

## Round Table Reflections / General Discussion

Dr. Chantana:

“Okay, welcome back to the last session. I think after listening to different panels maybe we should do some kind of refining on what has been discussed and try to find what does the last two days mean and what we are moving towards. I’d like to come back to the original question. You don’t necessarily have to follow it but I’d like to raise it again: at this conference, Mainstreaming Human Security, what does it take to challenge the traditional security discourse or do we need to do it at all? Have we a clear understanding of the threat and understanding of the people. And the last question is: can the existing system of governance handle the emerging threats to mankind? Maybe the different panels can discuss these different questions. I have not invited all the panel conveners – otherwise it would take forever – only some key aspects that cover more or less nationality as well. So I have invited Dr. [Teresa S. Encarnacion] and Dr. [Yoichi Mine] from Osaka University, Teresa from Third World Studies in Philippines. And then Dr. [Chandan Sengupta] from TISS, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, also Dr. Mike Hayes from Human Rights and Social Development and Dr. [Imtiyaz Yusuf] from Assumption University. I think we should start in the order of Dr. Teresa and then Dr. Chandan. Then Mike, Yusuf, and then Mine. I’m just trying to order the level of aspects that you might want to address. So I would like to ask each convener to spend five minutes and then reflect on the past day and a half.”

Dr. Teresa S. Encarnacion:

“Thank you Chantana. Our title was on Critical Assessment of Human Security, with five papers presented. Bennett Richardson basically spoke on the debate on defining human security, freedom from fear, freedom from want, which we discussed in the other panels. There seems to be a convergence but because of the war on terror it seems to have been pushed to more traditional security concerns. Herman Kraft’s presented a book on ASEAN as a venue for mainstreaming human security while Aries A. Arugay pointed to reforms, for example, security sector reforms in the Philippines which compliment efforts to mainstream human security. Raymond Quilop’s wrote about human security and how you find its principles in the national security program of the Filipino government. Zarina Othman’s book on human security showed us how Islam can be used to mainstream human security.

So the first question: what does it take to challenge the traditional security discourse? We found that to challenge it we really need to define what human security is. Should it be a debate on freedom from fear or freedom from want, or should it be determined by the communities themselves? So basically what are the conditions on-the-ground? Although there seems to be a preference to focus on socio-economic needs, there’s also the reality that, in some communities, the immediate problem is the freedom from fear not in the sense that it will require the peace keeping missions which Canada associates with its human security prospective. But you have a lot of pockets of armed violence, armed conflicts, for example in the Philippines you may have clan wars in Muslim Mindonao. Surveys shows that more people die in clan wars than in military encounters with communists or Muslim insurgencies. The issue of small arms has also caused a lot of deaths. So part of defining it is also the challenge of distinguishing human

security from human rights. They go together but they are conceptually different. You cannot be secure if your rights are not secure. At the same time human security seems still to be in the shadow of human rights.

Second is the challenge of distinguishing human security from human development. A study [Zarina Othman] pointed out in Malaysia human development is used interchangeable with human security. Human security provides the environment where human development is possible and we look at human security therefore as a threat-based approach while human development is more long-term.

Another issue in the definition is the point of reference. Canadian and Japanese perspectives focus on the strengthening of individual empowerment rather than community empowerment as we found in the keynote speech particularly of Professor Vitit. So is the focus on the individual a western concept? By focusing on the community are we falling into the trap of the Asian values concept debate or do we use individuals as the reference point to his or her own community. Second, the coverage of human security is very broad. There is a need to prioritize it in regards to its implementation. Should the communities concerned be the ones to define this? For example, in the session this morning – as Dr. Chaiwat pointed out – what are the weights to be given? Then there is also the issue of implementing human security where there may be a gap between theory and practice. Maybe this brings about a problem in the definition. Security is a policy issue. When you talk about issues of insecurity, to what extent is the state addressing things which people find threatening? When ASEAN raises issues of human security are they in connection with the grassroots community? Policies must conform to the realities on the ground. In defining human security, Japan has put together a comprehensive perspective of human security which encompasses non-traditional areas, political stability, environmental degradation but sometimes a practice of the Japanese government does not conform to this. For example, the Filipino government is currently pushing for the Japan-Philippine Economic Partnership Agreement, or JAPEPA, but there is a movement in the Philippines to boycott JAPEPA because it pointed out that the ratification of the agreement will bring toxic waste from Japan to the Philippines.

So in the second question, do we have a clear understanding of the complexity of the threats to the people? Human security is perceived to address structural violence. How can it therefore be used to address the bigger problem of [inaudible] domination which has perpetrated the big gap between rich and poor in Asian societies and the social-economic inequalities that have brought about political tensions? Human security does not also address the problems of international financial institutions which have been brought by IFIs like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the World Trade Organizations which have created developing particularly neo-liberalism paradigms which has brought about an increasing gap between rich and poor within and amongst societies. Most ailing is the Asian financial crisis which illustrates the failure of such a paradigm. So this has spawned anti-globalization movements in Asia and other parts of the world. Do we address these two human security aspects with social safety nets as pointed out by Dr. Surin which some look to be a band-aid approach. But even then such band-aid approaches are not accepted by a number of ASEAN countries. Then I thought complexity of the threats comes also when regional concerns are linked with the war on terror. For example, the issue of border trafficking, a human security issue – rights of women and children. But what has happened is that states have also adopted it as a way

of preventing terrorists from going from one country to another. So here we see the shifting from freedom of want to freedom from fear and also the shifting to traditional concepts of security. To what extent can grassroots communities identify with this ASEAN concern? So again going back to the state of human security and war and terror, is it positive or negative? Again the framework with an example: the framework of human security in Japanese ODA programs have focused on economic vulnerability so freedom from want. But, in practice, Japanese ODA is also part of peace-building efforts which are also linked to the war on terror thus focusing it, pushing it to a more traditional concept of security.

Lastly, can the existing system of governance handle the existing threats to mankind? We noted donor agencies are the ones defining human security. Canada and Japan has been on the forefront and, in one concern, brought up a top-down donor driven approach. And secondly, in the Philippine context, the primacy of the state with regards to defining human security is also a top-down approach. So is this attuned more to the needs of the communities? You also have cooperation on the concept of human security, as in the Philippines, they have an anti-terror law which is referred to as the human security act. So human security is often confused with the war on terror. What has also emerged with this is the role of the military. The military has integrated concepts of human security into its national security framework. They have also gone to the extent of implementing some of these with socio-civic activities. Their major aim is to end the insurgencies in the country, namely communist, Muslim insurgencies, and that which is spawned by the war on terror. Are we actually expanding or empowering the military? Should these anti-insurgencies be viewed or perpetrated as part of the mainstreaming of human security? As pointed out in the panel this morning, human security then does not become an end it becomes a means towards a particular end. So these are not mainstreaming human security acts but are state functions. But again the role of military becomes important in other reforms that are related to mainstreaming human security like the security sector reforms which also speak on development, democratic governance and sustainable peace. Maybe the last two points, mainstreaming of human security also comes at the level, at the regional level, which is ASEAN. ASEAN, as pointed out, is in the process of changing, particularly with its documents. For example, we have the emergence of the ASEAN charter. On the one hand, some say that ASEAN is elitist, it does not have real connections with the grassroots communities but it shows that it has the capacity to pull resources and civil society accountable to this. But again it's a top-down approach. It is also noted that ASEAN comes together when you have national problems that reach regional concerns, like SARS, energy crisis, but if these problems don't go beyond the national, for example hunger, poverty, extrajudicial killings, ASEAN is quiet. In all of this, what has been observed is the weakness of civil society. Conceptualization has been left mainly to the state and, ironically, the military to implement these standards. Lastly, a perspective that was brought in, the role of religion, particularly Islam, which also deals with concepts of human security including development, human rights and justice, so we have the issue of a faith-based approach to mainstreaming human security. Thank you very much."

Dr. Chantana:

“Thank you. Teresa is the only one of the conveners who is well-prepared. Therefore she has taken us on a bullet train. Anyway, we can come back later if you didn’t catch what she mentioned. The second, may I invite Professor Chandan.”

Dr. Chandan Sengupta:

“Let me take this opportunity, first of all, to thank you Dr. Chantana and all of you at Chulalongkorn University for inviting us to organize a panel and participate in this extremely important and stimulating colloquium in this part of the world. On behalf of the Tata Institute, my colleagues and myself, I thank you once again for inviting us. We organized the panel Rethinking Rural Development and apparently this panel came out to be one of the largest panels to be divided into two parts. We had a contingent of ten paper presenters. Yesterday we had one group of colleagues presenting their papers and today we had the other part completed. When we were thinking about organizing the panel, to be very frank with you all, the basic idea was to interrogate the whole issue of human security, not as much as a concept but also as a tool for empirical investigation and also as an intervention strategy. How much of the human security agenda has already been able to accommodate the concerns about the millions of people, particularly in the Asian region, which is predominantly agrarian, that is the majority of the people not only live in the rural areas but also depend on the activities connected to land and other activities in the rural areas. And because these are the [inaudible] areas which are under tremendous threat under the [inaudible] development we thought that the one major concern from this part of the globe was to really address the issues of the rural scenarios and situate the rural context, the rural issues in the context of human security. That was the assumption, or the conspiracy or strategy you might say, of really accepting this particular panel under the nomenclature of Rethinking Rural Development. We had ten papers, but not all of the ten papers were from the Tata Institute, although the Tata Institute took the lead presenting six papers, including the conveners – the initial idea was that the conveners had the Brahmanical right not to present the paper and we thought that the conveners could also be as proactive as any other presenter so this was the panel where both the conveners, me and my colleague, Dr. Ritambhara Hebbar, as well as the paper presenters. So including all of us there are six from Tata Institute and ten other colleagues from other regions including Afghanistan and Cambodia. In all, we had two good papers from Cambodia, one from Indonesia and another on Afghanistan. The range of issues were all discussed mostly under the rural canvas. The issues range from multiple levels of vulnerability starting from India, the farmer suicides, one of the very important critical issues almost threatening the whole very issue of the human security agenda. When we are talking in terms of growth and other kind of development issues there are millions of farmers in that part of the world which are now trying to catch up with the developed world, that is India. The farmer suicides are one of the most important and critical issues and reflect the vulnerabilities of the most active [inaudible]. So those are the issues, then there are issues on education on the actual interventions, skilled development – that is the issues on social opportunities, making people capable of not only having access to goods but also able to enjoy elements of human security. Everything was within the canvas of the rural scenario. This will be the paper, and as I said, one of the major objectives of the paper of the panel was to see what was happening in the countries like India in terms of

rural development and rural intervention. How much are they really affected? What has been the impact and implications and if we want to mainstream the human security agenda and where does rural India fit in? That was the major objective. And we found that what has been happening currently in places like India, particularly as far as rural India is concerned, there are lots of rural development packages. In many other countries in Asia, there are lots of rural development programs but learned hunger is not inside nowhere, the current hunger is not inside, on the contrary, there have been reinforcements of the existing inequities because as you know India is highly stratified – it is not only an agrarian country, but also highly socially stratified along the class and the tribe lines. And these are the most vulnerable groups and existing inequities take various forms. So if any attempts to improve the condition of the inequities, if those forces really reinforce the existing inequities then there is a problem. So these are some of the issues that we dealt with and we tried to look at how best we are able to do that in the pattern that is emerging. So this was our panel. But apart from the panel Dr. Chantana was also interested to know that in addition to the panels whether you have any personal or individual reflection. I can share with you the current discussion that goes on amongst some of us at the institute about the [inaudible] the endangerment of human security. The question is whether there is any possibility or there can be ways to rescue the human security agenda or human security programs from the clutches of neo-liberal paradigm development. This paradigm will not allow us to develop certain safety measures in terms of welfare measures. We have seen during the evaluation of the rural development program that even though it benefited some people it could only touch a tiny minority within a vast majority. And the idea is that whether the forces that be, the agents of the neo-liberal paradigm development, state included, have any right really to see that the resources that traditionally the people have been enjoying, the activities to which people have their own accesses, whether the state has any right to decide whether they can be, with the use of the eminent domain and learned acquisition and other kind of measures can be displaced and compensated and what is the logic of the compensation, how much the compensation and whether the compensation is really enough to meet the real needs of the these people. And where does this whole process of development fit into the whole issue of freedom from fear and freedom from want? This was the background under which we took up this particular team in order to interrogate or to reflect upon the human security framework to see whether it would really need an alternative way to look at it.

That is on how to deal with it. This is a big question and we started with the big question. We have not been able to come out with any answer but that was the question we started with. We thought this was the time where there is a role of social scientists to play. They should come together to make assessments and reassessment in order to prepare a bulleting of how best we can work together and understand this process well and find out whether we can really propose an alternative. So that was the academic perspective. This was enough so that we got into this particular workshop and, during the two hour panel; we tried to raise these issues. We may not have been successful but we thought would be able to raise some issues and questions and that was our objective.”

Dr. Mike Hayes:

“I’m not going to summarize – I was on the Human Rights and Democracy panel and briefly I don’t want to look in detail at the papers. They were very interesting papers, but of a very broad category, from colonial history in Pakistan to the Maoist insurgency and disappearances in Nepal to Asian values and indigenous rights and there’s no way that I can really bring all those together into a cohesive summary. What I will do is pick out some points that were raised or relevant from the discussion.

The first one, we all tend to know what human security was and there was no argument about the concept of human security. Some of us came along with books to show including bibliographies on what human security was. But a comment was made that the bibliography varies a lot from the reality. This wasn’t from my panel it was from another panel but that’s a very good idea because we know what it is but we don’t know what to do about it. Even from many of the papers today it’s still something that people are grappling about: ‘how do we do human security’? And I think this is made complex in a couple of ways. Firstly, human security is predominantly a government and academic area. In terms of civil society organizations or NGOs, you can probably count on one hand the number of human security NGOs there are. In terms developing programmatic actions with human security it is still a very small field. I don’t know about that many international organizations devoting money to human security programs. They may be devoting money to human security government initiatives or academic conferences like this but in terms of programmatic action it is quite small. In that case when we’re talking about mainstreaming I think this is the first time I’ve heard the idea of mainstreaming human security because it still has such a long way to go in the sense of getting a range of – not just conceptual – but also practical and programmatic issues on board.

The next concern about human security comes out of when we start to look at the relationship between human rights and human security. And I think there’s a bit of danger when using these as interchangeable concepts because I think human security and human rights do collaborate but in other aspects they do compete. And I’ll just raise three brief points that should be flagged about this relationship between human rights and human security.

Firstly, one of the things about human security is that it’s a reductionism of human rights. And human rights now we have nine international treaties – the treaties are being added every year like this year we have people with disabilities and we have the Enforced Disappearances Treaty, we’ve got the draft Declarations of Indigenous Rights. Human Rights is a growing international policy law area. When we start talking about human security, back to the very basics freedom from want, freedom from need, which were the 1941 announcements by Truman, pre-human rights, it seems like we’re going backwards not saying human right things that expand to other areas, we’re saying ‘well let’s go back to the basics and just look after these important things and all the other stuff is just a bit too much or a bit too difficult’. And it starts losing the complexity of the interdependence or the interrelationship between various rights.

The second area is that human security can depoliticize human rights. I still think we should discuss human security seriously. But I think we should discuss human security in a way which can address these concerns to make sure that we’re not using this to reduce human rights, we’re not using this to depoliticize human rights. We often see that particularly ASEAN governments start using human security because it depoliticizes

human rights. Certainly human rights don't become legal, they just become like policy initiatives. Or human security just becomes some title of some government post rather than being something that is legally enforceable. I think this is one thing that we have to make sure that human security doesn't depoliticize these issues.

Lastly the concern is that we have to make sure that human security doesn't start defusing these ideas of human rights. I think one thing about this conference is that it can be difficult to determine what isn't human security. Really the idea can be so expansive that it's like a party that everyone is invited to. And that can be good but if we want to have it mainstream we can't have it mainstream where everything comes along. The other problem with defusing is that it can become a kind of a casual fault – like we say when things go wrong, the governments blame globalization, western capitalism, the climate change or colonialism..."[Tape ends]

Dr. Mike Hayes [Continued from previous tape]:

“...we have to make sure that human security doesn't do those kinds of things. I was asked to respond to three questions and I'll do this rather quickly because I know it's more productive that we get the discussion going. The first one is how to challenge judicial security and I have a couple of little points about that. I think we should stop thinking that it is always the state's fault. Often it is, and the state is always wrong. But often there are other areas where there are things that can be fixed. In our first panel yesterday morning one of the big issues that came up was repressive agrarian regimes. And it seems that we tend to forget that there are social structures, there are cultural structures which can be traditional security threats to people. The second thing about traditional security threats is that we also shouldn't forget that the state use traditional security threats and the states can even use human security itself in order to increase or decrease levels of freedom. So, in the name of human security, we can find reductions of freedom and that's a contradiction – we don't want that to occur.

The next question is do we understand the complexity of the threats? My response to that is that complex threats are always going to need complex responses. And complex responses need to have issues of multilateralism involved, the need to look at it from the community to national to regional to global levels, need to be multidimensional in their responses. This is one of the natures of the difficulty of what we're talking about: we can't start reducing this to simple responses when we talk about very complex threats.

And the last question regarding whether our governments can manage the threats – the answer to that is just 'no'. It can't manage because we should expect us to manage and it shouldn't have to manage on its own. I'll leave it at that.”

Dr. Imtiyaz Yusuf:

“In the panel on human security in the context of violence and conflict I'm going to make the presentations of the panel in light of the three questions which were asked. From the papers presented it seems that the traditional concept of security is still challenging, especially in conflict areas and conflict zones and in conflict cases. Anything can happen – the states are very much concerned about national security. So it is interesting that in the cases of Indonesia and Sri Lanka natural disasters enable for the implementation of human security measures more easily where geography and human security were interacting. The three papers on southern Thailand showed that the human

security approach is still remote from application in southern Thailand. There is more of a need to emphasize cultural security than political and social security. The paper on gun control in the Philippines illustrated that the proliferation of certain guns needs to be handled with peace zones and legal mechanisms. It is interesting the case of the Aceh Tsunami there was an effort by International Military Corporation for taking up civilian activities. This may be exceptional to the case of Aceh more than other areas because of the special character of the Japanese security forces. On the second question, all papers illustrated that understanding the complexion of threats to the people is still a continuing challenge to the human security approach. It needs more concrete and practical attention. And on the third question, existing systems of governments have either followed the trend of human security by establishing a ministry – though this does not go far. It is more of a name than an action. So there is a need for the promotion of the concept of human security at a more general level in a practical dimension. This might not happen soon in Asia because the conflicts in Asia are still local and ethnic; they are not ideological conflicts as those in the case of the Cold War. There it was easy to propagate the concept of human security after the Cold War era but it is not the same situation in Asia for the propagation of human dimension of security. So if we're talking about the mainstreaming of the human security in Asia I think it still has a long way to go before it will become a generalized concept and an approach to security in a new manner. Thank you very much.”

Dr. Chantana:

“Professor Mine.”

Dr. Yoichi Mine:

“Thank you very much, Chantana. I have quickly drafted a paper which I'm going to read. Taking this opportunity drawing on the findings of my panel on education research and networking, in addition to other panels, I would like to talk about three crucial linkages in human security as well as the significance of mainstreaming human security by means of networking. Those linkages are, first, the linkage of concept; second, the linkage of reason; and third, the linkage of action.

First let me start with the conceptual linkage. Honestly speaking, human security still tends to be treated with bewilderment and caution in many quarters. On the one hand, some security fundamentalists exploit the concept to justify the war on terror. If you wave a flag of human security, you run the risk of being regarded that you are in the securitization camp of right wingers of George Bush. On the other hand, economic growth fundamentalists generally dislike the concept because of the affinity of human security with social security. If you endorse the volley of human security you run the risk of being labeled as an old, wealth-oriented social democrat. In reality, human security was born as one of the human triad, in my view; the human triad: human rights, human development, and human security. Discussion about the security is important, but I think we also have to discuss the human element. However, this is largely due to such an abuse of the concept and the result of labeling politics of the right and the left. The concept of human security has not been given necessary attention leaving it without substantial theoretical ground to date compared to the other two siblings of the triplet, in spite of the fact that the very process of neo-liberal securitization and economic globalization is



drawing more people – migrants, trafficked women, refugees, minorities, and other vulnerable people – into the state of serious human insecurity. Here is our challenge: we, professional researchers and action researchers, are now expected to revitalize and elaborate the concept of human security, eliminating carefully the conceptual linkage and complementarity of human security and human development, and between human security and human rights, as well as between human security and related vernacular values in Asia. We should not be reductionists – human security is not a derivative of rights nor development. We try to link those concepts precisely because those are different concepts. So there has been an array of insightful discussion about the definition of human security in this conference but I have got the impression that we could have more. I'm looking forward to the next forum.

Secondly I would like to address the regional linkage issue. Why is the regional cooperation for human security important? The reason is simple. The risks and the threats cross borders of nation-states. The conflicts and civil strife, the crack down on pro-democracy activists, emerging infectious diseases, natural disasters, human trafficking, economic crisis and so forth, have critical regional repercussions. But those risks have different characteristics. It appears useless for those who live in Nepal to worry about Tsunamis, and for those who live in Japan or in Korea to care about Malaria, for example. If so, why do we have to pay efforts to link up local initiatives on a region-wide scale? One possible answer is that there is ample room for us to learn from each other, from other regional ways of responding to emerging risks, the ways of enhancing problem-solving abilities which is called capacity development. Human securities are felt and experienced on the individual level, but the public actions to overcome risks and insecurities cannot but taking place collectively on the local, national, regional, and global levels.

Here comes the third linkage—the linkage of action. Academic institutions enjoy relative autonomy from the national framework of policy making and our common loyalty is directed primarily to knowledge and learning. As is such, we are in a good position to link up diverse experiences and actions for human security in the region providing an arena of mutual learning. As you know, big scale universities are composed of different faculties to achieve freedom from fear and freedom from want. We have to deal with both the physical and psychological insecurities. In order for us, academic researchers and action researchers, to make meaningful contributions to human security, it must try to integrate different perspectives of policy sciences, social sciences, and also humanities, including anthropology and historical study. And now, more and more people are getting concerned about the question of sustainability, the question of the inter-generational capacity of reproduction of human society and nature. Sustainable development is closely related to human security and thus a system that imposes a system of unbearable insecurity on people cannot be sustainable. Given the connection between sustainability and systemic insecurity, we may well try to invite more natural scientists to future networking events.

By way of conclusion, let me suggest one thing: why don't we continue our efforts of networking of human security in order to strengthen conceptual, regional and action linkages. The existing network of human security is mainly composed of national governments. I appreciate those initiatives, but given that human security is different from natural security, this seems anomalous. Where are the places for academic

institutions and civil society organizations? If there is no ready-made framework, why don't we set up our own places, by ourselves? I believe that the answer is definitely positive. Thank you very much."

Dr. Chantana:

"Thank you very much. I will not try to summarize what the conveners have just reported. I'm not sure whether my question that I'm about to raise is relevant anymore, after listening to all the conveners. Maybe it's premature to talk about those questions. I sense that the skepticism and reservation regarding the concept is still there. Approaches towards understanding it might be raised, maybe starting from understanding reality or playing with concepts. Agreement will be only one thing; problems are complex and it cuts across many other issues. I believe that language is very important. Language is a tool for thinking. If you don't have language or cannot invent it you might not be able to think as language enables you to expand your thinking. I think human security should still be something we should think about. I would like to open the discussion to the floor – whether you have some questions you want to raise, any reflections to any points raised by the conveners, or even from your own panel, we can also do so. We have until 5 PM and then we will have the last real session, the conclusion. Anyone? That's very good we can move to a new session...Sabrina."

Sabrina Shawn:

"My name is Sabrina Shaw, I'm with the international institute for sustainable development, a Canadian-based NGO. I was interested to hear the link between the concept of human security and sustainable development because perhaps if one looks at it from the perspective of sustainable development you could elevate the concept to include, by moving up a level to that of human security. So while it may diminish human rights it perhaps may elevate sustainable development. The comments of Dr. Yoshiko, I believe, with respect to bringing into the debate concepts such as sustainability and the natural environment involving scientists in the debate. I think this is a useful contribution and may prove to be a more natural bed fellow than human rights per se. And I just wondered what the panel think about looking at it from a more sustainable development perspective."

Dr. Chantana:

"Is that a question for the conveners or for everyone?"

Dr. Yoichi Mine:

"Yes, I agree. Sorry, a very quick comment. But I think that the human triad – human rights, human development and human security – all of these three are based on methodological individualism. But it is still important but still individualistic. That's why we have to think of sustainability – sustainability is more about the system and the systemic interaction between human beings and nature. So I think those two, a combination of the human triad and sustainability should go hand-in-hand. This is my understanding."

[Speaker unidentified—perhaps Dr. Chandan]:

“Well when we talk about human rights, human security, or democratization there may be in between a thin line and thick line at the conceptual level. But ground realities are quite different. I think that when we try to conceptualize these things we must not forget that we must listen to the victims. Victims’ perspectives are quite different and local. I think while mainstreaming issues like humans security we must not ignore that element of diversity and diverse experiences. Thank you.”

Dr. Chantana: Yes?

[Speaker unidentified]:

“I just noticed that the past two days really concentrated on the discussion on freedom from fear and freedom from want. I was wondering why the third element, which is freedom from humiliation was not given much focus considering that prejudice, discrimination and oppression are very present concerns in society at the moment? We know that many of the armed conflicts that happen in the world right now are caused by people’s hatred from those who are different or other. I was thinking that perhaps in other forums or conferences on human security we should also give space for discussions on challenging prejudice and discrimination and teaching tolerance or acceptance and respect for diversity, for different forms of expression, for different cultures. Thank you.”

Dr. Chantana:

“Any other comments?”

[Speaker unidentified]:

“This present age is characterized by certain processes in [word inaudible] and one of them is globalization, clash of civilization, ethnic conflicts, war between nations and states. In such an age, is it proper to think of human security as an agenda for human rights or human development.”

Dr. Chantana:

“Could you please rephrase the question again?”

[Speaker unidentified]:

“The present age is characterized by globalization, clash of civilizations, ethnic conflict, war between nations, and other such phenomena. Is it proper to think of human security as an agenda for all encompassing well-being development or human development or human rights, freedom from want and freedom from fear?”

Dr. Chandan Segupta:

“Since he is one of my colleagues, I can sort of simplify it on his behalf. What he wants to convey is when you have so many problems involving globalization, the world is beset with this ethnic cleansing, clash of civilization, ethnic conflict and globalization, is it proper to talk about human security? Is that the question?”

[Speaker unidentified]:

“Yes, yes the war between different states. This age is characterized by a lot of contradictions. All of us know that globalization creates massive inequalities. Globalization persists along with marginalization. In such a situation, is it proper to talk about or to spend time and energy on realizing the agenda of human security? This is my question.”

Dr. Chandan Segupta:

“Since he is my colleague I can settle it on a different level...”

Dr. Mike Hayes:

“I can maybe just add a couple of things. The first one is well what is the alternative – is the alternative to do nothing? There is, human security is one of many responses and it may be a good one. We don’t know yet because it hasn’t been developed. But we should give it a run. There are many valuable things about human security that makes it a good response to these troubles. Another one is just a slight criticism of how we tend to think of these conflicts in terms of globalization or the conflict between the nations and that’s a bit of traditional insecurity when really most violence is when the husbands come home and beat up the wives or parents hitting their children – there are these much more domestic things. Violence is pervasive in most societies. And if we just take it as something like ‘war of nations’ we tend to forget or naturalize it. And so human security at least is one level on which we can say that it is just violence at the human level that we’re going to address. And so we don’t have to – I mean globalization is still there but let’s start looking at it at the level of ‘who are the humans that face violence and what can we do about it’.”

[Speaker unidentified – perhaps Guarang S. Saray]:

“Just in response to my colleague, I also am working out the idea of human security because it really hasn’t been worked out in that sense. But it depends on how one looks upon human security, per se, especially in the panel we had on rethinking rural development, one of the issues that came out very clearly was in the whole discussion on human security we were raising very structural issues, very strong structural issues that require rethinking which really haven’t been addressed in all these years of development. So I don’t see human security as a weak concept. I feel there’s a lot of potential in the concept. And it needs to be reworked in a way that, through the various panels, the issues that have come out can make it more expansive and include many of the local diverse issues that have come up through the whole conference. I don’t share the pessimism of my colleague here – I just wanted to make that public.”

Dr. Chantana:

“Maybe I will just wrap up this round table discussion and then we can move on. The concern of this conference is that the term security has come on to us for some time and has a lot of impact on our normal lives. I think that raising the issue ‘whose security is it?’ and ‘what is security for?’ are very relevant questions from the standpoint of the conference. Therefore, the term human security is being used as an overarching framework to capture the relationship of all aspects of people that want to challenge the

traditional or existing security approach; that is, it doesn't really respond to the life and threats to people that seem to be more and more complex, cross-border etc. It's a strong relationship between direct violence and livelihoods - the good life versus basic safety. I think this is very fundamental and believe that you will also agree with me that, in most panels, the problems are not ordinary anymore – they are very tied up and complicated. We are imposed upon by the term 'security' of the state via national interests for a number of decades and it needs to be changed. Therefore, we raise the issue whether this can be changed and how to start. I think this conference has revealed that we are of course in an early state. The conference was designed in a way that it could be inclusive because we want to assess how people perceive and what are the perspectives of the people regarding human security? I think it reflected the very broad concept in that it covers all aspects. I also think that maybe that's a starting point. The approach of how to define it more sharply, more precisely, through action, is important. And the rural panel suggests that we don't care about the concept, we want to start with the reality and then work up to what it is we want to call it. I think that will be one of the approaches, maybe an important one. The other thing is that human security, even within the same region, might not necessarily be from the same blueprint – the emphasis could be different. I would like to go to Professor Farouk from [the panel titled 'Human Security in the Context of Violence and Conflict'] that why we have to make a decision between state security and human security? Maybe it really isn't a dichotomy - maybe it's a move, a process towards moving towards people. And that would relieve tension. It may not be a good strategy because it seems to compromise and then it falls into the problem of securitization – so it's still problematic and we will need to work it out again to fine tune this particular context, for instance Thailand and Cambodia can be very different in terms of talking about human security.

The second point is that mainstreaming by transcending traditional security starts from the right perception I suppose. I think this conference provides a platform to get to know it better but it is not finished. I'm thinking that maybe academics have not done enough in order to unravel the complexity of the term itself. Even though we have not been able to grasp what human security implies, working together and learning is still imperative. I think it is even more imperative than talking about ordinary development issues, ordinary security issues, because it's transnational and it's impossible for a particular country to address this issue alone. Maybe the way we work on a project or as a program would change. I will leave this to be a problem to solve. Maybe I'm not sure whether our last two final speakers will be able to address this or not but I'd like to just stop here and move to another session.”