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Abstract

In this article, we explore the human security ramifications of the global AIDS pandemic. We illustrate how HIV/AIDS is a threat to the human insecurity of millions of people because of the lethal nature of the illness and the widespread lack of access to anti-retroviral drugs in the developing world. The article shows that the AIDS pandemic also poses a profound indirect threat to human security because of the wider social consequences the pandemic is having in the most affected regions. HIV/AIDS is therefore not just one human security issue amongst many, but constitutes one of the most urgent human security challenges in the twenty-first century. The article concludes by outlining the implications of the HIV/AIDS pandemic for debates about the utility of the ‘human security’ concept.
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Introduction

The term “Human Security” was broadly popularised in the “international community” by the United Nations Development Programme in its 1994 Human Development Report intended as an agenda-package for the UN’s 50th birthday the following year. The definition it gave was:

“The security of people through development, not arms; through cooperation, not confrontation; through peace not war” (p.6), or more explicitly:

“First, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. And second, protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life whether in homes, in jobs or in communities. Such threats can exist at all levels of national income and...
development” (p.23).

But as the Report itself points out, this is not really a new idea at all. It reminds us that the founders of the United Nations have always given equal importance to people’s security and to territorial security. The idea of “freedom from fear” and “freedom from want” is found in Roosevelt’s “Four Freedoms” during World War 2, and in dozens of reports and analyses in the decades since. What was new in the early 1990s was the post-Cold War context, which allowed politicians and analysts to shift their focus away from the apocalyptic threats of West-East conflagration and notice what was happening “on the ground” what ordinary people were experiencing all over the world. The United Nations became unfrozen in the sense that the United Nations Security Council was no longer paralysed by the veto, and superpower control of the votes and actions of smaller states was loosened up. New issues could come to the fore without being decked in Cold War colours. Scourges such as landmines, small arms, the use of child soldiers, “conflict goods” and so on could all be considered as threats and abuses in their own right rather than being seen through the prism of the superpower conflict (Atwood, 2003).

Methodology

This is a desk top research, analysis of secondary data was done and in this respect, desk journals, internet, newspapers, books, and reports were consulted and studied. Secondary analysis allows for the examination of existing data yet can produce new and more detailed information, including the emergence of conclusions that differ to those in the original report.

Perspective of human insecurity

The world today faces a wide range of serious crises and instabilities, causing immense suffering to millions of people and threatening the security of the human family far into the future. Analysts differ over the relative priority of, to cite only the most prominent threats (Bissio, 2004):

HIV/AIDS, terrorism, climate change, genocide, ethnic conflict, mass rape, weapons of mass destruction, famine and poverty (Sachs, 2005). But to these enormous general challenges we should add more specific ones such as diseases like (UNICEF, 2005):

i.   TB, malaria and measles which continue to ravage the young and the poor;

ii.  The scourge of violence related to handguns, drugs and crime;
iii. The death tolls of road accidents and suicides;
iv. Increasing rates of sexual abuse, prostitution and human trafficking;
v. The millions who live in unemployment or struggle to find even exploitative, low paid jobs with poor conditions.

National security

These deep-rooted and interlocking threats can scarcely be addressed at all with traditional notions of national security (United Nations, 1994). By this we mean the attempt to protect “the State”, primarily through the threat or use of political or military force against competing states, either to deter attack or to pursue a foreign policy objective (Kaldor, 2004). Such policies pay little attention to the social and political conditions within the state, little regard to popular participation and consent, and almost none whatsoever to protecting the natural environment. The government, the fundamental purveyor of security, often fails in its obligations and at times becomes itself a threat to its own people most obviously in extreme cases of repressive or “failed” states. Attention must therefore shift from the state to people. There is also a growing recognition of the role that can be played by people themselves as individuals and as communities in ensuring their own safety. Security, like democracy, can be bottom-up (Boggs, 2003).

The way to Survival

A certain kind of security was assured at various times in the past, through the use of brute force by rulers. Examples of such imposed stability would be the Pax Romana or the Austro-Hungarian empire at its height. Today the issue is bigger than the simple control or protection of subjects or citizens. Humankind itself will face self-extinction through nuclear or environmental catastrophe if our centuries old habits of military violence and despoliation of natural resources are not curtailed (Kaldor, 1999). We need to adjust our concept of security to the new conditions in which humanity lives. The Human Security doctrine argues that we must put the human being, and the natural environment, at centre stage. Genuine security must be based on social justice, addressing the real needs of citizens, and including their participation in systems of national and international governance that promote sustainable development (Commission on Human Security, 2003).

Characteristics of Human Security
Human security differs from state security in four key respects Cooley, 2000):

1. **People-centred**: Its focus is on protecting people from a wide range of menaces, rather than external aggression alone.

2. **Menaces**: It approaches protection not just in terms of territorial boundaries and with and from uniformed troops. It also includes protection from environmental pollution, transnational terrorism, massive population movements, infectious diseases like HIV/AIDS and bird flu, and long-term conditions of deprivation and oppression. The most direct threat to human security is the presence of illegal and excessive armaments, and their continued proliferation in post-conflict zones.

3. **Actors**: The range of actors is also greater not states alone, but regional and international organisations, NGOs, and civil society.

4. **Empowerment**: It brings people together to identify and implement solutions.

   Obviously, it will be a very long time before we could say that the goal of the full achievement of human security has been met. Violent conflicts, injustices and poverty are extremely persistent and the world’s problems often appear to be accelerating. The pursuit of human security is a new version of the struggle for the “good society” that men and women have dreamed of through the ages. In this sense it builds on the visions and labours of our ancestors.

**The human security industry**

The ideas embedded in the human security concept were already circulating in policy circles twenty years before the UNDP report. The 1980s saw the arrival of a variety of heavyweight commissions, each with its package of prescriptions and recommendations: Brandt (development), Brundtland (environment), Nyerere (the South), Palme (common security) each contributed important perspectives to the global debate, and in particular to the evolution of UN programmes. This was followed in the 1990s by a long series of UN-sponsored World Conferences, which did much to focus public attention on the “state of the world” as seen through the lens of particular sectors (Drakulich, 2004).

Among them were large-scale gatherings on:

1. Environment and development (Rio, 1992)
2. Human rights (Vienna, 1993)
3. Social summit (Copenhagen, 1995)
4. Population (Cairo, 1994)
5. Women (Beijing, 1995)
6. Habitat (Istanbul, 1997)

There was no such summit on peace. The civil society took up the challenge and in May 1999 the Hague Appeal for Peace conference took place in the Dutch capital, with an attendance of 10,000. The event was co-organised by International Peace Bureau (IPB), the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms (IALANA), the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) and the World Federalist Movement (WFM) (Global Action to Prevent War, 2003).

All these events served to highlight the scale of humanity’s problems, and to map out specific agendas to tackle them. The very fact of giving visibility to the social dimensions of security did much to shift the centre of gravity away from Cold War pre-occupations (Elworthy and Minds, 2005).

**Human Security Institutions**

Over the last few years, new bodies have sprung up to develop further these issues. States have formed the Human Security Network; the Japanese Government with the assistance of various agencies and foundations has put together the Human Security Commission, and a number of new academic institutes focussing on human security have been created at Harvard, University of British Columbia (Liu Centre), American University, Tufts etc., tasked with doing research and teaching work in this field (Hough, 2004).

**The Human Security Network (HSN)**

The Human Security Network originated in May 1998 in the “Lysoen” partnership (named after the Norwegian town where the first meeting took place) between Canada and Norway. The Network now consists of 13 states: Austria, Canada, Chile, Greece, Ireland, Jordan, Mali, Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, South Africa (observer), Switzerland, and Thailand. The Network seeks to promote human security in areas such as human rights, conflict resolution and international humanitarian law. It welcomes cooperation with civil society to pursue the common goal of human security (Kaldor, 2003).

The Network holds annual meetings at Ministerial level. The initial meetings were held in Canada (2000), Jordan (2001), Switzerland (2002) and Chile (2002). The more recent ones have been held in Austria, Mali and Canada. The main topics covered at the Austrian meeting
were human rights education and children affected by armed conflict. The Network adopted a training manual on Human Rights Education; a Child Rights Training Curriculum; and a Medium-Term Work Plan until 2005. The issues of small arms and light weapons, HIV/AIDS, and the continuing development of international law were also addressed. Topics at the Bamako meeting included human rights education, children in armed conflict, small arms and gender in peacekeeping operations (UNSC Resolution 1325).

In addition, HSN workshops have been organised on human security and science and technology, HIV/AIDS, children in armed conflict, the humanitarian aspects of small arms proliferation, and human security policy.

The Human Security Network is beginning albeit timidly to promote the goal of human security more actively in the United Nations and beyond. In 2003, for the first time, statements on its behalf were delivered (by Austria) in Security Council debates, on “Women, Peace and Security”, and on “Protection of Civilians” (Klare, 2001). The HSN also addressed the UN Human Rights Commission in 2003 for the first time, on inter-linkages between political, civil, economic and social rights. The HSN has also launched an initiative to create a regional/national support network of Human Security Study Centres comprising civil society, academic institutions and NGOs (Ziegler, 2005). However it remains to be seen how much commitment the member governments of the Network are prepared to make to this important joint project in the longer term. Certainly there should be many opportunities for government-civil society partnerships in a field that covers such an enormous range of problems, and where NGOs and other actors are so active (Klare, 2004).

**The Human Security Commission (HSC)**

The independent Human Security Commission was established in 2001, as an initiative of the Government of Japan, in response to the UN Secretary-General’s call at the 2000 Millennium Summit to achieve the twin goals of “freedom from fear” and “freedom from want”. It had twelve distinguished members from around the world, and was chaired by Mrs Sadako Ogata (former UN High Commissioner for Refugees) and Prof. Amartya Sen (Nobel Laureate in Economics, 1998). It had three objectives, under its two-year mandate:

1. To promote public understanding and support for human security
2. To develop the concept of human security as an operational tool for policy formulation
3. To propose a concrete plan of action to address critical threats to human security.
At the conclusion of their mandate, in May 2003, the Commission presented their report to the UN Secretary General, entitled Human Security Now. At its launch in Geneva, Mrs Ogata recognised that human security means many different things to many people, be it freedom from terrorism, the enjoyment of health, employment, human rights, economic growth, disarmament, or adequate food and water. The human security concept, she said, with its twofold strategy of protection and empowerment of peoples, addresses all these factors in its presentation of conflict prevention and human development as integral to the security of individuals (Lacqueur, 2003).

The Commission’s report views human security as complementary to state security, implicitly acknowledging that a strong, democratic state which respects human rights is vital to individual welfare. It argues that a concerted effort to develop norms, processes and institutions that systematically address insecurities will serve to protect people. Concurrently, empowerment of individuals, enabling their full participation in the decision-making process, will ensure continued democracy (Rogers, 2000). This, the Commission wrote, is “no more than a beginning”. However, with “leadership and vision as well as commitment from the world community,” the philosophy may escort us away from the apprehension and insecurities currently characterising the new millennium (Renner, 2002).

The plan of action proposed in “Human Security Now” includes:

1. Protection of people, particularly civilians, in violent conflict and continued efforts to secure law and justice, democracy and disarmament
2. Supporting the security of people on the move, including an investigation into the possibility of a legal framework for international migration
3. Establishment of Human Security Transition Funds for post-conflict situations
4. Encouraging fair trade and markets to benefit the very poorest, and the development of an efficient and equitable global system for patent rights
5. Universal access to health care and basic education; provision of minimum living standards everywhere
6. Clarifying the need for a global human identity, while respecting the freedoms of individuals to have diverse identities and affiliations.

The three reasons why the conversation about human security needs to consider the case
of the global AIDS pandemic are: First, much of the scholarly dialogue on the concept of human security has hitherto been conducted in mostly normative, theoretical and disciplinary terms, rather than with reference to concrete case studies. The result has been that many of the supposed delimitation and limitation of the concept of human security end up being merely alleged by the elites, but not empirically verified. Analyzing the human security implications of the global AIDS pandemic, by contrast, provides a paradigm shift for the opportunity to explore the theoretical arguments and case study (Follér and Thörn, 2005). Second, HIV/AIDS is pertinent case study in our context because its direct and indirect human security implications are so immense, that the pandemic does not just constitute one important human security issue among many it ranks among the gravest human security challenges the twenty-first century confronts. Thus, it would be dis-service to conduct the debate on human security without a more detailed consideration of what is arguably one of the greatest contemporary human security challenges. Finally, as been shown in the introduction of this article, debates about the concept of human security can also benefit from an engagement with the issue of HIV/AIDS because the latter shows many of the frequently voiced criticisms of human security to be misplaced, while simultaneously exposing new and previously overlooked shortcomings associated with the concept that need to be further explored. All of this makes a more detailed engagement with the AIDS pandemic from a human security perspective inescapable (Boseley, 2002).

**Direct threat to Human Security by HIV/AIDS**

Human security was focussed on by the United Nations Development Program in its 1994 Human Development Report and seeks to redress the perceived imbalance in military security thinking that was dominant during the second half of the twentieth century. By developing a people-centric account of security that revolves around the needs of ordinary individuals, rather than around the realist ideologists’ protection of states (Nolen, 2003). Such an understanding of security may have been appropriate for the twentieth century during the bi-polar system of global governance (Cold War era), in the course of which the social importance of addressing widespread illnesses was gradually superseded by the greater threat posed to human life by Cold War confrontation. During this same period, technological and medical advances in treating infectious illnesses were also achieved. The greatest threat to humankind was instead deemed to emanate from the armed force, and especially nuclear capabilities, of other states. Twentieth century security policy evolved in a way that reflected these changing historical conditions.
largely ignoring the importance of health issues and instead focusing increasingly on avoiding
the outbreak of violent conflict between states (Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2002).

Theorists’ of human security and practitioners concur that it no longer remains adequate
for addressing a proliferating array of twenty-first century insecurities. In their view, there are at
least two pressing reasons why this understanding of security is outdated. First, the state-centric
nature of much realist security thinking has failed to capture the extent to which states, rather
than being a universal guarantor of security as implicitly assumed in much international security
literature and policy, can also act as a source of insecurity for many people around the world.
According to Ramesh Thakur, realists “should get real. In many countries, the state is a tool of a
narrow family group, clique or sect (International Labour Organization, 2003). By focusing on
the needs of individual people and communities rather than states, the human security approach
allows for a useful shift of emphasis in those countries where the state has largely abandoned, or
become sufficiently removed from the wider needs of its population (Harker, 2001).

Secondly, human security advocates believe that the excessive focus on the military
capabilities of states by realist approaches obscures the extent to which individuals in many parts
of the world are threatened every day by a growing range of more pervasive non-military threats

Neglected to periphery, the dialogue on human security is the fact that this people-centric
approach to security is not as novel as it might initially appear. Scholar Ullman had pointed to
the need to redefine national threats beyond their exclusively military focus as

\textit{an action or sequence of events that (1) threatens drastically and over a relatively brief
span of time to degrade the quality of life for the inhabitants of a state, or (2) threatens
significantly to narrow the range of policy choices available to the government of a state
or to private, nongovernmental entities (persons, groups, corporations) within the state.}^{1}

According to political realists Hobbes the importance accorded to securing the state
ultimately derives from the state’s primary responsibility to ensure the self-preservation of its
individual citizens. The starting point for his \textit{Leviathan} was the need to ensure the survival of the
individual, and where the state fails to meet this obligation, the legitimacy of its claim to security
diminishes accordingly (National Intelligence Council, 2000).
Once the human security model is adopted, the global HIV/AIDS pandemic quickly emerges as one of the most serious threats that the world and in particular Africa confronts today. Contrary to the falacy belief, HIV/AIDS is not confined to sub-Saharan Africa. Currently, every region of the world has a significant number of people living with HIV/AIDS making the illness a pandemic rather than just an epidemic (Nolen, 2003).

According to estimates from UNAIDS, adult HIV Prevalence Rate, 2013, there were 35.0 million people living with HIV in 2013, up from 29.8 million in 2001, the result of continuing new infections, people living longer with HIV, and general population growth. The global prevalence rate (the percent of people ages 15-49 who are infected) has leveled since 2001 and was 0.8% in 2013. 1.5 million people died of AIDS in 2013, a 35% decrease since 2005. Deaths have declined due in part to antiretroviral treatment (ART) scale-up (Pharaoh and Martin, 2003). HIV is a leading cause of death worldwide and the number one cause of death in Africa. New HIV infections globally have declined by 38% since 2001. In 27 countries with sufficient quality data, new HIV infections have decreased by more than 50% and by more than 75% in 10 countries. Still, there were about 2.1 million new infections in 2013 or about 6,000 new infections per day (Nolen, 2003).

Most new infections are transmitted heterosexually, although risk factors vary. In some countries, men who have sex with men, injecting drug users, and sex workers are at significant risk. When compared to the general population, HIV prevalence rates are estimated to be 19 times higher among men who have sex with men, 28 times higher among injecting drug users, and 12 times higher among sex workers. Although HIV testing capacity has increased over time, enabling more people to learn their HIV status, approximately half of all people with HIV are still unaware they are infected (Sarin, 2003).

HIV has led to a resurgence of tuberculosis (TB), particularly in Africa, and TB is a leading cause of death for people with HIV worldwide. In 2013, approximately 13% of new TB cases occurred in people living with HIV. However, between 2004 and 2013 TB deaths in people living with HIV declined by 33%, largely due to the scale up of joint HIV/TB services. Women represent half (50%) of all adults living with HIV worldwide. HIV is the leading cause of death among women of reproductive age. Gender inequalities, differential access to service, and sexual
violence increase women’s vulnerability to HIV, and women, especially younger women, are biologically more susceptible to HIV. Young people, ages 15-24, account for approximately 33% of new HIV infections (among those 15 and over). In sub-Saharan Africa, young women are twice as likely to become infected with HIV than their male counterparts. In some areas, young women are more heavily impacted than young men. Globally, there were 3.2 million children living with HIV in 2013, 240,000 new infections among children, and 190,000 AIDS deaths.

HIV Prevalence & Incidence by Region, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total No. (% Living with HIV)</th>
<th>Newly Infected</th>
<th>Adult Prevalence Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Total</td>
<td>35.0 million (100%)</td>
<td>2.1 million</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>24.7 million (71%)</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>4.8 million (14%)</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western and Central Europe and North America</td>
<td>2.3 million (7%)</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>1.6 million (5%)</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>1.1 million (3%)</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>250,000 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
<td>230,000 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Globally, HIV/AIDS ranks among the five most frequent causes of death. In sub-Saharan Africa, HIV/AIDS pandemic is the leading cause of death. This makes the HIV/AIDS pandemic a threat to the survival of humanity.

Indirect threat to Human Security by HIV/AIDS

HIV/AIDS have wider indirect human security consequences. In sub-Saharan Africa, HIV prevalence rates is approaching 40 percent of the adult population, the illness additionally affects almost all of the sub-categories of human security as outlined in the 1994 Human Development Report. The wider social effects of HIV/AIDS undermine the ability of individuals to ensure their survival (Barnett and Whiteside, 2002).
Economic Security

The term 'economic security' seems to be a contradiction in itself in liberal economies, since capitalism is based on insecurity. It refers to doctrines and policies, consisting in preventing and avoiding disruptions in the life of firms or, more often, of states. As our globalisation is firstly an economic process, it is understandable that security has shifted from the military to the economic. Economic security takes particularly into account the new risks occurring from the combination of the globalised competition and the incredible new role of information, for example threats on data, attacks on public research centres, attacks from financial predators against state currencies (Haacker, 2004).

The impact of HIV/AIDS on the economic environment takes two dimensions, namely the direct and indirect costs. The former refers to the cost of treatment associated with HIV related illness, which has serious implications for health care budgets around the region. Those segments of the population that are poverty-stricken stand to lose the most as pressures on the health budgets increases resulting in higher medical costs. Indirect costs are more difficult to measure as the refer to loss of value of production, the loss of current wages, the loss of the present value of future earnings, training cost of new staff, high staff turn-over, cost of absenteeism, higher recruitment costs, the drainage of savings, amongst others (Follér and Thörn, 2005).

The impact of HIV/AIDS at the household level also negatively impacts on the economic context. The repercussions of HIV/AIDS is felt most acutely at the household level, with the burden weighing most heavily on the poorest households, those with the fewest resources with which to cushion the economic impact (Foreman, 1999).

Personal Security

Personal security is a generic concept that captures many real and perceived experiences of households and individuals. It can be narrowed down to the protection of individuals from physical and psychological violence, which distinguishes it from “national” or “collective” security, which is preoccupied with states. Personal security refers to the safety of human beings which can look different for men, women, girls and boys and the ways in which they are enabled
to live a full and productive life with dignity, without feeling afraid or at risk. Personal security is not just a priority for fragile and conflict affected contexts, but all settings, whether upper, middle, or lower-income. It is a “universal” preoccupation and constitutes an intrinsic right on its own (Price-Smith, 2001).

Personal security is a permanent aspect of life everywhere in the world, whether one lives in a city, town, or village, and is not the preserve of just a small handful. It is also difficult to reduce personal security to a single metric or measure. Personal security is distinct from “food” or “job” security, which often emerges in the context of acute poverty and inequality. Lethal violence is a useful index of personal insecurity. A low number of violent deaths suggest a higher level of personal security, and vice versa. Violent death is also a “sensitive” measure of personal security, it can change rapidly and also allows for a granular understanding of how, who, where, and why people are affected (Fidler, 1996).

People can survive for several years with HIV before succumbing to AIDS-related illnesses, they may not survive the stigma and violence inflicted upon them by fellow human beings. Around the globe people living with HIV/AIDS face severe abuse, some of which turns violent. In the worst case scenario, such insecurity can even lead to the premature death of persons who are infected, or who are erroneously thought to be HIV-positive (Forman, 2002).

Community Security

The link between HIV/AIDS and communal security is obvious. The pandemic wages its most direct affront to human security by lowering life expectancy. It is estimated that AIDS will soon reduce the average life expectancy of people in 11 African countries to little more than 30 years (Boseley 2002). The death of adult family members often leads to the dissolution of the family structure and frequently results in drastic declines in household income. when one family member becomes infected with HIV/AIDS, the family’s income tends to fall between 40 and 60 percent.” Children orphaned by AIDS are more likely to drop out of school due to an inability to pay school fees or because of the social stigma attached to being an AIDS orphan. Without an education or a well-developed set of skills, these children are more likely to resort to crime to support themselves and are at higher risk of being recruited or abducted by militias or other armed groups (Lacqueur, 2003).
Large-scale loss of life from AIDS also undermines family and community cohesion and can serve to exacerbate divisions between ethnic, political, and social groups. This social tension can make societies more vulnerable to internal conflicts that can take on regional or international dimensions. In addition, as politicians, teachers, police, and health care professionals die or are unable to work as a result of HIV/AIDS, governance and social service structures are weakened. Consequently, public confidence diminishes and the population’s interests are not addressed, creating a climate of social unrest and disorder (Batteh et al, 2008).

**Political Security**

Political security is the defense against any form of political oppression. It is concerned with whether people live in a society that honors their basic human rights. Extradition is a means of preserving political security. HIV/AIDS is placing additional stresses on political communities because also it affects political elites, as well as the police force, representatives of the justice system, and government bureaucrats at a time when their skills are needed most. UNAIDS notes that “attrition rates among staff serving in justice institutions in high-prevalence countries appear to be on par with those in other sectors. This sector also includes judges, prosecutors, court clerks and lawyers some of the key players in maintaining the rule of law and socio-political stability. In this way HIV/AIDS also undermines the political institutions of communities (Ostergard, 2002).

**Health Security**

The term has evolved over time, with different connotations in different contexts. "health security" can mean: Achieving widespread access to essential health services, and protection from environmental and behavioral risks to public health. This definition frames health security as an aspect of human security: the "freedom from want" of life-saving clinical and public health interventions. This is not just a humanitarian concern: healthy populations are an essential aspect of economic development (Salama and Dondero, 2001).

HIV/AIDS has ramifications for health security, where, in addition to the AIDS-related mortality, the wider impact is again twofold. First, HIV/AIDS increases the number of people seeking health services. Costs for providing medical care are rising and difficult choices consequently have to be made about the allocation of scarce resources. In addition to generating an increased demand for health care services, HIV/AIDS is simultaneously having a negative
impact on the supply of medical services. Many hospitals are struggling because they are losing doctors and nurses to the illness, and absenteeism due to illness is on the rise. In an age of globalization, many of hospitals in developing countries are loosing doctors and nurses who choose to migrate to developed countries and work where conditions are much better and they have access to medicines that allow them to save people’s lives. These indirect effects of the pandemic, in conjunction with the large number of people dying annually as a direct result of the illness, make the global AIDS pandemic one of the world’s most pressing contemporary human security issues (Ziegler, 2005).

**Food Security**

Food Security means that all people at all times have physical and economic access to adequate amounts of nutritious, safe, and culturally appropriate foods, which are produced in an environmentally sustainable and socially just manner, and that people are able to make informed decisions about their food choices. Food Security also means that the people who produce our food are able to earn a decent, living wage growing, catching, producing, processing, transporting, retailing, and serving food. At the core of food security is access to healthy food and optimal nutrition for all. Food access is closely linked to food supply, so food security is dependent on a healthy and sustainable food system. The food system includes the production, processing, distribution, marketing, acquisition, and consumption of food (Batteh *et al*., 2008).

The negative impact of HIV/AIDS on nutrition and food security expands from the household to the community to different parts of the country. The socio-economic deterioration will eventually have a significant impact at the national level. The decrease in the labour force, worker productivity, total outputs, and overall economic growth could lead to a decline in national food supplies and a rise in food prices, including those in urban areas. The breakdown of commercial enterprises may undermine the country's capacity to export and generate foreign exchange (Laketch, 2004).

The serious setback in development experienced by some countries may not be captured in Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita figures. Yet, the epidemic has a major impact on development because it undermines three of the main determinants of economic growth: physical, human and social capital. For instance, the World Bank has estimated that HIV/AIDS has reduced the annual rate of Africa's per caput GDP growth by 0.7 percent. Food insecurity
and undernutrition among people living with HIV, in turn, compromise adherence to treatment and hasten AIDS-related mortality, even among those receiving ART (World Bank, 1990).

**National, Regional, and International Security**

HIV/AIDS is linked to national, regional, and international security. In Sub-Saharan Africa, security institutions, including the police and military, are being weakened by the pandemic. A weakened police force is less capable of keeping crime under control and addressing social tension in peaceful ways. In addition, a high HIV infection rate in its military leaves a country more vulnerable to external aggression by opportunistic states (Sarin 2003). The infiltration of HIV/AIDS into military ranks can undermine a country’s capacity to contribute to peacekeeping operations and other forms of international conflict management and resolution (Save the Children, 2004).

Just as HIV/AIDS likely creates conditions conducive to instability and conflict, such instability and conflict may accelerate infection rates. Combatants and peacekeeping personnel in conflict zones to the spread of the disease by engaging in sexual relationships with prostitutes and local women while on mission. They then infect their sexual partners when they return home. Rape also transmits the disease among both combatants and civilians (Hankins et al, 2002).

**Conclusion**

The term Human Security was first popularized by the United Nations Development Program in the early 1990s. It emerged in the post-Cold War era as a way to link various humanitarian, economic, and social issues in order to alleviate human suffering and assure security. The issues Human Security addresses include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Organized Crime and Criminal Violence
2. Human Rights and Good Governance
3. Armed Conflict and Intervention
4. Genocide and Mass Crimes
5. Health and Development
6. Resources and Environment

Human Security focuses primarily on protecting people while promoting peace and assuring sustainable continuous development. It emphasizes aiding individuals by using a
people-centered approach for resolving inequalities that affect security. One of the major failings of Human Security, according to its critics, is that it is too all encompassing and that it fails to achieve its ambitious goals for improving the human condition. Still, the relevance of this concept for addressing the world’s most pressing issues seems clear. Security has gone global. It is no longer simply related to the security of nation states. The security of the individual now directly impacts the security of the state and vice versa (Hough, 2004).

It is only through using a broad concept of security that the multi-dimensional nature of the individual and social insecurities produced by the AIDS pandemic emerges. While those working with the narrower, realist conception of national security have largely minimized or dismissed the security implications of HIV/AIDS, those working with a human security approach have been able to understand the manifold nature of the threat in a more comprehensive manner. This is not to deny that, as the case of HIV/AIDS shows clearly, such breadth may considerably complicate the task of the security analyst, especially because there are also complex interactions that take place between the various aspects of human security the disease incurred costs of medical care in the health sector (International Labour Organization, 2003).

The case of HIV/AIDS shows that the concept can be usefully deployed to analytically capture those issues that adversely affect the ability of people to ensure their survival. Indeed, those who think erroneously that human security is simply synonymous with development. So the human security concept does tend to prioritize those issues that directly and indirectly threaten the survival of individuals; in order to exercise choice, people’s survival must first be ensured. Trying to assure such minimum guarantees of survival and security also provides some continuity with the traditional focus of security studies on survival (of states), albeit changing the referent object to the individual, and opening up the agenda to include not just military but also non-military threats to the self-preservation of human beings. As the case of HIV/AIDS shows, in many countries these threats actually far outnumber the threats posed to individuals by armed conflict. Although the human security approach thus broadens the agenda considerably, this is still a far step from the charge that any issue can be made into a human security issue; clearly only issues that threaten the survival of individuals would qualify (Klare, 2004).

The case of HIV/AIDS also underscores two of the advantages that human security scholars and practitioners frequently ascribe to the concept. First, in the case of HIV/AIDS, the breadth of the concept has proved politically useful in the sense of assembling an influential and
wide ranging network of diverse actors, including international organizations, nongovernmental organizations, scholars, activists, and the media around the issue. Second, by using a new language of security, the human security approach has also helped place the issue of HIV/AIDS onto the international security agenda and has thus helped to draw attention to, and mobilize resources for, combating the spread of the pandemic. In these two ways, the case of HIV/AIDS not only casts doubt on many of the criticisms so often leveled against the concept; it also reaffirms the central tenet of human security, namely that there are important non-military threats to the survival of human beings throughout the world that are frequently ignored by states and elites in undemocratic countries (Sachs, 2005).

The case of HIV/AIDS highlights two important drawbacks associated with the idea of human security. First, despite some of the political gains, the human security agenda has not actually been particularly successful at challenging or displacing the traditional approach of national security. In the case of HIV/AIDS the concept of human security certainly helped initially to make important inroads into the international security agenda, but there was, and continues to be, immense pressure to also prove that HIV/AIDS is additionally a threat to national security, because it is only then that proper leadership and sustained resources will flow (Jürgens, 2002).

Second, the case of HIV/AIDS also shows that a profound tension remains not so much between human security and the state, but between human security and the idea of political sovereignty on the basis of which the international order was legally constructed following the Second World War. Where human security is successful in mobilizing a wide array of international institutions and nongovernmental networks, the politics of human security quickly begin to rub up against the question of sovereignty and non-intervention in internal politics. In those instances where governments are deliberately abusing their citizens, this may not cause much offence (except to those abusive elites). But where weak states are struggling with difficult structural and historical conditions, or are in positions of severe economic dependency on outside sources of funding, this focus on human security can allow international agencies and nongovernmental organizations to bypass the issue of sovereignty, not least by applying considerable conditions on aid that is delivered for human security objectives. This is potentially problematic because the human security agenda, despite its normative and charitable ambitions, contains very strong (and often robustly liberal) Western assumptions about: (i) how societies
ought to deal with the issue of disease; (ii) how political power should be exercised more generally; and (iii) ultimately even about what it means to be human (Rogers, 2000).

If the human security agenda were to be successfully implemented in world politics, it would effectively wrest sovereignty away from all those states who do not share these implicit assumptions. So perhaps the most important lesson of the case of HIV/AIDS for human security is that the relationship between human security and sovereignty needs to be further clarified, lest the human security agenda simply ends up universalizing a particular understanding of what it means to be human in the name of “saving lives” which would, in the end, also render it decidedly biopolitical (WHO, 2006).
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