. 65-70

Tsai, Yu-tai. 2009. "The Emergence of Human Security: A Constructivist View." *International Journal of Peace Studies.* 14. 2. 19-33.

United Nations Development Program (1994). "Human Development Report," *United Nations Development Program.* Oxford University Press. New York. NY. 22-44

United States Department of Agriculture. 2016. "Key Statistics and Graphics: Food Security Status of US Households in 2015."

Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics.* Cambridge University Press. Cambridge. NY.

Welch, Michael. 2009. "A Post-9/11 World." *Crimes of Power & State of Impunity.* Rutgers University Press. 3-14

Wetherall, Geoffrey, Christine Reyna, and Melody Sadler. 2013. "Public Option Versus the Market: Perceived Value Violations Drive Opposition to Healthcare Reform." *Political Psychology.* 34. 1. 43-66