

Human Security And Global Challenges - Neoliberal Perspective

Dr. Mohd. Yousuf Bhat

Assistant Prof. Political Science, Department of Higher Education, J&K State

Abstract: Focus of this paper is to highlight that neoliberalism with globalization has brought certain changes in the system which is not consistent with human security and has become a challenge. It is because that this ideology was utilized by core industrialized countries to gain their economic interests at the cost of developing world. The precursors of neoliberalism are classical liberalism and modern liberalism. Liberalism which is fairly an old ideology, whose roots can be traced back to 16th century, focuses on individual freedom, constitutionalism and rule of law. Individual freedom got more impetus by economists in 18th century namely Adam Smith, Ricardo and Malthus who advocated the principle laissez-faire economy. But by the end of 19th century, operation of capitalism has generated undesirable consequences in the form of injustice, poor condition of workers and has left the mass of people unattended by the market. A sympathetic form of liberal ideology emerged which supported welfare and betterment of people. This form of liberalism is identified as 'social' or 'welfare liberalism' or modern liberalism. It argues for protecting people from the vagaries of the market and its evils. This type of ideology did not last long and a new strand of liberalism took birth which reinforced capitalist ideology. Neoliberals rejected positive or developmental view of liberty as they consider it inimical to individual liberty. This is because they apprehended that any form of the intervention of the state in the name of securing sources of liberty, as the conception of positive liberty does, may lead to collectivist justification of state interference. On this ground they opposed planned economy and distributive justice. Although neoliberals believe that UN and other international institutions can play an important role in resolving conflicts and that it makes more sense for nations to cooperate and work towards long-term mutual gains, but these institutions too they utilized for their personal gains. Today a very important development in international relations is rise of large number of highly industrialized countries. Earlier states used to seek power by means of military force and territorial expansion. But situation has changed now. Economic development and foreign trade are given preference over military force and territorial expansion by highly industrialized countries because the former are considered to be less costly means of achieving prominence and prosperity. But Low politics i.e. economic development and foreign trade if liberated from value system is too problematic which is evident of neo-liberalism ideology that not only helped industrialized countries i.e. industrialized countries to exploit the resources of developing countries i.e. periphery countries and brings it with more gaps between rich and poor nations, thus putting at stake human security of poor and developing nations. Human security cannot be achieved by mutual interdependence of nation-states in economic terms but also requires rule of law and democratic system both at domestic level as well as in international organs. Moreover it requires peace and liberating individual from fully economic man to social persona. The responsibility not only lies on biggest stake holder i.e. State but also on individual human beings by fulfilling certain obligations towards state. Human security's core concern is well-being of individual. It does not negate the concept of national security but complements it and strengthens it as nations are composed of individuals and when individuals are safe and secure, nation will be secure.

Keywords: Human Security, globalization, Neo-liberalism, interdependence, Peace

I. INTRODUCTION

The Concept of security is as old as human civilization. It is as old as human being developed an element of reason by discovering fire and inventing wheel, which latter transformed

his life from primitive to industrial society, thereby not only fulfilling his own needs but needs of other fellow beings as well. It is somewhere between this transition an element of ego, selfishness took birth which became a concern of humanity. Philosophers, from ancient to modern who

witnessed or perceived all these happenings and tried to address them in their own way concerning well-being and ensuring human dignity. In the description of Aristotle, human traversed from household to political community not only for the sake of mere life but for the sake of good life. Self-sufficiency was its end and it is not meant only for the satisfaction of economic needs but also for regulation of the full human potential, thus focusing on human security element. The Aristotelian doctrine that the optimum size of the state is determined to the level of self-sufficiency was re-interpreted centuries later by Machiavelli as self-sufficiency in arms and the ability of the state to defend itself. It came to redefine as the right to self-determination and sovereignty of a nation, which permits the state to become the ultimate decision-maker within its territory, thus centering on security of the state. From Socrates to Harold Laski and McPherson focused on best governance system, well-being and opportunities to individual and community. In economics also welfare economics criticized classical growth centric models of growth and highlighted the need for interlinking human welfare and economics. After the decline of feudalism and emergence of nation-state primary responsibility of maintaining security was vested with state which ultimately led to linking all notions of security with territorial integrity and national sovereignty. Prior to creation of United Nations, the dominant concept of security was centered on the state and the principal of state sovereignty as was set up in the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 and whose influence on countries security centered on territorial integrity, political stability, military and defense arrangements and economic and financial activities. Security was conceived as an integral part of national security which put emphasis on military centric solutions to security related issues. It was understood that states would pursue power, which implied that the gains of one side would come as a result of losses of the other. According these traditional ideas, the state monopolized the rights and means to protect its citizens and the power of the state and its security were established and broadened in order to maintain order and peace. In classical narrative, security is about how state use force to manage threats to their territorial integrity, their autonomy and their domestic political order primarily from other states. This classical national security formulation has been criticized on various grounds. It restricts the scope of security to military threats. In this view rival states may deploy all other kinds of threats against each other's territorial integrity and domestic political order. The concept of security has for too long been interpreted narrowly as security of territory from external aggression, or as protection of national interests in foreign policy or as global security from the threats of nuclear holocaust. It has been related more to nation-state than to people.

The decades after World War II, were a period of decolonization. A large number of new countries appeared on the map as the old colonial powers gave up their control on them and hence given independence. Many of these new states were weak in economic terms. They were and still are at the bottom of the global economic hierarchy and constitute 'third world'. Marx, a famous nineteenth century, political economist, focused on capitalism in Europe, he argued that the bourgeoisie or capitalist class used its economic power to

exploit and oppress the proletariat or working class. With the advent of Marxism and rise of trade unions demanding more share and equal distributions of resources, some states including USA initiated social security policies not means to protect human security but as tactful strategy of containment of communism (Marshall Plan, Truman doctrine). Thus even in 19th century and first part of 20th century, the dominant concept of security was state centric privileging the instruments and agents of the state carrying forward the principles of state sovereignty as first articulated in the Treaty of Westphalia. After Marx, the Neo-Marxists extended his theory to the third world by arguing that the global capitalist economy controlled by wealthy capitalist states is used to impoverish the world's poor countries. The intellectuals from Chile, Argentina, Brazil and Peru brought together by the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA, today known as Economic Commission for Latin America and Caribbean ECLAC). The main theoretical tenet of ECLA's approach was that former colonies and non-industrialized nations were structurally different from industrialized countries as colonization restructured former colonies so that they specialized in producing in raw materials, cash crops and food stuff for export at low prices to the colonizers home countries. These theorists argued that free trade and international market relations occur in framework of uneven relations between developed and underdeveloped countries and work to reinforce and reproduce these relations. However, Neoliberals believe that it mainly internal factors that lead to underdevelopment not exploitation. They argue that it is corruption within governments' i.e. poor governance that is mainly responsible for lack of development in developing countries. But again when we connect Neo-liberalism with human insecurity, capitalists saw in the philosophy an opportunity to free themselves from regulation and tax. Francis Fukuyama (2004), a traditionalist but not a neoliberal, who in his work, *State-building: governance and world order in the 21st century*, strongly criticizes the neoliberal policies imposed by the United States on less developed countries, particularly in Africa. He showed how such policies failed states. What neoliberals desired to, together in rich countries where their ideology emerged and in the developing world, was a weak State that allowed national economies to become a playing field for large corporations, their top executives and financial agents to obtain all kinds of rents – in lieu of moderate interest rates, fair business profits and professional wages, the legitimate forms of reasonably the economic elites. International financial institutions such as IMF and World Bank appears to have strengthened the interests of MNCs (multinational corporations) and international financial capital, rather than long-term commitment to democracy and prosperity in the developing countries.

II. TRACES OF HUMAN SECURITY

Reference to human security can also be found in earlier documents of human rights. The Cyrus Cylinder (539 B.C.), recognized as the world's first charter of human rights. In 539 B.C., the armies of Cyrus the Great, the first king of ancient

Persia, conquered the city of Babylon. He freed the slaves, declared that all people had the right to choose their own religion, and established racial equality. These and other decrees were recorded on a baked-clay cylinder in the Akkadian language with cuneiform script. The other documents which followed later are, which are implicitly or explicitly related with human security are as follows:

- ✓ the Magna Carta (1215)
- ✓ the Petition of Right (1628)
- ✓ the US Constitution (1787)
- ✓ the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (1789)
- ✓ the US Bill of Rights (1791)
- ✓ Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)
- ✓ Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948)
- ✓ International Convention on Elimination of Racial Discrimination (1965),
- ✓ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966),
- ✓ International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights (1966),
- ✓ Convention on Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (1979),
- ✓ Convention against Torture (1984),
- ✓ International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (1990)
- ✓ The Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and Their Destruction (1997)
- ✓ International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearances (2006)

Hector Gros Espiell traces the origins of the idea of security back to Article 2 of the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizens of 1789, which stipulates that the aim of every political association is the preservation of natural and imprescriptible rights of man. These rights are liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression. He considers that without this conceptual and historical reference, it is impossible to understand the concept of security as applied in domestic law and modern constitutional law. Forerunners of human security can also be found within the documents of the International Committee of The Red Cross (founded in Geneva in 1863), the Hague Conventions as well as in the UN Charter, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, etc. The First World War which brought with it misery and unprecedented human loss, but even after the end of War, nothing substantial was done to secure human life, instead states continued to focus on economic gains and increasing their military strength. The madness of war continued after 20 years hiatus of some unsettled disputes in World War First, resulting in largest death of around 4-5 crore people in the history of humankind. It is after this huge loss of human life, world community fumbled for peace and security of human life and in 1945 United Nations was founded for such purpose. The founders of the UN, when considering security always gave equal weight to territories and to people. In 1945, the US Secretary of the State reported to his government on the results of the Conference in San Francisco that set up the

United Nations. He was quite specific on this point: the battle of peace has to be fought on two fronts. The first is the security front where poverty spells freedom from fear. The second is economic and social front where victory means freedom from want. Only victory on both fronts can assure the world of an enduring peace. No provision that can be written into the charter will enable the Security Council to make the world secure from war if men and women have no security in their homes and their jobs. Eduard Benes, a great statesman of the inter-war period, defined 'international security' as a rejection of the inherent desire of any people, any state, to be safe from the risk of aggression, and is based upon the state's certainty of not being attacked, or in the case of attack, of receiving immediate and active aid from other states. In UN Charter international security found a significant place and peace is always linked with security. In all the articles relating to peace, in particular 1, 11, 12, 24, 33, 34, 39 and 42, the two words 'peace' and 'security' are found together. There is never any mention of peace without security or vice versa. If there is to be clear understanding of the concept of international security in contemporary international law, Hector Gros Espiell insists, it must be repeated that peace is not possible without international security, and there can be no international security without peace.

Prior to the 1990s the orthodoxy of security studies focused largely on military concerns. Security was a matter of state or national survival. It was in the long discussed vernacular, "high politics". This orthodoxy was challenged by Barry Buzan's 1983 publication "People, States and Fear" in which he argued that security should be examined on at least three levels of analysis; the individual, the state and the international system. Buzan also argued that matters of security should be broadened to include not military matters, but also economic, social, political and environmental concerns. Buzan's arguments for both broadening and deepening research into the subject formed the basis for what latter became known as Copenhagen School of Security Studies. The superpowers were locked in ideological struggle-fighting a cold war all over the world. The developing nations have won their independence only recently, were sensitive to real and perceived threats to their fragile national identities. Forgotten were the legitimate concerns of ordinary people, who sought security in their daily lives. For many of them, security symbolized protection from the threat of disease, hunger, unemployment, crime, social conflicts, political repression and environmental hazards.

III. TRADITIONAL VS HUMAN SECURITY

The components of human security are interdependent. Human security is not a defensive concept; the way territorial or military security is. Instead human security is an integrative concept. It acknowledges the universalism of life claims. It is embedded in notion of solidarity among people. It cannot be brought about through force, with armies standing against armies. Human security is people oriented. It is concerned with how people live and breathe in a society, how freely they exercise their main choices, how much access they have to market and social opportunities. Human security

acknowledges that as a result of downturns such as conflicts, economic and financial crisis, ill health and natural disasters, people are faced with sudden insecurities and deprivations. These not only undo years of development but also generate conditions within which grievances can lead to growing tensions. Therefore, in addition to its emphasis on human well-being, human security is driven by values relating to security, stability and sustainability of development goals. It has been observed that too often gross violations of human rights results in conflicts, displacement and human suffering on a massive scale. In this regard human security underscores the universality and primacy of a set of rights and freedoms that are fundamental for human life. Human security makes no distinction between different kind of human rights-civil, political, economic, social, cultural rights, thereby addressing violations and threats in a multidimensional and comprehensive way. It introduces a practical framework for identifying the specific rights that are at stake in a particular situation of insecurity and for considering the institutional and governance arrangements that are needed to exercise and sustain them.

State and Human centered security paradigm

	State-centered security (a neo-realistic vision)	Human centered security
Security Referent (object)	In a Hobbesian world, the state is the primary provider of security: if the state is secure, then those who live within it are secure	Individual are co-equal with the state. State security is the means, not the end
Security value	Sovereignty, power, territorial integrity, national independence	Personal safety, well-being and individual freedom. ✓ Physical safety and provision for basic needs ✓ Personal freedom (liberty of association) ✓ Human rights; economic and social rights
Security threats	Direct organized violence from other states, violence and coercion by other states	Direct and indirect violence, from identifiable sources (such as states or non-state actors) or from structural sources (relations of power ranging from family to the global economy) Direct violence: death, drugs, dehumanization, discrimination, international disputes, WMD Indirect Violence: deprivation, disease, natural disasters, underdevelopment, population displacement, environmental degradation, poverty, inequality
By what means	Retaliatory force or threat of its use, balance of power, military means, strengthening of economic might, little attention paid to respect for law and	Promoting human development, basic needs, equality, sustainability and greater democratization and participation at all

	institutions	levels. Promoting political development: global norms and institutions, collective use of force as well as sanctions if and when necessary, cooperation between states, reliance and international institutions, network and coalitions, and international organisations
--	--------------	--

Table 1

Source: Adapted from Kanti Bajpai “Human Security: Concept and Measurement” in the Joan B Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, Occasional Paper # 19, University of Notre dame, 2000

Human Security is an interdisciplinary concept which focuses on human element of security, rights and development. It exhibits certain characteristics such as:

- ✓ People centered
- ✓ Multi-sectoral
- ✓ Comprehensive
- ✓ Context-specific
- ✓ Prevention-oriented

As people centered concept, individual is main focus. It considers conditions threatening life, livelihood and dignity of the individual and identifies threshold below which human life is intolerably threatened. In multi-sectoral understanding of insecurities, human security focuses on wide variety of insecurities emerging from economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political aspects. Threats to human security are mutually reinforcing and interconnected in two ways, One, they are interlinked in a sense that each threat feeds on the other. For example violent conflicts can lead to deprivation and poverty which in turn could lead to resource depletion, infectious diseases, education deficits, etc. Two, threats within a given country or area can spread into wider region and have negative externalities for regional and international security. The interdependence aspect implies that human security cannot be tackled in isolation through fragmented stand-alone responses. Instead it involves comprehensive approaches that stress the need for cooperative and multi-sectoral responses that bring together the agenda of those dealing with the security, development and human rights. It involves stronger and more integrated response from communities and states around the world. As context-specific concept, human security acknowledges that insecurities vary considerably across different settings and as such advances contextualized solutions that are responsive to the particular situations they seek to address. In addressing risks and root causes of human insecurities, human security is prevention-oriented and introduces a dual focus on protection and empowerment. By protection, it implies strategies set up by states, international agencies, NGOs and private sector to shield people from menaces. Menaces could be natural disasters, financial crises, and conflicts. States have the primary responsibility to implement such as protective structure. Protection is usually top-down approach. By empowerment, it means enabling people to develop their resilience to difficult situations. Empowerment implies a bottom-up approach. It aims at developing the capabilities of

individuals and communities to make informed choices and to act on their own behalf. This exercise enables to develop their full potential and allows them to find and participate in solutions to ensure to security as well as of others. Commission of Human Security clearly states that protection and empowerment are mutually reinforcing and cannot be treated in isolation.

IV. THREATS TO HUMAN SECURITY

Possible types of human security threats (based on UNDP Human Development Report of 1994 and Human Security Unit)

Type of security	What it entitles	Examples of main threats
Economic security	An individual's enjoyment of basic income, either through gainful employment or from a social safety net	Persistent poverty, unemployment
Food security	An individual's access to food via his/her assets, employment or income	Hunger, famine
Health security	An individual's freedom from various diseases and debilitating illnesses and his/her access to healthcare	Deadly infectious diseases, unsafe food, malnutrition, lack of access to basic health care
Environmental security	The integrity of land, air and water, which makes human habitation possible	Environmental degradation, resources depletion, natural disasters, pollution
Personal security	An individual's freedom from crime and violence, especially women and children who are more vulnerable	Physical violence, crime, terrorism, domestic violence, child labour
Community security	Cultural dignity and inter-community peace within which an individual lives and grows	Inter-ethnic, religious and other identity based tensions
Political security	Protection against human rights violation	Political repression, human rights abuses

Table 2

UNDP, Redefining Human Security, 1994, p.230

In 1994, Mahbubul Haq drew out attention to concept of human security, which believes on 'freedom from fear' and 'freedom from want'. Within International Politics, Mahbubul Haq was not the first to use the terms but they had already been introduced in the January 6, 1941 State of Union Address of the American President Franklin Delano Roosevelt as part of his vision of a world founded upon four essential freedoms i.e. freedom of speech, freedom to worship, freedom from want and fear later mentioned in the Atlantic Charter, signed on August 14, 1941 by Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and President Roosevelt. Of these four essential freedoms that Roosevelt used, freedom from fear and freedom from want became cornerstone of the United Nations. These concepts, in the opinion of Edward Stettinius, then US Secretary of State, would be the integral component of the strategy of peace of the UN: "the battle of peace must be fought on two fronts. The first is the security front, where victory spells freedom from fear. The second is the economic and social front where victory spells freedom from want. Only victory on both fronts can assure the world of an enduring peace. Hector Gros Espiell points out it was this very concept

that was taken up in 1948 in Article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that proclaimed that everyone has right to life, liberty and security of the person and that in the 19th century, comparative constitutional law and European and Latin American Law treated this concept of security as a human right. Mahbubul Haq put it bluntly in human development report, 1994 that human security could be achieved through development and not through arms. Then Secretary General of United Nations Kofi Anan recognized, human security is far more than just an absence of violent conflict. It is also a matter of human rights, of good governance, of access to education and to health care and of ensuring that all people have opportunities and choices to fulfil their potential in life. Every step taken in this direction, he has affirmed, is also a step towards reducing poverty, towards achieving economic growth and towards preventing conflict. He has pointed to freedom from fear, and freedom of future generations to inherit a healthy, natural environment as being the interrelated building blocks of human security and, therefore, of national security.

Famine, disease, pollution, drug trafficking, terrorism, ethnic disputes and social disintegration are no longer isolated events, confined within national borders. When the security of people are endangered anywhere in the world, all nations are likely to get involved. Their consequences travel the globe. It was the G77 which in mid-1970s, established links between underdevelopment and security. In 1980, the Independent Commission on International Development Issues (known as Brandt Commission) was established which argued that peace included the eradication of hunger and inequality. In 1982, the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issue (Palme Commission) referred to Morality in International Affairs. The Common Security report provided the first comprehensive criticism of the purely military approach to the security while highlighting the need to devote due attention to the relation between security and well-being of individuals. In 1987, the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (Brundtland Commission) focused on the relationship between Environment and Conflicts; in 1990, the South Commission (Chaired by Julius Nyerere) listed poverty, environmental dangers, deficiencies of democracy and deindustrialization as some of the causes of insecurity. Since 1994, major efforts have been made to enrich the concept of Human Security through research and expert meetings, to put human security at the core of the political agenda on both national and regional levels...and most important of all to engage innovative action in the field to respect to the needs and concerns of most vulnerable populations. There have been two landmark initiatives in this process. The first was the creation of the Human Security Network in 1999 and second landmark initiative has been the work of the Commission on Human Security co-chaired by Sadoka Ogata and Amartya Sen. The concept of Human Security as enunciated by the Commission of Human Security (CHS) seeks to "protect the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfillment. In its report published in 2003 mentions one of the vital objectives of human security is the Freedom to Live in Dignity, which thus means respecting basic principles of democracy, rule of law, and human rights

and freedoms. These are small steps taken by states but lot needs to be done.

V. NEO-LIBERAL IDEOLOGICAL CHALLENGES

We live in a world abundant in material goods and services and possessing a vast technological capacity which could be used for ending the blight of poverty that has shaped the modern world order. We could for example, use these tools to enhance our participation in the institutions and procedures that shape the political, economic and cultural aspects of our lives. What factors are preventing such possibilities being realized? Answers to this question are central to current political economy debates and past three decades have seen dominance at elite levels of neoliberal approaches (often bracketed under the heading of the 'Washington Consensus') with its emphasis upon the role of free trade and markets and restructuring of the state. In 1944, F A Hayek in his work "Road to Serfdom" argued that government planning, by crushing individualism, would lead inexorably to totalitarian control. This book was widely read and came to attention of some wealthy people, who saw in the philosophy an opportunity to free themselves from regulation and tax. When in 1947, Hayek founded the first organisation that would spread the doctrine of neoliberalism-the Mont Pelerin Society; it was supported financially by millionaires and their foundation. This ideology got strengthened when in 1970s, Keynesian economy began to fall with economic recession and stagnation in western world. Marget Thatcher and Ronald Reagan were the first persons who adopted the neoliberal ideology and it followed with massive tax cuts for rich, the crushing of trade unions, deregulation, privatization, outsourcing and competition in public services. Through the IMF, The World Bank, The Maastricht Treaty and the World Trade Organisation, neoliberal policies were imposed often without democratic consent. These institutions became the pillars of neo-liberal global order. Led by the United States government- dominant member, the two institutions IMF and WTO were transformed in ways that expanded their jurisdictions and their respective capacities to intrude into national economic policies and to incorporate into a global system of market-liberalising economic rules. These rules, which imposed far greater obligations than those of the post war period, subsequently became a focal point for criticism and resistance. Many reputed authors mention that since World War II, these multilateral institutions played a role in governing the international economy, although these institutions formally grant participation of multiple governments, but there is hegemony of the United States, that has dominated the international arena. Pinochet's Chile was the first nation in which the programme of Neo-liberalism was comprehensively applied. As Naomi Klein documents in 'The Shock Doctrine', neoliberal theorists advocated the use of crises to impose unpopular policies while people were distracted: for example, in the aftermath of Pinochet's coup, the Iraq war etc. Where neoliberal policies cannot be imposed domestically, they were imposed internationally, through trade treaties, incorporating 'investor dispute settlements', offshore tribunals in which corporations can press for removal of social

and environmental protections. It just became a mockery of democracy as they could not take independent decisions. Noted American Political Scientist Robert Dhal (1985) makes the important point that massive inequality is a major threat to meaningful democratic practice. The reason for this is quite simple. In a democratic system shaped by stark inequalities of power and resources, Dhal notes that the most powerful actors will, to a large extent, be able to use their influence and power to shape political outcomes to their own ends. The WTO summit meeting at Seattle in Nov-Dec 1999 is a classic example of this, with major corporate actors sponsoring the meeting in order to gain access to the ministers involved in the negotiating processes. This in turn has seen a shift in global political economy as states pursue policies that are largely for the benefit of private power rather than reflecting wider issues of human needs. This is illustrated by what Henwood and Rodrik see as the global assault on welfare systems, the very infrastructures that were established in order to guarantee people's basic needs. This inequality undermines the possibility of human security in two profound ways: first, it reinforces hierarchy and inequality as those actors and institutions that already dominate politics, the economy and culture do so increasingly. Thus it acts to reduce the autonomy and levels of meaningful participation that ordinary citizens are able to carry out in their own political systems. Second these developments have helped to erode the capacity of states to satisfying the needs of their populations at required levels such as health, education and housing, exacerbating social tensions that were already prevalent. Thus when the US president, nominally the most powerful politician in the world attempted to set out what were quite moderate health care reforms in order to extend health care coverage to those US citizens excluded from health care reforms in order to extent health care coverage to those US citizens excluded from health care provision, the interests of powerful private insurance and health companies allied with political representatives in the US Senate and House of Representatives were enough to end this proposed reform.

Private corporate power and interests can triumph over even the most basic of general public needs. The rethinking of thinking itself is a part of response to the challenge of globalization. As a phenomenon the definition of globalization is still a subject of some debate. Booth's definition of globalization is a twofold process. He sees as first a politico economic project, synonymous with the growth of the world economy with the United States taking the lead. This is globalization as neoliberal capitalist triumph. Second he sees it as techno-cultural process marking a multitude of "complex interdependence of the local and the global. Globalization is the set of processes constructing a smaller world". Globalization does more than the call for streamlining of operations. It is more the demand that we do things more efficiently, or faster, or with more and better technology. It is more than the expansion of old broader problems that has confronted the state for centuries. It is more than economic or political issue. Rather it is a wholesale challenge, not only to the capabilities of our economic, political, cultural and even spiritual institutions, but to all of the logical and even ontological assumptions upon which they are based. In short, none of the "common sense" ways of understanding we have

been using to comprehend the world around us are working. The situation is such that it has moved beyond the commonsensical. This does not mean that the world has gone mad, although surely it may be experienced this way. It would be far too easy to deal with if it had. All that would be called for is reestablishment of order. Much of the persistence or even deterioration in poverty in Africa may have little to do with globalization and more to do with the unstable or failed political regimes, wars and civil conflicts that have afflicted several of those countries. If anything such political instability reduced the extent of globalization in these countries, as it scared off many foreign investors and traders. Similarly pro-globalizers point to the fact that wages and (possibly) living standards are often better for poor in coastal cities in China than the poor in the remote areas in western China who are cut off from the international economy or for the poor who live in Mexican border with the United States, where the maquiladora are located, than for the poor in the interior provinces. The casual processes through which international economic integration can affect poverty involve primarily the poor in their capacity as workers and as recipients of public services. Let us first take the case of poor workers, they are mainly either self-employed or wage earners. Such as farmers work in small farms, artisans, and petty entrepreneurs in small shops and firms. The major constraints they usually face are in credit, marketing, insurance, infrastructure (like roads, power, ports and irrigation), and government regulations (involving venal inspectors, insecure land rights, and so on). These often require substantive domestic policy changes, and foreign traders and investors are not directly to blame (in fact, they may sometimes help to relieve some of the bottlenecks in infrastructure, services, and in essential parts, components and equipment). If these changes are not made and self-employed poor remain constrained, then it is difficult for them to withstand competition from large agri-business or firms (foreign or domestic). Less constrained small farms or firms are sometimes more productive than their large counterparts and are also sometimes more successful in export markets. Small producers (for example, coffee producers of Uganda, rice growers in Vietnam and garment producers in Bangladesh or Cambodia) are often heavily involved in exports. But in exports the major hurdle they face is often due to not more globalization but less. Developed country protectionism and subsidization of farm and food products and simple manufactures (like textiles and clothing) severely restrict their export prospects for poor countries. According to estimates of the World Bank, the total loss incurred by exports of textiles and garments on account of these trade barriers amount to more than \$ 30 billion and the loss to poor countries from agricultural tariffs and subsidies in such countries is estimated to be about \$ 20 billion.

There is an increasing recognition that globalization has facilitated the growth of local financial problems into international ones. Robert Litan, an economist at the Brookings Institution in Washington, describes regional and international financial contagious as a direct consequence of a "process of globalization that has also facilitated the transmission of financial crisis across national borders." A 1999 study undertaken by Norwegian sociologist Ranverg Gissinger and Nils Peter Gleditsch on globalization and

conflict used econometric modeling to research the relationship between high levels of trade and political stability world-wide between 1965 and 1993. The Norwegian researchers found that exports of manufactured goods create high levels of welfare and equality, while exports of agricultural products promote poverty and inequality, which in turn become among the factors that lead to political instability. Economist Dani Rodrik, a professor at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, has also reviewed the relationship between globalization and conflict. His study found that where governance was weak, the economic changes brought by globalization increased internal conflicts. He found that "the world market is a source of disruption and upheaval as much as it is an opportunity for profit and economic growth. Without the complementary institutions at home, in the areas of governance, judiciary, civil and political liberties, social insurance, and of course education- the result is too much of the former and too little of the latter." Human rights too have been undermined by the ease with which international criminal organisations have been able to launder their funds across borders as well, to bribe officials, to payoff other elements of their infrastructure and to send remittances back home for further recruitment of their human cargo. The same phenomenon is present as an element in the trafficking of women. The women's economic values is sharply greater at a distance from their official home. Funds they generate as sexual slaves have been reinvested in the trans-border infrastructure that enslaved them, laundered across many national borders.

The Human Development Report (1999), notes that the widening gap between the rich and poor of the world has attained exceptional levels. This inequality is reflected in a swathe of social indicators that divide states and classes in world order. To illustrate in 1960 the per capita income ratio between the countries with the richest fifth of the world's population stood at 30:1 with the poorest fifth. This increased to 60:1 in 1990 and 74:1 in 1995. Similarly this inequality has also been deepening within nations whether they are at the core or periphery of the world order. Britain, Sweden, US, Thailand, Eastern Europe as a whole, China and India have seen either significant or dramatic deepening in inequality between rich and poor. In the world's most powerful country, the United States these developments are stark. In 1977 the top 1 percent of wealth earners earned as much after tax as the lowest 49 million. In 1999, the top 1 percent earned as much as the lowest 100 million workers. Taking this to global level the question of power and inequality becomes simply staggering: the world's richest three people possess more wealth than the combined GNP of the world's 43 least developed states. Interestingly, even the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) issued a report stating that the implications of these tendencies presented a major threat to society, surely the antithesis of the idea of the 'good society' underpinning any approach to the political economy. A small minority of the world's population has inordinate power over the resources and institutions that shape the current world order-this is the position that is antithetical to the attainment of general human security.

Recent report of Oxfam International reveals that how the global economy enables wealthy elite to accumulate vast

fortunes while hundreds of millions of people are struggling to survive on poverty pay. As per the report eighty two percent of the wealth generated 2017 went to the richest one percent of the global population, while the 3.7 billion people who make up the poorest half of the world saw no increase in their wealth, the report discloses how the global economy enables a wealthy elite to accumulate vast fortunes while hundreds of millions of people are struggling to survive on poverty pay. The report mentions Billionaire wealth has risen by an annual average of 13 percent since 2010, six times faster than the wages of ordinary workers, which have risen by a yearly average of just 2 percent. The number of billionaires rose at an unprecedented rate of one every two days between March 2016 and March 2017. It takes just four days for a CEO from one of the top five global fashion brands to earn what a Bangladeshi garment worker will earn in her lifetime. In the US, it takes slightly over one working day for a CEO to earn what an ordinary worker makes in a year. It would cost \$2.2 billion a year to increase the wages of all 2.5 million Vietnamese garment workers to a living wage. This is about a third of the amount paid out to wealthy shareholders by the top 5 companies in the garment sector in 2016. The corporate bosses and shareholder earn their fortune at the expense workers' rights who make our clothes, assemble our phones and grow our food and are being exploited to ensure a steady supply of cheap goods. The report also mentions that India's richest 1% garnered as much as 73% of the total wealth generated in the country in 2017. The report's findings are in line with those of similar studies including the one published in July, 2017 by renowned economists Lucas Chancel and Thomas Piketty, and give credence to the theory that the rich have disproportionately benefited from liberalisation while others have been left struggling. India, so frequently praised for its embrace of the market consensus, displays both extraordinary rifts between the new elites and the impoverished, and several and persistent conflicts over its current economic strategy. For example, India's external debt crisis of 1991 brought the country close to default in meeting its international payment obligations. Under such circumstances India adopted neo-liberal or in other words 'market-friendly' economic policies. Furthermore, in India the embracing of neoliberalism is accompanied by a change in the position of big bourgeoisie. After the independence it asserted for relative autonomy, although not always consistent. However, since 1991, the Indian bourgeoisies increasingly getting integrated with the international financial capital and seeks strategic alliances with western capital.

In India over the last two decades more than 300,000 farmers committed suicide between 1995 and 2015 according to India's National Crime Records Bureau. This is entirely shocking to know that when the thousands of farmers are taking their life and are trapped in the cycle of debt and poverty, corporate "friendly" government policies have provided tax concessions of around \$75 million between 2015-2016. Swaminathan Committee report of 2006 who investigated the increasing farmer suicides, highlighted the "unfinished agenda in land reform, quantity and quality of water, technology fatigue, access, adequacy and timeliness of institutional credit, and opportunities for assured and remunerative marketing," which have contributed to the long-

term agrarian crisis as well as farmer suicides. Similarly in 2007, the Radhakrishna Committee on Agricultural Indebtedness which was appointed by the ministry of finance also underlined in its report that farm indebtedness is the main cause for such an extreme form of distress. Indebtedness of farmers is one of the main issues driving them to commit suicide. Problem starts off with availability of timely credit. Banking sector is not ready to provide credit /loan to Agriculture for avoiding risk. With the Breakdown of formal credit structures will make the farmers to increased reliance on informal sectors. Agriculture always has demanded for the last minute credit, and last minute credit comes at higher rates because of the classic demand theory the more the demand higher the price. The banks play no role in this, as it is not possible to get credit from banks informal sources of credit come only with greater interest burden leading the farmers to a vicious circle of private debt. Farmers want credit for buying seeds, pesticides and other major inputs. huge amounts of credit is also taken by them for installing tube wells. Well we can see credit is needed by them in every aspect they work in. there is a further lack of credit availability for small farmers. Whatever available is of very high interest. This has been reported in the New York Times that "access to formal credit has narrowed, the power of moneylenders, who charge at least 24 percent annual interest, has grown. The Rangarajan Committee on Financial Inclusion (2008) noted that about 66 per cent of marginal farmers are continuously resorting to informal sources of credit. So under these circumstances any loan waiver by government can do little help. The price of farm inputs have skyrocketed in recent years reducing the profit margin realized by farmers. Urgent steps need to be taken to bring down the cost of cultivation without affecting the productivity of crops. A one-time loan waiver will not end the farm suicides. So, as recommended by the National Commission on Farmers (2006) and the Working Group on Agriculture Production (2010), the minimum support price (MSP) for different crops that is fixed should be at least 50 percent more than the actual cost.

The state has a welfare role, which simply is negated by neoliberal ideology. It cannot only give loan waiver but also minimum support price for the food grains in case of need arises. Human security is vice-versa. State revenue depends on return of income taxes from its population, but state machinery becomes handicapped when there is slackness from people's side in this regard. Income tax department of India reveals very disturbing figures when it comes to payment of taxes. It mentions that only 1.7 percent (2 crore) of Indians paid income tax in assessment year 2015-16 (fiscal year 2014-15).

When it comes to arms production a major chunk of resources of developing countries goes to purchasing of arms. The three leading arms exporters of the world are USA, Russia and China. The global arms trade has developed an increasing trend. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute SIPRI data reveals that arms trade was 16 percent larger in 2010-2014 than in 2005-2009. USA sold 31 percent of all global arms during 2010-2014, followed by Russia 27 percent in same period and China accounting 5 percent. The customers they got from all over the world, NATO countries with exception of Hungary, Mexico and East Asian purchased them

from USA, Central Asian Republics with exception of Uzbekistan got them from Russia and China has sent weapons to 9 sub-Saharan countries, generally Angola, Iran and Sudan purchased weapons from China and Russia. In selling arms China, it has another objective to use its influence in order have access to natural resources like oil and growing labour and market place for building more power.

Capitalism is a factor of war between social classes. For Marx and Engels, peace and markets have no intrinsic market value. War and conflicts relate to the superstructure and are conditioned by antagonistic social relations. Rosa Luxemburg considered military investment to be very useful for the development of the capitalist economies, in the first instance as catalyst of primitive accumulation; then as instrument of colonial domination; and lastly as hegemonic factor of struggle between the capitalist countries to divide up the world. Lenin also thought that imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism, necessarily stigmatized by the total wars and the capitalist exploitation of the world, ruled out any non-economic disarmament process without the advent of socialism. In the same way, Baran and Sweezy argued that military expenditure serves to absorb the economic surplus that monopoly capitalism creates; on that view arms race matches the logic of capitalism, which seeks to maintain a constant ratio between production and solvent demand through productive expenditure. Other analyses went to the same direction notably those of J.K Galbraith, who agreed with the idea that the American economy needs armament support in order to maintain its hegemony. Today, the economic importance of the military sector in the capitalist economies seems indisputable; it would be compared to the role played by the military research and development, in the development of the ultramodern technologies. Jacques Attali regards war as an extreme manifestation of industrial competition. Conflicts provide a stimulus to production and transforms, the patterns of consumption and social habits. War is a consequence of the domination of the rich. A lot of economists, notably those specialized on the developing countries (as Amartya Sen) or on former socialist economies (as Stanislav Menschikov), dispute this last position. For them, globalization may be a factor of conflict. It is often (but not only) the economic expression of the domination of the rich countries to the detriment of the poorest and outcast. Whether war or peace, it is in both conditions, capitalist class is benefited. Besides the sanctions intended to provoke important economic damages for a country, so that it changes its national politics (such a apartheid, violation of the rights of minorities, tyrannies, etc), constitute indisputable power instruments. The ideology of the globalization by the market is the revealing of the dominant thought, the objective of which is the preservation, without pressure, of the western hegemony. In this case economic thought is the only argument to preserve the acquired advantages. Peace does not necessarily mean demilitarization and reduced military spending, but if it does then it indicates improved economic performance is possible. It is in fact likely to lead to moving resources away from existing defense industrial bases to other civil sectors and this should have positive effects. It should also allow the focus to move from military to alternate concepts of security, such as human and environmental. This could improve the situation for

developing countries as well as the poor in developed countries. It could also provide increased demand for industry, through investment in alternative technologies; and could also allow policies to reduce inequalities, support sustainable development etc. and so improve the economic situation of all countries. Improved trade and wealth should reduce the likelihood of conflict, but the experience of this century does make one wary of making such statements with confidence. Nevertheless, it is difficult to see anything but economic benefits resulting from peace.

Post-Cold War period has many examples where states themselves became perpetrators of insecurities, not only failing to accomplish their responsibilities toward their own subjects but threatening their very existence. The era also witnessed a variety of new and often unsuccessful international interventions in Bosnia, Kosovo, East Timor and Afghanistan. While conflicts seemed to be settled, the very reasons that had led to conflict in the first place were not dealt with through rehabilitation and long-term peace-building efforts. Human security is concern with 'the good society', a familiar theme from political economy and one which recognizes that it is not enough for the array of local, national and regional and global institutions (the four levels of world order) that shape our lives to satisfy human needs alone. It is also necessary that with capacity to influence these structures, procedures and institutions in a meaningful way. Thus human security concern itself with the maximization of human needs satisfaction and type of institutions and procedures that would be appropriate for this. This point is at the heart of a great deal of contemporary political controversy as a range of regional and global institutions in recent decades have explained their power and reach in ways that would seem to render them increasingly unaccountable to ordinary citizens (Held, 1995) A lot needs to be done which can be collective effort of international organizations, private investment companies, NGOs and non-state entities. Some international organizations like the Commission of Global Governance tend to emphasize 'freedom from fear' while the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) understands human security as also incorporating 'freedom from want'. Similarly, at the state level, Japan and Canada in their foreign policies have taken initiatives in realizing human security. While Canada, is a leading contributor to the UN peacekeeping operations, emphasizes the dimension of 'freedom from fear', Japan, a leading donor of development assistance, emphasizes the dimension of 'freedom from want'.

VI. CONCLUSION

Present global order is asymmetrical in nature in which rich and powerful nations are benefiting from natural and labour resources of developing countries. It appears that there is a close cooperation between IMF and World Bank which strengthens the interests of MNCs and international financial capital. Because of globalization national governments have much less autonomy in economic policy decision making. It has widened gap between the rich and poor as well as destroyed traditional resources, knowledge and techniques. In today's era, no country is self-sufficient and they cannot live

in isolation, interdependence has become order of the day. Soft power methodology adopted by powerful states needs a human face; it cannot be based on robbing of resources from developing states but has to strengthen their economies as well. Mutually assured destruction syndrome needs to be converted into mutual economic interdependence. It is in the hearts of people everywhere that they cannot achieve anything through arms race, which needs a major junk of their national economies for their expansion, even North Korea has realized that conduct of tests is not in their interest rather integrating themselves with world economy is a best possible way out after facing tough sanctions of the UN. It seems that in democratic countries individuals are only democratic in electing their representatives i.e. in political sense only but in economic aspects they don't have any say and suffer silently as they consider it in their fate and they have to follow it without questioning the economic policy of their political bosses. The forces of financial markets seem to be running amok, humbling governments, reducing the power of unions and other groups of civil society, creating a sense of extreme vulnerability for individual confronted with forces and decision making processes way beyond his reach. Human security has to be part of policy of governments at domestic as well as international level. At domestic level it has to be part of grass root level policy framework particularly in rural areas, which lack basic facilities of life like wellbeing of old age persons, destitute, widows, orphans in conflict zones such an approach is not possible from government level alone but needs efforts and assistance of civil society at local, national and international level. At domestic level there is need to strengthen local entrepreneurs with less tax so that it will give opportunity to indigenous population to earn their livelihood. A Chinese proverb is that "Give a man a fish you feed him for a day. Teach man to fish and you feed him for a life time". So it is not only giving assistance to poor and developing countries but also to focus on capacity building programmes in these countries in order to make them self-reliant. There is need to strengthen low level industrial development in these countries and bring them out of vicious circle of dependence on core countries. At international level, there is need of global corpse fund which can be utilized in poor and developing countries for the well-being of needy people. Such global corpse fund can be generated by donations from multinational corporations as per their profit accrued from their investment in developing countries. The government wishing to operate in the public interest would have to impose heavy taxation on corporate sector. To do so would incur prompt and ruthless financial retaliation. The world's corporate rulers will not tolerate governments that deviate too far from the corporate-neoliberal doctrine. Yes, some token tax hikes will be permitted, some relatively modest boosts in social spending. But any government that implements a tough "anti-corporate" agenda risks punitive investment "strikes," the exodus of more factories and jobs to low-wage countries. It is almost futile for putting public interest ahead of private interest.

At current stage of World Order to face this neoliberal ideological challenge is hilarious task. At minimum what these nation-states can do who have fallen prey to current epoch of neoliberal ideology can demand for structural changes in UN

system with focus on individual well-being. One important demand which these countries could do is making UN more representative. In Security Council expansion if any in future, any new participant should follow criteria of good record of human rights, human development, human security and rule of law. It will be a positive sum game and will improve human security level both horizontally i.e. across nations and vertically from top (UN) to bottom (nation-state level). As well as there is need to restructure and reform international financial institutions like International Monetary Fund (IMF), whose decisions are always guided by policies of rich capitalist states and secondly, there is need for change in structure and functions of World Bank in this era of World Trade Organization (WTO) which supports lending without borders as it caters the agenda of capitalism in the grab of its Structural Adjustment Programme. This will also help in resource generation than resource robbing in the sense that more funds can be utilized for human well-being than production and purchasing of arms. Neoliberalism is an ideology of hegemony. There is growing distress, discontent, de-politicization, skepticism and loss of confidence in the political class. The distress is intense. the drive for privatization has not won the day: but are egalitarianism and social collectivism still alive and well? There is a logic that something is wrong with a system which distributes wealth in a 1% - 99% way. Politicians feel obliged to reassure the public daily that the cuts are 'fair'. There are other such echoes in popular consciousness. But who is nurturing them? Beyond afield, in Europe, there is popular dissent, resistance to austerity strategies and support for 'growth-and-jobs' alternatives. There is the democratic wakening of the 'Arab Spring' and, in Latin America, explicit challenges to neoliberal hegemony. Hegemonies are never completed projects: they are always in contention. There are always cracks and denials - and therefore new prospects.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aristotle, Politics, p. 45
- [2] Politics, p. 1912, Book 7
- [3] Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu Ray: The Human Security Framework on National Development Reports, UNDP, NHDR Occasional Paper 5, United Nations Development Programme, 2006, p.3
- [4] Sudha Menon, "Human Security: Concept and Practice", http://mpra.ub.unimuenchen.de/2478/MPRA_paper_No_2478
- [5] Fernandez Periera, Juan Pahlo: Seguridad Humana, Doctoral thesis, University of Barcelona, 2005
- [6] Kanti Bajpai, Human Security: Concept and Measurement, KROC Institute Occasional Papers, 19:OP:1
- [7] Human Development Report, UNDP, 1994, p.22
- [8] Richard Jolly and Deepyan Basu Ray, Op.cit
- [9] As cited by Luiz Carlos Bresser-Pereira in Assault on the State and on the Market: Neoliberalism and Economic Theory, Estudos Avançados 23 (66), 2009
- [10] John Graham Royde-Smith, Thomas A. Hughes, World War II, Encyclopedia of Britannica.

- [11] Human Development Report, UNDP, 1994, p.24
- [12] Human Security Approaches and Challenges, UNESCO, Paris 2008, p.6
- [13] Hector Gros Espiell, 1998, Universal International Security and Regional Security, 25 January, 1996, in what kind of security?, Paris, UNESCO
- [14] Barry Buzan, People, State and Fear: The National Security Problem in International relations, Brighton: Wheatsheat Books, 1983
- [15] Chris Erickson, The Poetics of Fear-A Human Response to Human Security, Continuum, London, 2010, p.8
- [16] Human security in theory and practice-An overview of the human security concept and the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security, Human Security Unit, United Nations, Page 6-7
- [17] CHS: 2003:10
- [18] CHS: 2003:10
- [19] Sung, Lyal S: "the Concept of Human security: Does it add anything of value to International legal Theory or Practice?" en Power and Justice in International Relations, Ashgate, University of Innsbruck, Austria, p.132
- [20] Espiell, Op.cit, pp. 55-57
- [21] Kofi Anan, Towards a Culture of Peace, 8 Nov. 2001, cited by Fuentes and Rojas Aravena, 2005, Promoting Human Security: Ethical, Normative and Educational Framework in Latin America and Caribbean, Paris, UNESCO, p.33
- [22] The Human Security Network is a group of like-minded countries from all regions of the world that, at the level of Foreign Ministers, maintains dialogue on questions pertaining to human security. The Human Security Network identifies concrete areas for collective action. It pursues security policies that focus on the protection and security requirement of the individual and society through promoting freedom from fear and freedom from want. The Network plays a catalytic role by bringing international attention to new and emerging issues. include issues such as the universalization of the Ottawa Convention on Anti-personnel Landmines, the establishment of the International Criminal Court (which is now in place), the protection of children in armed conflict, the control of small arms and light weapons, the fight against transnational organized crime, human development and human security, human rights education, the struggle against HIV/AIDS, addressing implementation gaps of international humanitarian and human rights law, and conflict prevention.
- [23] The commission on human security was established in in January 2001, in response to the UN Secretary General's call at the 2000 Millennium Summit for a world "free from want" and "free from fear". The Commission consists of twelve prominent international figures, including Mrs Sadako Ogata (former UN High Commissioner for Refugees) and Prof. Amartya Sen (1998 Nobel Economic Laureate)
- [24] Jackson, 1997
- [25] Peter Wilkin, The Political economy of Global Communication, An Introduction, Pluto Press, London, 2001, p.17
- [26] George Monbiot, Neoliberalism-the ideology at the root of all our problems, The Guardian, April 15, 2016
- [27] Nitsan Chorev, Sarah Babb, The crisis of neoliberalism and the future of international institutions: A comparison of the IMF and WTO, Springer, 28 June 2009
- [28] Waltz 1979, Baldwin 1993, Wallerstein 1974, Shaw 2000, Cox 1987
- [29] George Monbiot, Op.cit
- [30] Angell, Alan (1991), The Cambridge History of Latin America, Vol. VI, 1930 to the present. Ed Leslie Bethell, Cambridge, New York, Cambridge University Press, p. 318
- [31] George Monbiot, Op.cit
- [32] Mokhiber and Weissmann; 1999, as cited by Peter Wilkin, The Political economy of Global Communication, An Introduction, Pluto Press, London, 2001, p. 21
- [33] Merrien, 1998; Rodrik, 1997; 20, Peter Wilkin, The Political economy of Global Communication, An Introduction, Pluto Press, London, 2001, p. 21
- [34] Henwood, 1997
- [35] Thomas, 1996; UNDP, 1999: Chapter 1
- [36] Henwood, 1993
- [37] Ken Booth and Tim Dunne, eds Worlds in Collusion: Terror and Future of Global Order, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2002, p.11
- [38] Chris Erickson, The Poetics of Fear- A Human Response to Human Security, Continuum, New York, 2010, p.6
- [39] Pranab Bardhan, Scarcity, Conflicts and Cooperation, The MIT Press, Cambridge, 2005, p.252
- [40] Ibid, p.253
- [41] This is not to minimize the trade barriers imposed by the developing countries on imports of other developing countries
- [42] Pranab Bardhan, Op.cit, p.253
- [43] "Economics: Global Finance", Robert E Litan, in Managing Global Issues, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2001
- [44] "Globalisation and Conflict: Welfare, distribution and political unrest" Ranveig Gissing and Nils Petter Gleditsch, Journal of World System Research, Vol 5, 2, 1999, 327-335
- [45] Rodrik, Dani (1997b), Has Globalisation Gone too Far?, Institute for International Economics, Washington DC, see also Professor Rodrik's Speech, Globalisation, Social Conflict and Economic Growth, presented to UNCTAD in Geneva on Oct 24, 1997.
- [46] Jacques Fontanel, Manas Chatterji, War Peace and Security, Emerald, UK, p.16
- [47] Shalom, 1999; UNDP, 1999
- [48] UNDP, 1999, p.258
- [49] Thomas, 1996
- [50] Hahnel, 1999
- [51] Oxfam International "Richest 1 percent bagged 82 percent of wealth created last year - poorest half of humanity got nothing", <https://www.oxfamindia.org/pressrelease/2093>, retrieved on 15 April 2018
- [52] <https://thewire.in/economy/richest-1-cornered-73-wealth-generated-india-2017-oxfam-survey>, retrieved on 15 January 2018

- [53] Kalim Siddiqui Globalisation and Neo-liberal Economic Reforms in India: A Critical Review. In (Eds.) Pramanick, S.K. and Ganguly, R. Globalization in India: New Frontiers and Emerging Challenges, pp 219-243, 2010, New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.
- [54] Martin Wolf, What India Must Do to Outpace China. Financial Times, 14th February 2006. London.
- [55] Fawaz Abdul Salam "Why can't India's agricultural sector keep up with the rest of its economy?", <https://www.trtworld.com/opinion/why-can-t-india-s-agricultural-sector-keep-up-with-the-rest-of-its-economy--16294>, 28 March 2018
- [56] <http://peoplesvoice.in/2015/08/05/india-needs-pro-people-national-land-and-agriculture-policy/>
- [57] A Narayanamoorthy P Alli, "Why our farmers are killing themselves Business line", The Hindu, January 26, 2017
- [58] Debts And Drought Drive India's Farmers To Despair, The New York Times, June 06, 2004
- [59] <https://www.thehindubusinessline.com/economy/only-17-indians-paid-income-tax-in-ay-201516/article10001918.ece>
- [60] Jeremy Bender, Skye Gould, Business Insider India, dated 21st March 2015
- [61] Jacques Fontanel, Manas Chatterji, War Peace and Security, Op.cit, p.2
- [62] Ibid, p.30
- [63] Shahrbanou Tadjbakhsh, Human Security: Concepts and Implications with an Application to Post-Intervention Challenges in Afghanistan, Les Étudesdu CERIN° 117-118 - September 2005
- [64] As cited by Peter Wilkin, The Political economy of Global Communication, An Introduction, Pluto Press, London, 2001, p.6

IJIRAS