



International Journal of Humanities & Social Science Studies (IJHSSS)
A Peer-Reviewed Bi-monthly Bi-lingual Research Journal
ISSN: 2349-6959 (Online), ISSN: 2349-6711 (Print)
Volume-I, Issue-IV, January 2015, Page No. 30-49
Published by Scholar Publications, Karimganj, Assam, India, 788711
Website: <http://www.ijhsss.com>

The Nature of Cultural Diversity and Impacts of Human Security to live better

Dr. Sartipi Hosein

Member of Faculty in Payame Nour University (PNU), Ph.D. in International Law, Iran

Abstract

The role of political economic, the same as other segments of international assistant elements of globalization, has being increased in all human life styles. Universal peace and comprehensive secure model would not be achieved without considering the economic views of human security. Besides, this study is about the theoretical implications of the economic and human security concepts. It argues that the economic and human security concepts can well capture the various aspects of the threats against humankind and contribute to raising awareness of root causes of social disturbances and armed conflicts. They can also help elevate the priority order of developmental issues. Policy recommendations for dealing with economic security and human security may overlap with and lead to inefficient use of scarce resources. However, if they were implemented in an efficient and integrated manner, they might further promote the policies to adapt to economic change and to ensure human security. In addition, the concept of human security may help to generate various military and non-military security as well as non-state security studies although these concepts themselves may hardly generate systematic and empirical studies. The situation sharpens a long-standing dilemma how universal economic human rights can exist in a multicultural world. such as issues, concerns, and questions underlying the debate over universal human rights, economic security, and cultural relativism. It would be attempted to prepare logical practical answer for the mentioned questions.

1. Human Security, Nature, and Requirements: Since the early 1990s, the concept of human security has been the focus of many debates in the United Nations system, in international organizations and governments of different regions, as well as in the academic and intellectual fields. Indeed, with the end of the Cold War, the world became aware of the multiplication of non-violent threats against security at the international, regional, national, and local levels. A great deal of theoretical and practical efforts has been made to identify the most suitable modalities to deal with the threats. The combined impact of using force within states, degradation of the environment, worsening of extreme poverty, spreading of pandemics, and exploitation of cultural and ethnic differences promotes various kinds of conflicts affecting a great number of people, generally the most vulnerable and unprotected sectors of the populations. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, somewhere show significant weaknesses in coping with the consequences of globalization process.¹ Instability in the region has increased, and significantly affected most of the population. Even though the main classical security issues have been overcome in the region that did not have any substantial contribution to global instability², somewhere is far from having policies that promote people's security, human security. Moreover, the intra-national nature of conflicts increases the vulnerabilities of millions of people around the world. For instance, in Latin America, search for a common security concept in the world is a basic challenge for the Rio Group, for the Organization of American States (OAS) and its Committee on Hemispheric Security, and for all the states of the region in the 21st

¹ - Translator: Mahmud Salimi G. B. Medilson " *Globalization, the challenges and opportunities* " 'Rahbord Journal 'Vol. 22 'Winter 1380, p.53.

² - " *THE RIGHT TO SOCIAL SECURITY ADDRESSING WOMEN'S POVERTY AND DISADVANTAGE* " 'South African Journal on Human Rights '25 '2009, p. 34.

century. Civil society organizations and academic institutions such as FLACSO can play an important role in this task. The 21st century is witnessing the emergence of new transnational actors and non-state actors with large capacities for global action. This is an important change in international relations and in the primacy of the interaction between the various actors.¹ The 21st century also shows more strongly than in previous eras the need to solve the problems of millions of human beings who are adversely affected by enormous, growing insecurity in political, economic, social, health, personal, and cultural fields. A significant part of the world population experiences tremendous vulnerability in an unfair system with increasing regional and global interdependence. The consequences are that (in) security is global, even though its manifestations may differ from region to region and country to country.²

To progress towards the construction of a new global order is the core concern. An order that is able to place humanity at the centre of the planetary system, and for states, which continue to be the actors with the greatest relative power, to be able to efficiently guarantee their security and contribute to overcoming the vulnerabilities and difficulties of hundreds of millions of people in acceding to progress and development. The end of the Cold War and the process of globalization led to the increased opportunities for cooperation in the international system and in various regions.³ The communications revolution, the new waves of democracy around the world and the globalization contributed to the universalizing values and principles stipulated in the Human Rights Charter. Promotion of and respect for this Charter require increased association and more cooperation.⁴

An approach to *global politics* from a human-interest perspective, as developed by Mel Gurtov, allows one to compare value matrices. This value distinction originates from different theoretical points of view.⁵ The realist theory looks at international problems and stresses conflicts, which means that cooperation between the different actors is not properly gauged. Transnational 'corporate-globalist' views stress economic aspects and the hegemony of a capitalist model of production and division of labor. Even though these 'rules of the game' establish overall preservation, they are seen as a zero-sum game compared with other values. In both cases, in the absence of any common values, both realism and the corporate-globalist approach stress competitiveness as the basis of constant conflict and rivalry. When one looks at the world from a new perspective with a global humanist projection, the stressed values are different. The need for a more holistic approach asks the core question: Who speaks for the planet? Based on the question, one looks for other angles in international relations, thinking about relations in the international system as a people-related issue. This approach means that one can relate different problems to new priorities. The main priority is necessarily peace. This is directly associated with social aspects, economic justice, political justice, human governance and common responsibility in a balanced environment. Recently, many evidences are to approve the nature, domain and context of sovereignty are changed.⁶ The responsibility of governments is increased rather than their immunity. Therefore, international atmosphere that is affected by international security regimes is going to redefine the criteria of human rights, Human security and their other relationship elements. Because of this situation, every day people observe the vast changes in human rights regulations and administrative tools.⁷ Encountering of the first and

¹ - Hiroshi Ohta " *The Interlinkage of Climate Security and Human Security: The Convergence on Policy Requirements* " Waseda University '9 March 2009, p 5.

² - *Human Development Report 1999: Globalization with a Human Face*, New York, United Nations Development Program, 1999.

³ - Shahroz Ebrahimi " *Globalization and Security of IRI* " *Defense and Security Studies Journal* 'Vol. 33 ' Winter 1381, p. 44.

⁴ - On globalization, see Ulrich Beck *Qué es la globalización?* Buenos Aires, Editorial Paidós, 1998; Clóvis Brigagão and Gilberto Rodrigues, *Globalização a olho N.U. o mundo conectado*, São Paulo, Editora Moderna, 1998; Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye Jr, 'Power and interdependence in the information age', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 77, No. 5, 1998, pp. 81–94; Francisco Rojas Aravena (ed.), *Globalización, América Latina y la diplomacia de cumbres*, Santiago, FLACSO-Chile, 1998.

⁵ - Mel Gurtov, *Global Politics in the Human Interest*, Boulder, Colo., Lynne Rienner *Introduction. Human Security: Emerging...* Francisco Rojas Aravena

⁶ - " *'A monstrous failure of justice'? Guantanamo Bay and national security challenges to fundamental human rights* " *International Politics* '47 '2010, p23.

⁷ - Humphreys, S. *Human Rights and Climate Change*: Cambridge University Press, 2010.p.15.

second generations of human rights and entering into the last innovations, human rights levels such as development right or collective right would approve that any countries or other legal or illegal obstacles would not be able to deny or stop development movements to universal human rights. Human security is an emerging paradigm for understanding global vulnerabilities whose proponents challenge the traditional notion of national security by arguing that the proper referent for security should be the individual rather than the state. Human security holds that a people-centered view of security is necessary for national, regional and global stability. It has been definitely one of the most crucial reasons to create or continue bilateral, regional, and worldwide wars in the history of humankind. The concept emerged from a post-Cold War, multi-disciplinary understanding of security involving a number of research fields, including development studies, international relations, strategic studies, and human rights. The United Nations Development Program's 1994 Human Development Report¹ considered a milestone publication in the field of human security, with its argument that insuring "freedom from want" and "freedom from fear" for all persons are the best paths to tackle the problem of global insecurity. Frequently referred to a wide variety of global policy discussions² and scholarly journals,³ human security is often taught in universities as part of international relations, globalization, or human rights studies.⁴ Critics of the concept argue that its vagueness undermines its effectiveness;⁵ that it has become little more than a vehicle for activists wishing to promote certain causes; and that it does not help the research community understand what security means or help decision makers to formulate good policies.⁶

For many years, the subject and concept of security has comprehended as military concept. Wherever that military conflict has never been seen, everybody imagines security exists. The traditional notion of security continued until the time of development the doctrine of human security by the United Nations Development Program UNDP. The subject has been raised as well as Good Governance Doctrine by World Bank in 1989. However, some believe that human security notion for the first time had been declared in the Palme Commission Report on Disarmament and Security former in 1982. About a decade after presenting this report, UNDP 1993 report seriously considered the above ideas. Consequently, the new concept of security, titled as Human Security, and its various aspects became subject of attention.⁷ Somebody believes in the idea that this new approach (the concept of human security), and the current bureaucratic system of human rights is the only problem.⁸ For them, the subject could not raise any new approach. On the other hand, some people assist on the human security approach would represent a real and objective situation so that human rights get benefited. In addition, it would show new special function of human rights notion. The first group often considers what is under the security titles of the reports of United Nations Development Program only as reflection of the rights mentioned in UDHR (1948), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (1966). Some rights and freedoms such as freedom of poverty and free of fear are traditional rules contained in the Atlantic Charter (1941). As a result, it is not necessary to rebuild such concepts. The important and necessary matter is logical relationship between activities of international organizations, such as United Nations Development Program and what has never been considered in many treaties in mostly past decades. What happened in international situation of human rights is

¹ - United Nations Development Program (1994): Human Development Report.

² - For numerous examples of this, see the Human Security Gateway, <http://www.humansecuritygateway.com>

³ - Human Security Journal / Revue de la Sécurité Humaine - Center for Peace and Human Security - FNSP/IEP Paris.

⁴ - Translator: Saber Shakiba Siz G Link " *Ambiguous meaning of globalization* " «Journal of Strategic Studies «Vol. 3 «Autumn 1380, p.38.

⁵ - Paris, Roland, Human Security - Paradigm Shift or Hot Air? In: *International Security*, 2001, Vol. 26, No. 2.

⁶ - For a comprehensive analysis of all definitions, critiques and counter-critiques, see Tadjbakhsh, Shahrbanou & Chenoy, Anuradha M. *Human Security: Concepts and Implications* , London: Routledge, 2006.

⁷ -see: Claude , Bruderlein, peoples security as a New Measure of Global stability, vol.83,NO.842,IRRC,2001,P.353, Available at:www.icrc.org.

⁸ -Tamoshat Cristian, Human Rights, Theoretical Roots, Translator: Hosein Sharifi Tarazkohi, Tehran, Mizan, 1386, pp.150-151.

based on this subject. In front of this idea, some lawyers believe in the idea that the concept of human security highlights on the function and special action that international institutes must do to strengthen and protect human rights. Besides, it explains the real practical conditions that are beneficial to human rights. It represents effective factors to perform these rights in real life. Therefore, the human security concept merely does not refer to a legal status, but it has the exact consideration to the public interest observer's role and function. The human security doctrine considers the security not only as mere current situation, but also as a goal to achieve webmaster needs. Such approach transforms the concept that the perfect benefits of human rights would be Institutionalization, if the future problems considered as a general and complicated package. Moreover, possibility of achieving such rights cannot be ignored. For instance, it pays attention to the point that achieving many rights without eliminating poverty (especially extreme poverty) is impossible. So elimination of poverty has been raised as a new aspect.¹

Principals of human security and human rights are seriously related to consideration of some social conditions prevailing on the international arena. Power structure at national, international conditions, and economic, social, and other problems have been effective on raising subjects, such as humanitarian intervention, problems related to migrant workers, terrorism, environmental issues, etc. In such a situation, human security seriously faced dangers and its rights have been attacked widely.²

² As a result, representation of human security again assists on consideration of human rights as a fundamental subject. States historically more tend national security as important and early priority than individual security and human rights. International human rights system has attempted to focus on humanity as necessary target of any security system. Then, human security doctrine means to encourage human rights regulations in national and international levels and to interpret and perform most protection to human dignity.

2. Traditional Security, Human Developing, and Economic Aspects: In recent years, human security emerged as a challenge to ideas of traditional security, but human, traditional or national securities are not mutually exclusive concepts. Without human security, traditional state security cannot be attained and vice-versa.³ Traditional security is about a state's ability to defend against external threats. Traditional security (often referred to as national security or state security) describes the philosophy of international security predominance since the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 and the rise of the nation-states. While international relations theory includes many variants of traditional security, from realism to idealism, the fundamental common trait of the schools is their focus on the primacy of the nation-state.

Economic, social, and cultural rights are recognized and protected in the instruments of international and regional human rights. Member states have a legal obligation to respect, protect and fulfill economic, social, and cultural rights and are expected to take "progressive action" towards their fulfillment.⁴ Human insecurity is the product of diverse and complex factors. In one form or another, it has always formed part of the human condition, and could never be eliminated altogether nor is it clear that total security would be a desirable state of living. Nevertheless, human beings have sought, through the ages, to reduce insecurity to a tolerable level. Although insecurities in different domains are interrelated and feed on each other, the primary focus of this paper is on economic insecurity. Compared with the early post-war decades, it is undeniable that economic insecurity has worsened in most parts of the world in recent years. As argued above, insecurity derives from high levels of unemployment, precarious job conditions, deepening poverty, and diminishing state support.⁵

Some differences would be shown between traditional security and human security. Traditional security policies are designed to promote demands ascribed to the state. Other interests are subordinated to those of the state. Traditional security protects a state's boundaries, people, institutions, and values, but human security is a people-centered matter. Its focus shifts to protecting

¹ - . See: GA Res.55/2, 8September 2000, section III.

² - see: Truong Thanh -Dam, Human Security and Human Rights ,in: The Essentials of Human Rights , Ed. by Rhona k.m. smith and Christien Van den Anker , Hodder Arnold, Newyork ,2005,pp.172-173.

³ - Human Security Centre. "What is Human Security." <http://www.humansecurityreport.info/index.php>

⁴ - Henry J. Steiner , " *International Human Rights In Context* " ,Newyork: Oxford,2007 ,p 264.

⁵ - Dharam Ghai, " *Economic Globalization, Institutional Change and Human Security* " ,UNITED NATIONS RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT ,November 1997, p 15.

individuals. The important dimensions entail the well-being of individuals and respond to the ordinary people's requirements in dealing with sources of threats. In the scope, some points have been raised. Traditional security seeks to defend states against external aggression. *Walter Lippmann* explained that state security is about a state's ability to deter or defeat an attack.¹ It makes uses of deterrence strategies to maintain the integrity of the state and protect the territory from external threats. While, In addition to protecting the state from external aggression, human security would expand the scope of protection to include a broader range of threats, including environmental pollution, infectious diseases, and economic deprivation. In traditional security, the state is the sole actor to ensure its own survival. Decision making power is centralized in the government, and the execution of strategies rarely involves the public. Traditional security assumes that a sovereign state operates in an anarchical international environment, in which there is no world governing body to enforce international rules of conduct. But, in human security, the realization of human security involves not only governments, but a broader participation of different actors², regional and international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and local communities. In addition, traditional security relies upon building up national power and military defense. The common forms it takes are armament races, alliances, strategic boundaries etc. While Human security not only protects, but also empowers people and societies as a means of security, people contribute by identifying and implementing solutions to insecurity.

Human security also challenged and drew from the practice of international development. Traditionally, embracing liberal market economics was considered as the universal path for economic growth, and thus development for all humanity.³ Yet, continuing conflict and human rights abuses following the end of the Cold War and the fact that two-thirds of the global population seemed to have gained little from the economic gains of globalization,⁴ led to fundamental questions about the development way. Accordingly, in 1990s, human development has emerged to challenge the dominant paradigm of liberal economy in the development community. Human development proponents argue that economic growth is insufficient to expand people's choice or capabilities; moreover, the areas such as health, education, technology, the environment, and employment should not be neglected.

Human security could be said to further enlarge the scope for examining the causes and consequences of underdevelopment by seeking to bridge between development and security. Too often, militaries did not address or factor in the underlying causes of violence and insecurity while development workers often underplayed the vulnerability of development models to violent conflict. Human security springs from a growing consensus. These two fields need to get more integrated in order to enhance security for all. As a result, as read below, security and development are deeply interconnected.⁵

- 1- *Human security forms an important part of people's well-being and is, therefore, an objective of development.*⁶
- 2- *Lack of human security has adverse consequences on economic growth and, therefore, development.*⁷
- 3- *Imbalanced development that involves horizontal inequalities is an important source of conflict.*

¹ - Walter Lippmann, *U.S. Foreign Policy*, Boston, 1943, p.51.

² - Caroline Thomas, "Global Governance, Development and Human Security: Exploring the Links", *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp 167-168, 2001.

³ - Caroline Thomas, "Global Governance, Development and Human Security: Exploring the Links", *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp 167-168, 2001.

⁴ - see *Financial Times*, 24 December 1994 and *New York Times*, 15 July 1996: 55.

⁵ - nces Stewart, "Development and Security", Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security, and Ethnicity (CRISE), Working Paper 3, London: University of Oxford, 2004.

⁶ - An objective of development is "the enlargement of human choices". Insecurity cuts life short and thwarts the use of human potential, thereby affecting the reaching of this objective.

⁷ - Some development costs are obvious. For example, in wars, people who join the army or flee can no longer work productively. Also, destroying infrastructure reduces the productive capacity of the economy.

Therefore, vicious cycles of lack of development that leads to conflict, then to lack of development, can readily emerge. Likewise, virtuous cycles are possible, with high levels of security leading to a development, which further promotes security in return. Further, it could be said that the practice of human development and human security share three fundamental elements:¹

First, human security and human development are both people-centered. They challenge the orthodox approach to security and development, i.e. state security and liberal economic growth respectively. Both emphasize people are the ultimate ends not the means. Both treat human as an agent, and should be empowered to participate in the course.

Second, both perspectives are multidimensional. They address people's dignity as well as their material and physical concerns.

Third, both schools of thought consider poverty and inequality as the root causes of individual vulnerability.

Despite these similarities, the relationship with development is one of the most congested areas of human security. "Freedom from fear" advocates such as Andrew Mack argue that human security should focus on the achievable goals of decreasing individual vulnerability to violent conflict, rather than broadly defined goals of economic and social development. Others such as Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy argue that human development and human security are inextricably linked since progress in one enhances the chances of progress in another while failure in one increases risk of failure of another.² To help clarify the relationship between these two concepts³, there should be attention on *values, orientation, time frame, General objectives, and Policy goals*. Values in Human Development attends to well-being, while in Human Security has be attended to security, stability, sustainability of development gains. Human Development move is progressive and aggregate, "Together we rise in *orientation part*. However, Looks at who was left behind at the individual level, "Divided we fall" goes up in human security.

Human development has happened in long term while human security combines short-term measures to deal with risks with long term preventing efforts grown with equity. Expanding the choices and opportunities of people to lead lives, their value is *General objectives in* human development. However, "Insuring" downturns with security are shown for human security. In addition, identification of risks, prevention to avoid them through dealing with root causes, preparation to mitigate them, and cushioning when disaster strikes are raised in this part. Finally, empowerment, sustainability, equity, and productivity have been recognized as *Policy goals in* human development. About human security, protection and promotion of human survival (freedom from fear), daily life (freedom from want), and the avoidance of indignities (life of dignity) have been introduced as *policy goals*.

3. Human Rights, Human Security, and Cultural Diversity: Relationship between human rights and cultural diversity has been one of the important discussions in human sciences scope at the scientific and political situations, especially at the current decades. Many various notions have been raised mentioned below:

- 1- The first idea about human rights says it is universal. Cultural diversity would never have impact on the norms of human rights. The proponents of this idea define human rights as a universal subject by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international treaties.
- 2- Others, who are known as Relativists, believe in the idea that human rights are relative. As a result, its norms are defined by cultural and geographic characteristics. They believe universal definition of human rights is not seen. Each government is allowed to especially define its cultural characteristics by human rights criteria and to perform its regulations.
- 3- The third group believes universal human rights are substantial, but the definitions of human rights norms are not necessarily universal. Various legal systems have declared different definitions of human rights, but intercultural communications about human rights would assist in order to achieve a common comprehension to about universal human rights.

¹ - Sabina Alkire, "A conceptual Framework for Human Security", Centre for Research on inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity (CRSE), Working Paper 2, London: University of Oxford, 2003.

² - Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy, *Human Security: Concepts and implications*, London: Routledge, 2006.

³ - S Tadjbakhsh, "Human Security", 'Human Development Insights Issue 17, New York: UNDP HDR Networks.

The above mentioned ideas have led to formulate some groups in international politics. Then, many states (often western countries) tried to promote Western definition of human rights by Universal Declaration of Human Rights, both Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and Covenant Economic Social and Cultural Rights, other international instruments, such as Convention Against Torture, the Convention on the Rights of Women, and the Convention on the Rights of the Child as universal criteria for human rights.¹ On the other hand, some states have rejected any international criteria for human rights by belief in cultural diversity.² They have attempted to justify their weak functions by their national definitions of human rights. What is seen in the international community has been actually political and intellectual of conflict between both of these groups.³ Unfortunately, because of so-called conflict in the intellectual debates about human rights, the non-scientific and non-political notions have been raised. This causes the image presented to the human rights, and cultural diversity sounds single-dimensional and unbalanced. Due to such popularity in the media and university scopes, cultural diversity has been represented as a justification for the breach of human rights by developing countries.⁴

In addition, the relation between human rights and cultural diversity has been never shown well, and the credit of cultural law in both international literature and implementation step weaken. Because of that, the necessity of recognition of the exact relation between human rights and cultural diversity and identification of the collective and individual rights is unavoidable. Regarding to this necessity, Islamic Republic of Iran proposed a resolution plan as titled "Human Rights and Cultural Diversity" to general Assembly of United Nations in 1999.⁵ This proposal approved by consensus of states. The idea of cultural diversity approved by the above resolution seriously considers the basic concepts, such as self-determination respect for all, tolerance, intercultural dialogue, and the universality of human rights.

4- Socio-cultural Diversity and Human Security: The issue of international terrorism has highlighted the potential human conflict inherent in the existence of marked socio-cultural, religious, linguistic, political or any other type of differences between large groups of people throughout the world and within specific nations or regions. These differences are evident and coexistence between different sectors marked by various degrees of cooperation and/or conflict. Recognition of the potential for the conflict and insecurity inherent in this coexistence, together with recognition of the legitimacy of the existence of these differences and their peaceful expression, are conditions for bringing human security to fruition. Modernization and modernity bring with them the homogenization of life patterns, values, and behaviors. Although this is stated as an empirical fact, it is sometimes used as a governing criterion against sizeable communities by defending different right in a world, in which their security is associated through the permanence of guidelines and values that are known. However, it is not necessarily, and to be shared by all building sectors of a nation and rebelled by different means. Peace and prevention of conflict require proper understanding of diversity, sincere acceptance of its legitimacy and the design of institutional mechanisms to process tensions, which may arise naturally from the existence of marked diversity in society.

5- The linkage between cultural diversity, Peace, and Economic Security: Living in a peaceful and secure environment is fundamental to human dignity and development. Given that sustainable development is pertinent to every aspect of human life, teaching and learning for sustainable development must have social, economic, environmental, and cultural perspectives. Peace and human security are among the 27 principles of sustainable development, Principle 25 claims: "Peace, development and environmental protection are interdependent and indivisible." Economy is vital to

¹ - Javaid Rehman, " *International Human Rights Law* " (London Longman, 2009) p 243.

² - Asadolah Asadi " *Respect the presumption of innocence in the quasi-judicial proceedings in France in the light of the European Convention on Human Rights* " (Journal of Legal Studies, 49, 1389), p.44.

³ - Mahmud Reza Golshan Pazoh " *Human Rights in the World: Processes, Cases and Reactions* " (Tehran: Azad Islamic University, Mordad 1388) p 23 and " *UNIVERSAL HUMAN RIGHTS IN A CULTURALLY DIVERSIFIED WORLD* " (Criminal Defense Lawyers, <http://www.racialjusticecollaborative.org/universal-human-rights-in-a-culturally-diversified-world.htm>

⁴ - Brandi Nikole Andrews " *Cosmopolitanism and Human Rights: Creating a Global Consciousness* " (European University for Peace Studies, January, 2008, p.24.

⁵ - <http://humansecurityconf.polsci.chula.ac.th/Documents/Presentations/Shanaweze.pdf>

the task of acquiring the capacity to live together peacefully. It can help to prevent insecurity and conflicts from thwarting the progress towards sustainable development. Economy can also call upon rebuilding a more sustainable society after violent conflict. There are clear linkages between education, poverty reduction, human security, and sustainability. For instance, the poor and marginalized ones are disproportionately affected by poor environmental and socio-economic conditions.¹ Some international organizations such as ESD contribute to sustainable environmental management to improve livelihood means and increase economic security and income opportunities for the poor ones. In addition, educational responses to poverty need to address the fact that many of the world's poor do not participate in the formal market economy but in non-formal economies, and many are self-employed entrepreneurs. In the other hands, a relevant and purposeful education is able to transform people's lives.²

The *Universal Declaration of UNESCO on cultural diversity* established a link between diversity and cultural rights³ and defined a principle of mutual protection between cultural diversity and human rights, which impedes relativist drifts and community's self-exclusion⁴. The major impediment to granting respect for cultural diversity is that not all cultural diversities are, *per se*, good. It is through respect for indivisible and interrelated human rights that all richness and interpretations of universality contained in the diversity of cultural milieu can gain all their worth. Promoting respect for cultural diversity without ensuring respect for all human right opens a door to relativism. Of all human rights, cultural rights are the ones in the best position to ensure this mutual protection of both universal human rights and diversity. While the international community has frequently been perceived as an impediment to progress and to universality in the past culture, it has become aware that cultural diversity constitutes an invaluable resource for:

- The effective and universal implementation of all human rights;
- Respect for identities and cultural rights endangered by the homogeneity linked to globalization;
- Conflict the prevention and restoration of peace;
- The instruments and dispositions concerning the rights of the people belonging to the minorities recall and make the universal character of these rights more precise, particularly, in art 27 of the international covenant on civil and political rights, Convention 169 of the ILO on indigenous people, Article 19 of the International covenant on civil and political rights (UDHR), the UN convention on the rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious, linguistic minorities, and the UN; and;
- The empowerment of actors involved in the fair and sustainable development.⁵

The cultural dimension of human security has been largely overlooked while injuries to the identities, collective humiliations and the general suspicion with which cultures are viewed are determining factors in the spread of violence, conflicts, terrorism, and extreme poverty. During the period that acts of terrorism have become widespread, it is vital to address those violations of identities that lead to humiliations, reductionism, and mutual incomprehension and hatred. Diversity and cultural rights are essential to guaranty human security. Cultural rights are rights to *diversity*. A diversity that brings peace by allowing differences to be considered as normal and rich contributions to social environment instead of as threats. Welcoming these different possibilities brings out the value of this cultural richness, necessary to build a long lasting peace.⁶

¹ Dharam Ghai, " *Economic Globalization, Institutional Change and Human Security* " (UNITED NATIONS RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (November 1997)p.171.

² - Ehsan Javid " *nited Nation Human Rights Council and Its Mechanism for Military Conflicts* " (International Law Journal (40 (1388)p.22.

³ - Art. 5, and § 4 of the Plan of action : « Making further headway in understanding and clarifying the content of cultural rights as an integral part of human rights»

⁴ - First principle of art. 2. Resolution 60/167, adopted by the UN General Assembly on march 7th 2006, considers the link of mutual strengthening « between respect for cultural diversity and the cultural rights of all ».

⁵ - This right includes the right to benefit from scientific progress, protection of the essential freedoms needed needed to pursue scientific research and artistic creation, protection of intellectual property rights and rights of authors and also includes implicitly the right to access cultural heritage.

⁶ - Voir sur notre site le DS 15, le Document de Nouakchott : *Droits culturels et traitement des violences. Aux sources de la sécurité humaine.*

6- Human Security, Development Right, and Economic Subjects: When Dr. Mahbub ul Haq first drew global attention to the concept of human security in the United Nations Development Program's 1994 Human Development Report and sought to influence the UN's 1995 World Summit on Social Development in Copenhagen, importance of economic aspects of human security has been raised in the international community. The UNDP's 1994 Human Development Report's definition of human security argues that the scope of global security should be expanded to include threats in seven areas. One that is reflected in this article is related to economic fields in human security context. The global financial crisis of 2008 sharpened debate on the nature of global economic security. Like the Asian crisis of 1997-98 that began as a single-country, single-sector crisis spread to other countries and other sectors, demonstrating how the global age has become intimately interconnected.¹

Economic security, in the context of politics and international relations, is the ability of a nation-state to follow its choice of policies to develop the national economy in a desired manner. Historically, conquests of nations have made conquerors rich through plundering new resources and enlargement of trade through controlling the conquered nation's economy. In today's complex system of international trade, characterized by multi-national agreements, mutual inter-dependency and availability of natural resources etc, economic security forms, arguably, an important part of national security as military policy. On the other hand, economic security requires an assured basic income for individuals, usually from productive and remunerative work or, as a last resort, from a publicly financed safety net. In this sense, only about a quarter of the world's people are presently economically secure. While the economic security problem may be more serious in developing countries, a concern also arises in developed countries as well. Unemployment problems constitute an important factor underlying political tensions and ethnic violence.

Economic security, in the context of politics and international relations, is the ability of a nation-state to follow its choice of policies to develop the national economy in the manner desired. Historically, conquests of nations have made conquerors rich through plundering new resources and enlarging trade through controlling the conquered nations' economy. In today's complex system of international trade, characterized by multi-national agreements, mutual inter-dependence and availability of natural resources etc, economic security forms, arguably, an important part of national security as military policy. On the other hand, economic security requires an assured basic income for individuals, usually from productive and remunerative work or, as a last resort, from a publicly financed safety net. In this sense, only about a quarter of the world's people are economically secure at present. While the economic security problem may be more serious in developing countries, a concern also arises in developed countries as well. Unemployment problems constitute an important factor underlying political tensions and ethnic violence.

7. Human Security, Economic Political and International Approaches to Peace: Conditions currently exist to form an international coalition of states and civil society organizations to support and promote projects aimed at establishing greater security for people and their performance as the core of international security. The United Nations is encouraging this point of view, basically, by improving new international law that seeks to guarantee peace and governance and foster positive incentives. In this regard, we would like to stress the point of view set forth at the Lysøen meeting of the Human Security Network: 'An innovative international approach will be needed to address the source of insecurity, remedy the symptoms and prevent the recurrence of threats which affect the daily lives of millions of people.'² The goal set by the UN in terms of security is a "world free from fear". Achieving this entails recognizing a new set of international circumstances typified by less weight given to inter-state conflicts and more weight to intra-state conflicts. The Millennium Report of the General Assembly, drawn up by former Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, "*We the Peoples*"³ stresses that more than 5 million people died in this type of internal wars in the 1990s. There were also mass migrations, refugees, destruction of infrastructures and alterations to the

¹ - Rosita Dellios2 " *Mandalic Regionalism in Asia: Exploring the Relationship between Regional Governance and Economic Security* " *Culture Mandala* Vol. 8, No. 1 (October-December 2008, p1.

² - Chairman's Summary, 'A Perspective on Human Security', Lysøen, Norway, 20 May 1999.

³ - Millennium Report by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, *We the Peoples: The Role of the United Nations in the 21st Century* (www.un.org/).

environment. All this violates the basic human rights of millions of people and makes it hard to prepare conditions for peace – as a primary right – as the foundation for building a better world. UN analyses indicate that conflicts are more frequent in regions with poor countries, so the challenge of protecting more vulnerable populations is even greater. The above poses a global and regional dilemma regarding the most suitable mechanisms for achieving stability, peace, and fostering cooperation. Even though one cannot completely disallow intervention, it has shown that, in most cases, it is not the best option for settling conflicts. The same is true about the system of sanctions. In this framework, operations of maintaining and imposing peace must be reviewed. In the type of conflict that emerges as the most relevant at the beginning of the 21st century, controlling small arms becomes just as important as controlling nuclear weapons. This all marks a change in the perspective of the main international actors regarding situations of tension, conflict, and, on a more general level, security concepts.

The international system has been changed dramatically in less than a decade. Not only did the disappearance of the Soviet Union definitively mark this change, but also there were substantial changes that accumulated over time and are expressed with particular strength in the post-Cold War context. The number of state actors participating in the institutionalized international system has multiplied by at least, since the United Nations set up in 1945. Other actors with increasingly more influence on international relations, not just international agencies capable of changing their surroundings, but a series of transnational forces expressed with particular strength in transnational companies and non-government organizations (NGOs), began to emerge. Communications improvements, technological revolution, economical changes, and globalization speeded up these changes. This is mainly expressed in the state – the main actor – having less power. States ceased to enjoy monopolistic control or have the capability to establish and promote actions in six basic areas:

1. *Communications*. Internet is the best example of world linkage free of state control. Radio and TV are also good examples.
2. *Technological development*. It depends more on companies than on the state and affects investment capabilities, from genetic techniques and cloning to technological developments designed for war.
3. *Finances*. Financial transactions flow around the world and generate regional and global crises with little capacity for state intervention.
4. *Investments*. Even though states generate reinsurance for investments, their ability to control decisions about where to invest and where to obtain the investments is minimal.
5. *International migrations* and the ability to control movement of people have also diminished in all states.
6. *Trade* has opened up more and more and states face evident problems in setting up controls and restrictions.

At the beginning of the 21st century, the countries of the region are immersed in a process of debating and reformulating security concepts. A conceptual transition is taking place from a Cold War perspective that visualizes an enemy expressed in strongly military actions of a state to a post-Cold War perspective in which threats are diffused, the weight of military factors are diminished and many of the threats appear not linked to state actors and even not linked to any particular territory. In general, however, the end of the Cold War has led to reappraisal of main theoretical matrices used to evaluate international problems.¹ This will allow progress towards a new paradigm, which places greater emphasis on cooperation and association while recognizing conflict and confrontation. The change requires tremendous political will on the part of core actors and specific forms of coordination. Development of theories about international regimes² and about forming global public

¹ - Michael P. Snnar and D. Neil Snarr (eds.), *Global Issues*, Boulder, Colo., Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998; Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde, *Security. A New Framework for Analysis*, Boulder, Colo., Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998; Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye Jr, 'Power and interdependence in the information age', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 77, No. 5, 1998. pp. 81–94; Mel Gurtov, *Global Politics in the Human Interest*, op. cit.

² - Stephen D. Krasner, *International Regimes*, Cornell University Press, 1983, 6th ed.,1991; Roberto Keohane, *Instituciones internacionales y poder estatal*, Buenos Aires, Editorial GEL, 1993.

goods¹ has gained greater significance and importance, as contributes to theories of negotiation² and practical instruments to relieve tension.³ Theoretical exploration of this field will generate suitable knowledge to improve multilateral relations and their outcomes, especially to those capable of changing relations in the international system⁴, beginning with cooperative multilateralism.

Today, the world has more information. Links are improved. Political, economic, and social events in a country or region are important for other side of the world.⁵ Economic decisions made in one part of the world have direct consequences on economic growth and sustainability of other areas. All above proves the existence of substantial changes in the basic concept of sovereignty and demonstrates the reduced capabilities of nations to cope with their main problems.⁶ Hence, coordinating policies, establishing regulations and generating international regimes, based on common values, are essential points in designing a new international system for the 21st century. Only the ability to act jointly will allow states accompanied by other actors to recover their abilities to generate a legitimate order capable of meeting the demands made, including the issue of security worldwide: building a world free from threats and fears. Cooperation is the basic concept that makes security understandable in the post-Cold War period. This concept emerges in all reports systematizing progress and interpreting the changes in the world. It also plays an important role in different views, both for prevention and promotion peace and international security. The series of views indicate that new problems that must be incorporated into the concept go beyond military aspects; hence, cooperation elements are an essential point.

8. National Security and Economic Security: Countries all develop their global objectives and strategies. They all develop sophisticated scanning processes to understand the political, economic, sociological, and technological variables, which have an impact on them. In some countries such as USA, the federal government does not manage the country as a "system". Their need to an interagency cooperation is an essential element of what should be changed in future, in addition to other forms of cooperation between the government and its members. By industry, all industries - not just that base portion that supports the military - directly government corporations increasingly act as large social systems with a global focus. Nevertheless, if were asked the CEOs of the Fortune to describe their considered issues on any given day, "National Security" would not be among them. Many global corporations do not believe that they owe allegiance to any stakeholders other than theirs and sometimes their customers. This attitude has profoundly been changed since the end of the Cold War. Have this had an impact on national security of governments? Certainly, in the post Cold War circumstances, economic security is national security, but national security community does very little about it. A new vision of national security is required. It needs to encompass cooperation between government and all its stakeholders, including but not limited to industry.

Lacking economic security or a viable market based economy, the USSR disintegrated. It disintegrated rapidly, broadly, and precipitously. That disintegration created a new world order

¹ - Inge Kaul, Isabelle Grunberg and Marc A. Stern, *Global Public Goods*, New York, UNDP/Oxford University Press, 1999.

² - J. William Breslin and Jeffrey Z. Rubin, *Negotiation Theory and Practice. Program on Negotiation Books*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Law School, 1995. Roger Fisher, Andrea Kupfer Schneider, Elizabeth Borgmardt and Brian Ganson, *Beyond Machiavelli. Tools for Coping with Conflict*, Harvard University Press, 1994. Roger Fisher, Elizabeth Kopelman and Andrea Kupfer Schneider, *Más allá de Maquiavelo. Herramientas para afrontar conflictos*, Buenos Aires, Editorial Granica, 1996 (original version in English, 1994).

³ - Michael Krepon, Michael Newbill, Khurshid Khoja and Jenny S. Drezin, *Global Confidence Building, New Tools for Troubled Regions*, New York, St Martin's Press, 1999.

⁴ - Stanley Hoffmann, *World Disorders. Troubled Peace in the Post-Cold War Era*, Boston, Mass., Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1998.

⁵ - This trend has increased with the impact of global terrorism and the fight to eliminate it. *UNESCO/FLACSO-Chile* 16

⁶ - Roberto Bergalli and Eligio Resta (comp.), *Soberanía: un principio que se derrumba*, Buenos Aires, Editorial Paidós, 1996.

through which concern about regional challenges to national security replaced the global threats and counterbalances of the Cold War. Clearly, the reduced tensions of this new world have helped new democracies advance. Traditional democracies such as the United States get also benefited. These developed nations have had economic security due to their market-based economies. Now, they are able to devote more resources than the Cold War period to address such global problems as the environment, overpopulation, technology transfer, and infrastructure developments. They also have the resources to cooperate in peacekeeping operations around the world to create new alliances such as Partnership for Peace and to go ahead in planning to expand other alliances like NATO and the United Nations.

Most critical for the economy, both government and industry are failing to cooperate as completely as they could in crucial areas in advance national security, such as leveraging the national laboratories and encouraging increased researches and developments on many fronts. Industry does not really understand government's red tape. Government's lack of appreciation of the Wall Street's powerful role in the life of industry frustrates them. With so rapid and ir retrievable movement of industry into global markets and agreements, which ought to be a great boost for the economy, national security has grown uneasy, feeling a steady loss of control. Industry, for its part, frequently ignores government's often-rightful regulatory efforts.

The relationship between industry and military - especially between the long-range planners of both sides - now suffers from a growing lack of understanding. There is ignorance on both sides due to poor communication and lack of true "partnership." If this ignorance continues, the country will lose its role as the world leadership, and European or Asian consortia could outpace the role relying on close cooperation of their military and government with industry since long ago. Thus, in effect, the United States could decline in whatever the post-Cold War period is called for decades hence. Today, no one predicts it. Ironically, the nation who ended the Cold War by its willingness to stand against the Soviet Union for forty years has made it possible to boom great economics in Asia, to raise democracies in Europe and Latin America, and even indirectly to ease the path for the emergence of China. The nation could decline by allowing itself to deteriorate from within while much of the world enjoys the fruits of a victory earned largely by the United States. There could and should be a peace divided, but only when an increased communication happens between government agencies and its stakeholders, including industry.

There are many kinds of "war" against corporations and countries. It may be difficult to stay away from some of these "little Wars" because they are not considered "war" in the traditional sense. For example, act of terrorism when a foreign country kidnaps and hold an executive for ransom. Is this single terrorism act an act of "Economic War" when the executive's knowledge gives his company a competitive advantage on a global basis, and thus helps his country's economy to be stronger? If the executive is killed, is it an act of war? Is there a difference between real war and economic war? In a real war, people's lives are at risk. In an economic war, a nation's economy and its citizen's livelihoods are at risk. Either way, national security is at risk. Though history shows that when nations' economies are at risk of failure, like the situation of Japan and Germany' before World War II, the penchant war is high. Economic wars can lead to economic chaos that follows real wars, very dangerous ones. In a globally competitive economy, how do national economies compete? Is there such a thing as economic war? When does natural competitions end and economic war begin? Who is the enemy in an economic war: a company or a country? How can a government defend itself against economic war, if it exists?

Understanding the ramifications of the global economy and its relationship with countries' economies and their ability to compete is the core of national security of the world of Post-Cold War because economic security is national security. Without economic security, there is no national security in a military or any other sense. So, isn't an attack to the economic security of a country, in a sense, an act of war? Threats to national security are defined according to the context of the age. For instance, for decades, many U.S. industries have seen that some foreign countries' policies can have a profoundly negative effect on the ability of any country to export or sell their products and services competitively. This can lead to the loss of the whole industries in a country. When a country's government deliberately encourages its industry and governmental officials to harm another country's economy or its industry through industrial and other policies, an economic war is waged.

Economic security is national security in the broadest sense. Government and industry sometimes fail to consolidate their achievements following the victory in the cold war because they did not cooperate, and, in fact, went on adversarial relationship. The division between government and industry is largely one of the misunderstandings, and yet, filling the gap is crucial to the national security. Understanding the "systems" of nature of national security is at the very heart of why it is crucial for government and industry cooperation to maintain the leadership position of the states in the 21st century. In a system, all elements are interconnected and, at the same time, interdependent. Therefore, systems are only as strong as their weakest links. However, in some countries, the links between government and industry are weak. Government and industry have been adversaries for lots of generations that do not know each other well enough even to recognize each other's strengths and weaknesses. They fail to capitalize on what could be a powerful and inexpensive force multiplier. The most recent reasons for this misunderstanding root in cultural differences that began during the Vietnam War period, for example. Unfortunately, for the nation, this has continued into the post Cold War period because the two sides approach the new world order along separate paths. In addition, the two sides mostly have viewed each other with suspicion and distrust. To survive in the 21st century, the United States requires learning the true meaning of national security and its concomitant requirements for cooperation between government, industry, and other sectors. Each side has a great deal to learn from the other though neither has made a serious effort in this regard. The irony of all this is that the U.S., in the current absence of a major global threat, could fritter away a significant portion of its strength by a self-inflicted wound. There is a brighter prospect, however, which lies in the possibility of a government and industry cooperative partnership that builds upon the strengths of both and finds ways to augment weaknesses to bring a secure future for the country. When there have been efforts to cooperate, they have frequently produced positive results, such as USCAR. Unfortunately, the number of cooperative efforts is far short of requirements for the nation to remain a global leader for long term. The executive branch of the federal government and the corporate officers of government should start a dialogue to learn from each other and work together in the national interest. Other nations have done superb jobs of the cooperation, such as Japan. Using systems thinking, the nation will benefit from seeing how powerful and productive common sense cooperation could be for 21st century America. Indeed, without such cooperation, the United States' chances to retain its global leadership position are questionable. Government and industry should develop other cooperative relationships; those that strengthen the infrastructure of the nation, including the education system, technology, research and development. It is important to explain the systems of nature of national security and its components that provide a context.

Now, it is especially interesting time to study the global community while the world is in a period between the end of the Cold War and what comes in future. In the real world, a system can be described as any entity with an open boundary that contains interdependent elements. A system must be able to adapt to its environment. Systems can be small or large. They can be physical, such as human body or solar system. They can be social, such as a family, church, or company. Whole societies are systems, too. The "global village" is perhaps the largest social system. Global systems are both physical and/or social. Satellite channels, telecommunication networks, or Global Positioning System Satellite to determine latitude and longitude anywhere on the planet are examples of global physical systems. The United Nations, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund are amongst the largest economic and/or political systems. In a global economy, understanding the global systemic behavior is essential. It would be especially complex, when individual nation's currencies compete with one another. There will truly be a global village and economy when there is only one global currency.

It is most helpful to discuss economic security as national security in a system of context. With the fall of the Berlin Wall, the crumbling infrastructure of the former Soviet Union, with the increasing pace of change and technology that are leading the planet beyond Alvin Toffler's "third wave," and the globalization of the world economy, the stable bipolar world of the cold war has changed forever. Instead of a global "peace dividend," which raised the living standards, the people around the world have inherited an increasingly complex and unstable, even chaotic, place to live. After World War II, General George C. Marshall said, "We are now concerned with the peace of the entire world. And the peace can only be maintained by the strong." If we take General Marshall's comments as a premise, what does it mean to be strong? Why must national security be thought of as a "systems" perspective

in order to enable the United States, for example, to get strong, and thus to support commerce and peace initiatives around the world. A part of being strong relates to the strength of our nation's infrastructure: the foundation upon which the continuous growth of our society depends. This includes its strong societal and moral codes, the rule of law, stable governmental and political institutions, schools, and educational programs to ensure a knowledgeable citizenry and life-long learning. Infrastructure also includes power plants, roads, sewers, ports, banks, telecommunications, housings, health-care centers and hospitals, powerful militaries, and environmental subjects. Most important, to support all these infrastructures, it is essential to have a healthy market based economy with a strong industrial base and globally competitive industries which continuously improve their quality and productivity and produce jobs and more jobs. All of the mentioned elements of infrastructure are critical to national security. They must be sound for a nation to be strong.

National security cannot be viewed in any other way but in a societal systems context. In addition, it must be defined within that context. This may have occurred in Dr. Deming's earliest thinking about social systems since he told the Japanese to view their entire country as a system in 1950. Dr. Deming would say, "A system must have an aim" to be a system. What is the aim of the United States? Perhaps, we could say, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," within the system framework of maintaining the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and providing for a common defense. Of course, another system constraint includes a finite amount of tax dollars and globally competitive capital for free-market growth, with which to build the infrastructure and, in addition, the knowledgeable people essential for an effective society. A major part of the infrastructure of a nation is a sound economy. It, therefore, follows that one important way to secure peace around the world is to ensure prosperity and a high quality of life on a global basis. Economic stability, however, is not necessarily considered an element of national security. However, it is. Too frequently, national security is mainly viewed within a military framework, but that is much too narrow a context for the 21st century. But, in a broad definition of national security, the military may need to play a role to help integrate, though not control, the many "voices" that come together to define its nation's security.

9. The Importance of Cultural Dimension and Human Rights: Globalization has universalized such values as human rights, democracy, and market. This globalization has a strong Western flavor. Basic technological and economic processes associated with globalization have generated greater global interdependence with positive and negative aspects, such as more trade, more dissemination of scientific knowledge, and more global information. There is also a greater danger to environment; terrorism has acquired a global dimension; organized crime is worldwide; and financial crises know no borders. Generating stability and global governance without proper institutions is difficult. Significant deficiencies could be observed in this area. In turn, there is increasing differentiation and multiplication of international actors in the globalization context and this has a bearing on the degree of importance and power resources with which one deals with the processes and seeks to influence future courses of action. A futurist vision is essential. In this framework and in current period of the international system, various global concepts in specific areas such as security have been raised.

Human security visualizes a *new global order*, a world founded on global humanism. The core issue is to fulfill the population's basic needs in the context of globalization and interdependence. This presupposes, on the one hand, a tendency to unify behavior, consumption and values centered on universal values and, on the other hand, the requirement to recognize and respect diversity and particular identities and cultures. In addition, we have seen, however, that globalization increases differences and does not in itself fulfill any needs. Globalization also has an adverse effect on cultural practices and national and local identities. All this takes place in an economic and social polarization context in many areas of the world. The result is local ungovernability, which transfers instability to the global system and regional subsystems. Classic security asserts that there is no absolute security and that a greater security of one actor can mean a greater degree of insecurity of another actor. In the case of human security, we can assert that the vulnerabilities of one are manifested as the vulnerabilities of all, a mutual vulnerability. In the Latin American region, we require to pay greater attention to and seek more alternatives for the Colombian conflict. Defining cultural rights also enables us to better identify the cultural components of other human rights, not to relativise these but to supplement their interpretation, their appropriation by all actors involved and thereby their implementation. For example, the right to food cannot be correctly implemented without proper

consideration for the right's cultural dimension. The same logic is applicable to most human rights. Overlooking the cultural dimension of rights is particularly important factor in persistence of poverty. Capacity building and empowerment of persons in situation of extreme poverty and of social stakeholders involved in development are greatly conditioned by the exercise of their cultural rights (respect for their know-how, their values and identities, access to education, information, and cultural heritage). Investing on these resources and capacities is the best option to improve each person's possibility of choice.

10. Economic Human Security, Globalization, and Cultural Impacts: Recent years have witnessed a marked acceleration in the tempo of globalization. Its scope has also widened beyond the realm of economy to embrace the domains of social, cultural, and political norms and practices. This powerful thrust has been associated with far-reaching consequences for economic well-being, social structures and political processes in countries around the world. The different parts of the world have become so interdependent in so many ways that it is no longer possible to understand their socio-economic problems and much less to do something about them without taking into account the play of global forces. The process of globalization has been accompanied by major changes in the role and responsibilities of a wide range of institutions - families, communities, civil society institutions, business corporations, states, and supranational organizations. An important consequence of the changes associated with globalization has been increased insecurity at the individual and the family levels. This, in turn, not only affects individual welfare, but has broader economic, social, and political impacts as well.¹ In recent years, there has been a good deal of discussion in academic circles, especially among sociologists, on the concept and defining characteristics of globalization.² In a full treatment of the subject, it would be important to review the variety of conceptualizations of and approaches to globalization put forward in the literature. In common parlance, globalization is often equated with growing integration of national economies. As employed here, the concept also refers to the rapid and worldwide spread of some dominant social, cultural, and political norms and practices. The pattern of global economic integration also displays some sharp inequalities. Whether measured in terms of trade, capital flows, foreign investment, technology transfers or activities of transnational enterprises, most transactions take place among developed countries. Linkages with developing countries have expanded significantly in recent years, but there is a marked concentration of direction: a handful of countries account for the majority of flows. The fact that this group includes some large Asian and Latin American countries means that, in terms of population, the pattern of flows is distinctly less uneven. Nevertheless, most of the poorest and least developed countries are largely bypassed by the intensified circuits of trade, capital, and investment.

The globalization processes have been associated with wide-ranging socio-economic consequences. Globalization has been associated with a number of other changes, such as technological progress, liberalization, and deregulation. It is quite impossible to separate out the economic impacts of globalization, however defined, from those of the preceding factors. There is a further difficulty arising from the period over which the analysis carried out. The immediate and short-term impacts may turn out to be very different from those of the medium and long term. Despite the qualifications, it is important to stress that the globalization processes tend to produce certain socio-economic effects. In the short run, most of the changes associated with globalization are likely to deepen income inequalities.³ The greater role of market forces in the labor and capital markets are expected, in most countries, to raise interest rates and lower wages, especially those of unskilled workers because governmental regulation of these markets is designed to control interest rates and

¹ - Dharam Ghai, "*Economic Globalization, Institutional Change and Human Security*" (UNITED NATIONS RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (November 1997), p 3.

² - See, for instance, Roland Robertson, *Social Theory and Global Culture* (Sage Publications, London, 1992); Anthony G. McGrew et al., *Global Politics: Globalisation and the Nation-State* (Polity Press, Cambridge, 1992); Mike Featherstone (ed.), *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalisation and Modernity* (Sage Publications, London, 1990); Peter Beyer, *Religion and Globalisation* (Sage Publications, London, 1994); Malcolm Waters, *Globalisation* (Routledge, London, 1995).

³ - Dharam Ghai, *Structural Adjustment, Global Integration and Social Democracy*, Discussion Paper No. 37, UNRISD, Geneva, 1992); Al Berry and Frances Stewart, *Changes in World Income Distribution* (North-South Institute, Ottawa, mimeo).

ensure minimum wages. The effect is likely to be reinforced by changes in taxes and public expenditure, such as moves towards indirect taxes, lower marginal rates of individual and corporate taxes, reduction of subsidies, social security, and welfare expenditure. The deflationary effects on economic activities may put further pressure on employment and wages, which may be reinforced by labor-saving technological progress.

Besides, cultural factors alone do not explain all of the cross-national variations in economic growth rates. Every economy experiences significant fluctuations in growth rates from year to year because of short-term factors such as technological shocks or unforeseen circumstances effecting outputs. These could not be attributed to cultural factors, which change gradually. A society's economy and political institutions also make a difference. For example, prior to 1945, North Korea and South Korea had a common culture, but South Korea's economic performance has been far superior. On the other hand, the evidence suggests that cultural diversity and differences are an important part of the story. Over the past five decades, the Confucian-influenced economies of East Asia outperformed the rest of the world by a wide margin. This holds true despite the fact that they are shaped by a wide variety of economic and political institutions. Conversely, during the same period, most African economies experienced low growth rates. Both societal-level and individual-level evidence suggests that the economic and political institutions of a society are not the only determinants of economic development; cultural factors are also important.¹

When discussing the issue of readjustment and redefinition programs of economic development models, one cannot avoid the issue of poverty in the Latin American and the Andean regions in particular. This issue has probably received the most attention and research, and there are a number of accumulated studies and empirical evidences regarding the difficulty – or impossibility, as the case maybe – of acceding to human security when minimum conditions of participation in collective well-being do not exist. Thus, just to emphasize once again, proper treatment of the problem of overcoming poverty is a necessary condition for achieving individual, national, and international human security.²

The social and cultural impact of globalization has also been widespread. It is manifested most clearly in the worldwide presence of certain patterns of consumption and lifestyles. These include car, television, video, fashion and designer clothing, popular music, movie, TV and video show, dance, beverage, and fast food, namely a few prominent symbols of world culture. The socio-cultural impact is especially noticeable on two sections of the population: affluent minorities and youths. While many consumption goods and services are available only to affluent minorities in developing and former communist countries, others such as TV programs, videos, and fast foods reach the much larger proportions of the population in these countries. Another important consequence of globalization is that it creates or strengthens the groups throughout the world that are linked by common interests or lifestyles. Affluent minorities in poor countries can thus relate to middle classes in the industrialized world. A common culture binds together youths from different parts of the world.³ These cultural and social links strengthen the ones already created by the international commerce, production, finance and investment network. All these provide points of common interest going beyond state borders, thus further loosening of national ties. A fundamental aspect of social and cultural globalization is that vast multitudes of people in poor countries - but increasingly in the rich countries as well - are left outside these circuits of consumption and leisure activities. The sense of frustration engendered by deprivation is fuelled by relentless exposure, through the media, to the temptations and seductions of "the good life" enjoyed by the fortunate few. It is hardly surprising that this sometimes leads to get-rich-quick activities, which are typically associated with illegal acts, such as crime, arms trade, prostitution, pornography, and production and sale of drugs.

¹ - Rosita Dellios2 " *Mandalic Regionalism in Asia: Exploring the Relationship between Regional Governance and Economic Security* " Culture Mandala Vol. 8, No. 1 (October-December 2008)p 2.

² - Ralf Dahrendorf, "Economic opportunity, civil society and political liberty" in Cynthia Hewitt de Alcántara (ed.), *Social Futures, Global Visions* (UNRISD, Geneva and Blackwell, Oxford, 1996).

³ - UNRISD, *States of Disarray*, op. cit.; Marshall Wolfe, *Social Integration: Institutions and Actors* (Occasional Paper No. 4, UNRISD, Geneva, November 1994).

One of the main consequences of accelerated globalization and the changes associated with it is an intensification of human insecurity.¹ It appears to have occurred across a wide spectrum of countries with varied socio-economic systems and levels of development. The sources of the insecurity can be traced in the changes in the domains of economy, society, politics and culture.² Any dynamic system generates human insecurity, but when changes occur with startling rapidity, the cumulative impact is quite frightening. Moreover, when the institutions and mechanisms in place to cushion insecurity begin to crumble under the impact of the same forces, the effect is intensified. Enhanced economic insecurity is at the centre of the rising spiral of human insecurity. The key contributory factors are intensified competition, internationalization of production, changes in methods of production, surges of financial speculation, and the rapidity of technological innovations. These dynamic forces have put unprecedented pressures on livelihood security, which are expressed in different ways for different groups in different countries. In most countries, intensification of the unemployment problem is a central element in economic insecurity. These sources of economic insecurity have been reinforced by changes in state policies in the field of income redistribution and social security. Influenced by new ideologies and buffeted by the factors noted above, most states have been cutting down on subsidies on items of mass consumption, increasing charges for social services and reducing the level and range of benefits under social security and welfare programs. Thus unemployment benefits, health coverage, and old-age pensions are being adversely affected for most citizens.³ Family and community structures also undergo important changes under the influence of globalization and the changes associated with it, and are thus less effective in cushioning the impact of adverse economic changes. Some existing and new institutions such as religious bodies and citizens' organizations are trying to fill in the void, but their efforts have had limited impacts at best.

Sources of insecurity are also located in other domains of human activity. In the sphere of politics, the close bonds between political parties and their supporters have loosened in recent years. Workers, unemployed ones, and other categories of low-income groups lack confidence in the traditional parties to defend their interests. It is not surprising that there is a growing disenchantment and lack of interest in political process. In the social domain, the weakening of community and family structures exacerbates a sense of personal insecurity. Changes in the established patterns of relations between generations, sexes, and peer groups add a potent new source of anxiety for many.⁴ In the sphere of culture, the clash between traditional values and those propagated by the media and the consumer society contributes to conflicts and uncertainty.

Economic security cannot be enhanced simply by reverting to the conditions and policies of earlier years. The forces of globalization cannot be rolled back. Technology alone has forever changed the world we live in. Nor does it make sense to reverse the reliance on free markets and private enterprise as the primary mechanisms for promoting economic progress. The great challenge for analysts, reformers, and leaders alike is to devise policies and institutions to ensure greater security in the new situation created by accelerated globalization and technological advance. It must be admitted that this is a daunting task and little progress has been made so far in this respect, either at the level of thought or action. This section can do no more than sketch the broad directions for policy and institutional reform for enhanced human security. Even so, more questions are raised than answers provided. The problems of human security differ in industrialized, transition, and developing countries, and so must the policies deal with them. A case in point concerns the prescription of higher growth rates to combat unemployment and poverty. Most developed countries were able to achieve near full employment in the first three decades of the post-war period, in large part due to historically

¹ - International Labour Office, **World Employment 1995** (ILO, Geneva, 1995); A.R. Khan, **Overcoming Unemployment** (ILO, Geneva, 1994); World Bank, **Workers in an Integrating World** (Oxford University Press, New York, 1995).

² - United Nations Development Program, **Human Development Report 1994** (Oxford University Press, New York, 1994); Barry Buzan, **People, States and Fear** (Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead, 1991).

³ - Gøsta Esping-Andersen, **Welfare States in Transition: National Adaptations in Economies** (UNRISD, Geneva and Sage Publications, London, 1996); Jessica Vivian **Adjustment and Social Sector Restructuring** (UNRISD and Frank Cass, London, 1995).

⁴ - Anthony Giddens, "Affluence, poverty and the idea of a post-scarcity society", in Cynthia Hewitt de Alcántara (ed.), **Social Futures, Global Visions** (UNRISD, Geneva and Blackwell, Oxford, 1996).

unprecedented rates of economic growth. It is unrealistic to assume that this experience may repeat in future. More probably, the growth rates of the past two decades, more in line with historical experience, will prevail in future. In any case, both environmental considerations and the nature of technological progress raise serious doubts about whether higher growth is the best route to handling unemployment problems in rich countries. Reforms in labor markets and in educational and training systems could help enhancing employment possibilities. However, significant progress towards full employment would call for more imaginative policies and institutional reforms in such areas as technological progress, new combinations of work, learning and leisure, work sharing, novel arrangements for financing socially, and economically useful work.

The economic growth idea is partly shaped by cultural factors encountered considerable resistance. A reason for this resistance is that the cultural values have been widely perceived as diffuse as permanent features of given societies: if cultural values determine economic growth, the outlook for economic development seems hopeless because culture cannot be changed. Another reason for opposition is that standard economic arguments supposedly suffice for international differences in savings and growth rates.¹ For example, the standard life cycle model and not cultural arguments explains the difference in saving and growth rates between, say, Germany, Japan, and United States.

11. Conclusion: As the reader understand, the concept of human security is still under construction, considering the number of priorities and dimensions to be taken into account in order to achieve integrated action to respond to urgent and wide-ranging needs, particularly on behalf of the most unprotected sectors of the population. Besides, the specific links between the promotion of human security, the prevention of conflicts, and actions in favor of human rights and democracy should be clearly established. Courses of actions in these different fields often follow a very different political, economic, and social logic, and perhaps the time has come to create a forum for more effective interaction among them, especially in the area of preparing coherent policies, the implementation of which requires the cooperation of all social actors without exception. Another essential aspect is the need for a long-term perspective on the processes that may lead to new non-violent threats to peace and security. This perspective would require a more active and joint contribution from the social and human sciences and the natural sciences, particularly regarding the interactions between environmental degradation and worsening poverty and destitution (economic aspects).

There are problems could be considered as human security, but there are more properly perhaps belong to the spheres of international and state security. To make this distinction is a necessity and must. Even at a human security level per se, one should distinguish between issues affecting 'freedom from want' and issues affecting 'freedom from danger'. The former cover a wide-rang of fields that mix up with politics, economics, social policies, etc. Precisely for this reason, warnings have been given about the danger of excessive 'securitization' of problems that can normally seem belonging to other disciplines (as above). Human security and development fields are obviously interconnected. Every attempt done in the field will be too little during our lifetime. All minimally reasonable ideas must be encouraged in order to fill the gap between economy and society. The practices performed by NGOs and other non-state institutions such as foundations, neighborhood organizations, etc. must be supported. Similarly, the highest possible level of state concern is demanded. Besides making demands and controlling state institutions responsible for tackling the increasing of common crime and insecurity in cities, the development of civil society agencies or institutions, which can play an important role in improving the situation, must be encouraged.

In addition, this paper has been concerned with the economic, political, social, cultural diversity and institutional consequences of accelerated globalization over the past two decades. It has focused particularly on heightened human insecurity resulting from the processes of globalization. Apart from being a source of human sufferings, intensification of economic insecurity is associated with social problems, ethnic conflicts, and political instability. The social support systems for disadvantaged groups built up in the post-war period are under severe strain and are increasingly ineffective in coping with these problems. Policy and institutional reforms to provide a modicum of social and economic security should reflect the reality of open markets, fierce competition, and rapid

¹ - Rosita Dellios2 " *Mandalic Regionalism in Asia: Exploring the Relationship between Regional Governance and Economic Security* " *Culture Mandala* ·Vol. 8, No. 1 ·October-December 2008·p 19.

technological change. In a long run, the globalization of the economy should match to the globalization of social policy.

Above all, the concepts of economic security, human security, and cultural diversity have a great potential to raise the priority of policies that address threats to people, their communities and economic and cultural environment by identifying the issues of daily life and environmental degradation as “security” issues. In fact, one of the findings of this study is that there is a clear convergence on policy requirements between economic security and human security with concerning diversity of culture in the four corners of our globe. The policy linkages of these security concerns are the policies for adaptation to economic change and those for ensuring human security. If these policies were fully implemented, they could lay the foundation for building sustainable society and, at the same time, help eradicate the root cause of social disorder and armed conflicts in many less/least developing countries. Besides, cultural factors alone do not explain all of the cross-national variations in economic growth rates. Every economy experiences significant fluctuations in growth rates from year to year because of short-term factors, such as technological shocks or unforeseen circumstances that effect output. These could not be attributed to cultural factors, which change gradually.

In conclusion, attending regional cooperation could be assessed as a useful mechanism in order to promote economic security in regional and international levels. Preparation of a regional framework for the promotion of human security in order to incorporate a number of factors such as ethical foundations of human security, human rights, cultural diversity, and different perceptions of security at the regional, national, and especially local levels, is needed to move towards the protection of the most vulnerable sectors of the population. One of the most important considered points is to promote regional approaches in order to define the most suitable requirements and modalities of action and jointly to promote human security and conflict prevention in each specific regional and cultural context. Finally, it is crystal clear that human security would never be achieved without promotion of economic security, and to be successful in eliminating the economic insecure space, the regional and international economic rates and criteria should be developed in all aspects so that all roots of wars and conflicts get removed. In such situation, national security and thus international security would appear the suitable living environment to people.

12. Bibliography:

1. Asadolah Asadi, Respect the presumption of innocence in the quasi-judicial proceedings in France in the light of the European Convention on Human Rights *Journal of Legal Studies* 49 (1989).
2. Ann M. Florini and P. J. Simmons, *The New Security Thinking: A Review of the North American Literature*, New York, Rockefeller Foundation, 1998.
3. Ashton B. Carter, William J. Perry and John D. Steinbruner, *A New Concept of Cooperative Security*, Washington, D.C., Brookings Institution, 1992.
4. Anthony Giddens, *Affluence, poverty and the idea of a post-scarcity society*, Cynthia Hewitt de Alcántara (ed.), *Social Futures, Global Visions* (UNRISD), Geneva and Blackwell, Oxford, 1996.
5. Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde, *Security. A New Framework for Analysis*, Boulder, Colo., Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998.
6. Brandi Nikole Andrews, *Cosmopolitanism and Human Rights: Creating a Global Consciousness*, European University for Peace Studies (January 2008).
7. Caroline Thomas, *Global Governance, Development and Human Security: Exploring the Links*, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 2, 2001.
8. Dharam Ghai, *Structural Adjustment, Global Integration and Social Democracy*, Discussion Paper No. 37, UNRISD, Geneva, 1992.
9. Dharam Ghai, *Economic Globalization, Institutional Change and Human Security* (UNITED NATIONS RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (November 1997).
10. David Held, *La democracia y el orden global. Del estado moderno al gobierno cosmopolita*, Buenos Aires, Editorial Paidós, 1997.
11. Ehsan Javid (United Nation Human Rights Council and Its Mechanism for Military Conflicts) *International Law Journal* 40 (1988).
12. Fardin Kharazi, *Human Rights and the Council's strategy of IRI*, Institute for International Studies - Center for Strategic Research, Tehran, Summer 1386.

13. G. B. Medilson , Translator: Mahmood Salimi, Globalization, the challenges and opportunities ‘ Rahbord Journal ‘Vol. 22 ‘Winter 1380.
14. Hiroshi Ohta ‘The Interlinkage of Climate Security and Human Security: The Convergence on Policy Requirements ‘Waseda University ‘ 2009.
15. Henry J. Steiner ‘International Human Rights In Context ‘ Newyork, Oxford‘2007.
16. Inge Kaul, Isabelle Grunberg and Marc A. Stern, Global Public Goods, New York, UNDP/Oxford University Press, 1999.
17. Humphreys, S. Human Rights and Climate Change: Cambridge University Press, 2010.p.15.
18. J. William Breslin and Jeffrey Z. Rubin, Negotiation Theory and Practice, Program on Negotiation Books. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Law School, 1995.
19. Joseph J. Romm, Defining National Security The Nonmilitary Aspects, New York, Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1993.
20. Javid Rehman ‘International Human Roghts Law ‘London, Longman,2009.
21. Michael P. Snarr and D. Neil Snarr (eds.), Global Issues, Boulder, Colo., Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998.
22. Michael Krepon, Michael Newbill, Khurshid Khoja and Jenny S. Drezin, Global Confidence Building, New Tools for Troubled Regions, New York, St Martin’s Press, 1999.
23. Marshall Wolfe, Social Integration: Institutions and Actors, Occasional Paper No. 4, UNRISD, Geneva, November 1994.
24. Mehdi Zakerian, A process of fundamental human rights to Jus cogens rules, Foreign Policy Journal ‘Vol. 14 ‘Spring 1379.
25. Mahmood Reza Golshan Pazoh, Human Rights in the World:Processes, Cases and Reactions ‘ Tehran, Azad Islamic University ,Mordad 1388.
26. Leckie, Scott; Gallanger, Anne, Economic social and cultural rights: a legal resource guide, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
27. Onces Stewart, Development and Security, Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security, and Ethnicity (CRISE), Working Paper 3, London, University of Oxford, 2004.
28. Paris, Roland, Human Security- Paradigm Shift or Hot Air? In International Security, Vol. 26, No. 2, 2001.
29. Patrice M. Franco, Toward a New Security Architecture in the Americas, Washington, D.C., Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2000.
30. Roger Fisher, Andrea Kupfer Schneider, Elizabeth Borgmardt and Brian Ganson, Beyond Machiavelli. Tools for Coping with Conflict, Harvard University Press, 1994.
31. Roberto Bergalli and Eligio Resta (comp.), Soberanía: un principio que se derrumba, Buenos Aires, Editorial Paidós, 1996.
32. Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye Jr, Power and interdependence in the information age, Foreign Affairs, Vol. 77, No. 5, 1998.
33. Roberto Keohane, Instituciones internacionales y poder estatal, Buenos Aires, Editorial GEL, 1993.
34. Rosita Dellios2, Mandalic Regionalism in Asia: Exploring the Relationship between Regional Governance and Economic Security, Culture Mandala, Vol. 8, No. 1 ‘October-December 2008.
35. Siz G Link , Translator: Saber Shakiba, Ambiguous meaning of globalization, Journal of Strategic Studies,Vol. 3, Atumn 1380.
36. Stanley Hoffmann, World Disorders, Troubled Peace in the Post-Cold War Era, Boston, Mass, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1998.
37. Stephen D. Krasner, International Regimes, Cornell University Press, 1983, 6th ed., 1991.
38. Shahroz Ebrahimi ‘" Globalization and Security of IRI ‘Defense and Security Studies Journal ‘Vol. 33‘Winter 1381.
39. Tamoshat Cristian, Human Rights, Theoretical Roots, Translator: Hosein Sharifi Tarazkohi, Tehran, Mizan, 1386.
40. Truong Thanh -Dam, Human Security and Human Rights ,in: The Essentials of Human Rights , Ed. by Rhona k.m. smith and Christien Van den Anker , Hodder Arnold, New york ,2005.
41. Walter Lippmann, U.S. Foreign Policy, Boston, 1943.
