

## Human Security - development of the policy #3

Then, the Commission on Human Security was created and started in operation in 2002. I was frequently asked questions on the definition of human security. I pointed out that human security does not stand against the nation-state, and that it should complement what the nation-state cannot do in protecting people. And we started to find ways to realize it. Notable scholars, politicians, and others from all over the world gathered and had discussions for one and half years and held various hearings. Some of them actually went to Africa and asked the members of NGO or local leaders, "What is your greatest concern?" If this had been asked in New York, the answer would have been the terrorist attack on September 11th, but when they asked this question in Africa, their answer was how to face a lack of human security caused by economic instability. Some of those answers were: "I don't know about my life tomorrow"; "I may easily die, if I get sick tomorrow"; "I don't know if I can work tomorrow or not". We felt we needed a working definition for human security. We therefore proposed two approaches, considering various situations from a broader perspective.

One is "protection from top authority", a top-down approach. The roles of the nation-state, as everyone expects, are terribly important in that the nation-state administers and governs, recognizing the importance of protecting basic human rights and freedom, promoting law and order as well as enhancing administrative ability. Establishment of the dominance of law, expansion of juridical institutions and police power are counted as being of vital importance. The other approach is bottom-up, which focuses on reinforcement of human abilities. These include education, free access to information, expansion of health management systems, and establishment of social security. People can act on their own by employing various forms of these services. We regarded reinforcement of human abilities as essential factors for human security, maintaining the philosophy that humans are so free that the purpose of human life lies in the fulfillment of the free human's abilities and possibilities. In other words, I think this is a combination of "govern" and "autonomy". We regarded this idea as a key principle and tried to search for specific ways to realize it.

One such solution was establishing human abilities after defining the various roles of the nation and its administrative functions. We considered that a combination of already-existed socioeconomic development theories and new administrative studies'

theories could bring about human security. This proposal has been widely adopted since then. Reports from the Committee on Human Security have been widely read in Japan, and human security has been recognized as an important today's issue. They were revised and published as fifth and sixth editions and translated into six languages, including English, Japanese, French, Spanish, Russian, and Arabic. They have been read very broadly and understood as well. The important thing here is not just theories but specific strategies, and how they have been developed. They are currently conducted in several ways, in which Japan started to contribute to economic and social development through UN organizations by donating human security funds for UN programs. When projects which directly impact human security are proposed, Japan assists them financially. When it comes to the question of whether individuals or communities are more important than the other, we thought communities are more important. Although individuals' safety is important, from an administrative viewpoint, communities, which are made up of individuals, versus governments are also considered important, and we have tried to work for integral development which serves communities. In the case of Japan, the concept of human security has been adopted in our ODA scheme. Within the Japan International Cooperation Agency's (JICA), ODA scheme and human security have been the key concepts in its outline of service. But how can they be put into actual use?? JICA has implemented many technical supporting projects, and the concept of human security has been included in their objectives as a form of contribution for community development.

On the other hand, security in the entire community cannot be guaranteed even if only educational programs are developed. Rather, a combination of efforts in different sectors, such as education, security, highways, social insurance, and security for women, is effective. The term, "cross-sectoral" is used, and JICA had adopted such an approach as mixing different sectors and then letting them stimulate each other to improve various problems in the community.

Additionally, I would like to talk about how human security has been widely considered. We consider that the transitional period from peace-keeping to peace-building is a significant phase to achieve human security. Although there have been various conflicts over the years, many of them sprung from warfare between nations or from domestic conflicts. In many cases there have been difficulties in going back to a peacetime situation even after the end of those conflicts. From my 15 years experience in many fields, there was only the case of Cambodia where peace was

established after conflict and a peace treaty was concluded, but I think this case is exceptional. When the conflict in Cambodia ended, an international conference was held in Paris and a peace agreement was concluded and implemented. Other cases were ambiguously resolved, peace-keeping forces entered the scene, and gradually a peaceful situation was established and partial reconciliations were made, and consequently conflicts started to vanish. I feel the best example of this is the Balkan Conflict. Conflicts in Bosnia were really bloody domestic conflicts. At last, with American and other nations' interventions, a peace agreement was concluded at Dayton. Before conclusion of the peace agreement, 30,000 UN peace-keeping forces in that region helped as many people as possible, and gave as much food as possible and led people to safer places. After the peace agreement was concluded, NATO, substituted for UN peace-keeping forces, supplying 60,000 troops. I hope you will understand how difficult it is to build peace after conflicts. 30,000 peace keeping forces, 60,000 NATO troops, and though gradually the size of NATO forces decreased, and there are still 15,000 NATO troops there. Establishment of peace after the end of conflicts of this kind is really difficult. The reason is that people fight against people.

What I still remember is the breakdown of the federation where Serbian, Croatian, and Islamic people, who had formerly lived together in peace, now wanted their own independent nations. It was rather natural that people fought against neighboring people when the majority was Serbians in one area while there were Croatians in another area. While I was taking care of returnees, I asked a woman, "Did you return with a sense of relief when you finally came back to your home?" she replied "What I felt was shock that most of my neighbors would not talk to me at all". That is to say, warfare left behind something. Besides, this was warfare after separation of a nation which used to have mixed ethnicity. So, peace-building really takes a long time. Meanwhile, what can we do to prevent the deterioration of the situation? The situation in Afghanistan was really like that. In 2002, a peace conference was held in Bonn, and finally a government was established, then international peace-keeping forces were dispatched around its capital, Kabul, to protect its government. Although a government was being built, it was still difficult to oust the Taliban, so the continued presence of peace-keeping troops was required. What these peace-keeping forces do, for one simple example, is to provide public safety by acting as a police power. In a process of providing safety, more reconciliation was made. Schools were built in a course of gradual rebuilding of devastated nations. Six million refugees came back to their homes. We made efforts to let returnees find a place to live, and to have something to eat. People who had difficulties

in attending school were now able to attend. During times, such as these, police power in some form is necessary to stifle any new conflicts.

Under such circumstances, we felt strongly that we had to target people themselves and to put human security as our central issue. But here, how can we prove to them that there is a better life ahead? JICA sent fifty people there to help recovery, but the best way of proceeding is to show them the benefits of peace as soon as possible. We must build a peace in which there is a quick ending of conflict and life gets better. A peace in which people can attend school, cook meals for themselves, build homes, and have plenty of food. However, the benefits of peace cannot be felt easily by people when conflicts are being resolved by police power and military power. When people cannot see the benefits of peace, distrust arises. If foreign armies protect their lands and there is a natural distrust of foreign nations, then a stable situation cannot be created.

Recently, I have been worried about Afghanistan. It is because the Taliban's power is getting stronger and threatening the rule by the government. Therefore Japanese experts cannot move around freely. As a result of their activities being limited, they can't carry out projects to show proof of peace. This creates a vicious circle. Under such circumstances, much more efforts are needed to establish security where human security is not guaranteed.