

HUMAN SECURITY CONCERNS OF SOUTH ASIA: PAKISTAN'S PERSPECTIVE

Muhammad Imran Ashraf,* Sajida Begum,**
Iqra Jathol***

Abstract

The South Asian states have been facing grave challenges to human security since long as a result of increasing extremism, border conflicts and terrorism. These domestic, regional and global factors are a menace and main hindrance in the progress and prosperity of this region. Terrorism has posed a serious threat to peace, security and stability of this region and the rest of the international community. This article highlights the human security problems specific to Pakistan, though contextualised within broader human security challenges affecting South Asia. Today, Pakistan is facing different types of internal and external threats. The South Asian region has strategically strong and weak features, where Pakistan and India are two major regional players. Therefore, the issues regarding peace and security depend on the relationship between these countries. Pakistan lives in an environment lacking in human security. At present, she is facing crucial problems like political instability, socio-economic underdevelopment, energy crises, terrorism, drone attacks, suicide bombing impacting human security in the country. The authors suggest that India and Pakistan need to make progress in the field of economics and trade and realize that at present it is in the interest of not only the two states but also their huge populations.

Keywords: South Asia, Human Security, Political Instability, Economic Underdevelopment, Media, Regional Conflicts Terrorism, Extremism.

* Muhammad Imran Ashraf, PhD Research Scholar at International Islamic University, Islamabad. imran.iuu.phd@gmail.com

** Mrs. Sajida Begum, Assistant Professor, Minhaj University, Lahore.

*** Ms. Iqra Jathol, M.Phil Scholar, Minhaj University, Lahore.

Introduction

South Asia has a distinctive role to play in world politics because of its geographical setting. South Asia holds a very important geopolitical position in relation to the rest of the world because it connects the East and the West, with the potential to bridge the Global South with the North. Thus, it forms an important locus for discussing the role of global powers' rivalry in the region as well as role of democracy and democratic institutions in bringing about and sustaining peace. This sets it apart from the other regions of the world. As for the history of present day South Asia, it begins with the Indus valley civilization dating back to 2350 B.C.¹ It is indeed one of the four oldest civilizations of the world. The South Asian region comprises of eight countries: Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan and Maldives. South Asia hosts almost a quarter of the world's population. Despite achieving consistent economic growth, the region is marked by dense poverty and human deprivation. South Asian countries inherited a weak and backward economic infrastructure from their colonial masters or the indigenous authoritarian rulers. Except Sri Lanka and India, where some kind of infrastructural development had taken place during the colonial rule, the other countries lacked even the basic economic infrastructure. All the South Asian countries began the process of modernization and development in the nineteen fifties. There have been numerous problems and challenges which have affected the South Asian economies. The region needs to tackle the burgeoning non-traditional security threats in order to promote well-being of the people and improve the quality of their lives by investing resources in human development and implementing constitutional provisions that protect fundamental human rights and dignity. South Asia is one of the most populous regions of the world. Despite achieving consistent and rapid economic growth over the last several years and possessing huge potential for regional development and prosperity, the region is marked by severe political, economic, social and cultural inequalities.

The political and economic policies of the governments in South Asia continue to pre-dominantly focus on the traditional state-centric security paradigm. For this, states channelise the bulk of their resources for state security while paying minimal attention to human development. This practice not only contributes to the prevalence of dense poverty and deprivation but also contributes to inter-state conflict and rivalry in South Asia.²

¹ Muhammad Ayoob, *The Third World Security Predicament: State Making, Regional Conflict, and the International System* (London: Lynne Rienner, 1995), 17.

² Muhammad Saleem Mazhar and Naheed Goraya, *Post-2014 Afghanistan: Reflections & Off-Shoots* (Lahore: University of the Punjab, 2014), 19-21.

India and Pakistan are the most prominent and rival states in the regional setting. Both the states came into being in August 1947, but have never been able to maintain cordial relations due to various issues, disputes and security challenges. As for Pakistan, it has been facing the challenges of lack of democratic values and stability for more than 66 years of its existence. Pakistan began with a democratic system of governance but could not sustain it.³ Thus, in South Asia, Pakistan is a significant regional actor, whose tribulations have implications for the security of other countries in the region. These implications have spillover effect for not only the traditional but human security as well.⁴

The article argues that in South Asia the internal and external policies of states are rival centric and not people centric. As a result, human security at the community level is affected by larger geopolitical concerns. The greatest threats to human security at the local level are issues relating to geopolitics because terrorism, religious extremism and political instability are the consequences of geo-political problems.

Conceptualizing Human Security

The literal meaning of security or safety is freedom from various internal and external threats. It is defined as the condition of being secure from or not wide-open to menace; safety or freedom from scare, concern or anxiety; and feelings of security or freedom from danger.⁵ Analytically, the concept of security is essentially controversial in nature due to its complexity, seamlessness and lack of factual objectivity, thus the concept has to be understood with the help of broader approaches. It is a subjective problem that mainly depends on one's ontology. In other words, the concept of security has multiplicity of meanings. Thus, it needs to be contextualized. Barry Buzan argues that people don't coincide on a single idea of security due to their moral, ideological, and normative differences. Therefore, the security perspective is always defined with the support of other established theoretical frameworks. In the realist framework, security is seen as derivative of power or mere synonym of power⁶. The notion of security and safety is highly relative and multifarious in nature, therefore security can be well-defined or explained in its own specific and exact surroundings; it differs according to the context.

³ Manas Chatterji, ed. *Conflict and Peace in South Asia* (UK: Emerald Publishing Ltd., 2008), 39-49.

⁴ Shahid Burki, *Pakistan: Fifty years of Nationhood* (Lahore: Vanguard, 2004), 71.

⁵ John Andrew and M. Proffitt, *Oxford English Dictionary*, (UK: Oxford University Press, 1993), 12.

⁶ Marianne Stone, "Security according to Buzan: A comprehensive security analysis", *School of International and Public Affairs, Security Studies Discussion Papers Series1* Columbia University (New York: GEEST, Spring 2009), 2-4.

Further, there are a number of security theories that have emerged and evolved with shifting international and national priorities and as a result of domestic, regional and global key events. These theories are not static; each has its variations and permutations. Likewise, each theory is to some extent reductive and essentialist, relying upon assumptions about the nature of the world we live in. While there has been an evolution in security discourse, it is not strictly linear or time-specific but dynamic, so that some theories had greater prevalence at certain times and with particular actors. Equally, there are differing perceptions as to where we are along this evolving continuum. Given below are some of the central theories that have shaped security discourse by way of background to the emergence of the 'human security' concept.

The theorists of law have had equally varying perspectives on security, ranging from the more traditionalist views- placing the protection of the state and state sovereignty as fundamental goals and determinants of security- to a number of broader and diverging concepts. Theorists of law have an added drawback of considering the role of law in addressing insecurity. Recurring debates on the relationship of law with politics play on in the background, such as whether law is a constraining force on state action or itself a consequence of state interests. In particular, law experts grapple with the extent to which law is a tool, or indeed the principal tool, to ensure security. Lawyers are most comfortable within the certainty and predictability of a rules-based system, but are typically frustrated when at moments of greatest political tension the rules appear flawed or lack the requisite force.⁷

However, theoretical schools prior to the Critical Security Studies (CSS) could not sufficiently explain security in the human context, but finally the School of Critical Security Studies (CSS) provided the closest theoretical underpinnings for the shift to the concept of human security. The CSS recognizes that the bifurcation of security into the material world 'out there' and the inner world of human relationships, reflected in the nominative and adjectival forms of the word, exaggerates the gap between the two images. McSweeney argues that the assumption of security studies, which ignores the human dimension is contradicted by the practical dependence of policy-makers and theorists alike on the human individual as the ultimate referent or subject of security. Thus, the individual is ignored in conceptualizing the idea of security at the state level only to be reinstated as its basic rationale – as it must be – in order to make sense of and legitimize the policy derived.⁸ For security to make sense at the international level, critical security theorists argue that it

⁷ Alice Edwards, Carla Ferstman, *Human Security and Non-citizens Law, Policy and International Affairs* (UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 4.

⁸ Bill McSweeney, *Security, Identity and Interests: A Sociology of International Relations* (UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 16.

must make sense at the basic level of the individual.

Critical Security Studies (CSS) further provides insight to the student of security studies to know that the use of 'security jargon' is a double-edged sword. This double-edged use of security terminologies can label the subjects of this security discourse as threats to security, rather than being victims or at risk of insecurity. The process of 'normalizing' the language of security can hide from view the real agendas at play and permit the erosion of fundamental rights, as states feel justified reducing or removing rights in situations of 'exception' or 'crisis'. As a collective discourse, there is concern that individuals can become voiceless or that the term may be misappropriated and misused to justify state-centric responses to the movement of people. This is not an uncommon response to migrants, asylum-seekers and refugees who have been increasingly portrayed as security threats, rather than as individuals fleeing violence, persecution or human insecurity. Thus, there is concern in framing such issues within 'security' terms.

Human security and human rights have been coexisting aims of the UN Charter since 1945. However, it is interesting to analyze that where most threats to human security can be formulated as human rights violations, at the same time human security is threatened by the acts for provision of human security.⁹ Such as, the US led wars threatened human security in the name of protecting human rights. In this context, it is essential to first define the contours of human security.

According to Freedman, when anything that generates anxiety or threatens the quality of life in some respect becomes labelled as a 'security problem', the field risks losing all focus.¹⁰ The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) Report defines human security as the security of people-their physical safety, their economic and social well-being, respect for their dignity and worth as human beings and the protection of their human rights and fundamental freedoms. However, the ICISS definition is criticized for making no explicit mention of how the state, particularly in the indebted South, can guarantee the 'economic and social well-being' of their citizens under conditions of 'predatory globalization'. By concentrating on 'freedom from fear' and effectively ignoring 'freedom from want', the 'narrow approach' may be seen as consistent with a neo-liberal framework.¹¹ The idea of the new security framework under Critical Security Studies is that it focuses directly and specifically on individuals and communities, as opposed to

⁹ Barbara von Tigerstrom, *Human Security and International Law: Prospects and Problems* (UK: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2007), 30-40.

¹⁰ Tadjbakhsh Shahar banou, *Human Security: Looking Back Before Looking Forward* (UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 1-2.

¹¹ World Bank, *World Development Report 2000/2001: Attacking Poverty* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 39.

states. The traditional realist approach is not indifferent to individuals (or citizens), whom the state is charged to protect, however, individuals are passive in that framework. There is concern that national defense is frequently achieved at the cost of individual security or safety.

The significant feature of the human security framework is its recognition that the providers of security extend beyond the state. Security providers are said to include states, inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations and the affected individuals and communities themselves. This position is likened to liberal institutionalism, which recognizes the critical role of organizations (particularly the UN) in addressing transnational and international challenges. Yet proponents of human security go further, understanding that even in purely domestic contexts there is a need for a multiplicity of actors.¹²

People rather than states as the focus of security denoted the obvious shift from traditional to non-traditional security framework. The traditional geopolitical security traits were prioritized during the Cold War era under the conventional view of security in the Westphalian state system. It considered the state as the sole actor and was centered on state's security preservation of its territorial integrity and political sovereignty against any military threats. According to the traditional security notion, the only actual security concern is for a country to preserve persistence, power, control and freedom against external pressures from rival states.¹³

The Westphalian order moved the world towards globalization, which was characterized by two synchronized trends: firstly, global politics and its existential security implications and secondly, economic integration. In the late 1980's, economic and environmental aspects were also included in the notion of security as 'comprehensive security'. In the 1990s, the conceptual trajectory indicated an obvious paradigm shift from material security threats to normative social security threats. It appeared as a major shift in the Westphalian order of international affairs that brought the individual to the center of state's concerns. The non-traditional threats challenged the traditional concept of security; it included threats such as environmental pollution, transnational terrorism, massive population, and infectious diseases that posed a threat to the individual's security.

In warfare studies, it is established that a person's security cannot be achieved through military capabilities. Consequently, it involves the notion of human security. According to Morgenthau, the international

¹² Tadjbakhsh Shahar banou, *Human Security : Looking back before looking forward*, (UK : Cambridge University Press, 2009), 15-19.

¹³ Sung Won Kim, "Human Security with an Asian Face", *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 17-1 (USA: Indiana University Maurer School of Law, 2010), 83-103.

relations of the new millennium is impelling many analysts to broaden their conception of security to include issues of human security broadly defined¹⁴. Human security is a shared phenomenon, which delivers freedom from fear and wants to individuals. Beginning in the mid-1990s, the concept of human security has begun to visibly influence and challenge global politics, institutions, and governance.

In 1993, a UNDP document formally articulated and stressed that the concept of security must change from an exclusive emphasis on national security to a much greater stress on people's security. It shifted focus from security through armaments to security through human development; from territorial security to food, employment and environmental security. In the Human Development Report (HDR) of 1994, an Asian scholar, Mahbub-ul-Haq, encouraged comprehensive scope of human security. The HDR formalized and defined the idea, which identified security with people rather than regions and with progress rather than arms. However, it did not advocate for weak defence but talked about 'freedom from wants' and 'freedom from fear'. The idea brought about a new shift in global climate and governance of human rights safety.

The United Nations Development Program (1994) delineates the expanded scope of human security as follows:

- Advance human growth, not weapons
- Connect political decision-makers to undertake the new dividend of peace
- Give the United Nations a clear mandate to promote and support human development
- Increase the concept of development cooperation so that it comprises all streams, not just aid.
- Agree that 20 % of national budgets and 20 % of foreign aid be used for human development.
- Establish an Economic Security Council.¹⁵

An analysis of human security in different situations helps recognize that the inability to address a potentially extensive variety of reasons of specific insecurity can finally destabilize a country's security and definitely that of neighboring countries for instance, where people are forced to flee across borders. Where people seek to flee their country in such numbers that they are perceived by receiving states as a threat to national security, it may result in border closures, as done by Turkey against the Kurds in 1991 or Kenya against the Somalis in early 2007. People may alternatively become stuck in a 'no man's land' between borders, such as currently on the Iraqi borders with Syria and Jordan.

¹⁴ Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among the Nations : The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York : A.A. Knopf, 1948), 29.

¹⁵ UNDP, *The Human Development Report* (New York : Oxford University Press, 1994), 10.

Peace and security have also been described in a report titled : *In Larger Freedom* as 'freedom from fear', that's why it is often a central concern of efforts to protect refugees.¹⁶

In this connection, the concept of human security further focuses on initiatives taken by the international community under the UN Charter to enhance the security of particular groups including refugees, citizens in armed conflict and children in armed conflict. It also discusses how interventions to strengthen the establishment of sustainable peace are critical to successful voluntary repatriation with safety and dignity of refugees. In each of these areas, initiatives in recent years can be seen as having adopted a broader and more inclusive approach, although the term 'human security' is rarely used as such. Finally, UN Report 2008 outlines briefly UN efforts to integrate the gender perspective into both peace and security concerns, notably through Security Council Resolutions 1325 (2000) and 1820 (2008). This shows how a more comprehensive and inclusive approach is being taken when seeking to establish and consolidate peace and that women empowerment, refugees' settlement are more widely recognized as critical to such efforts.

UN initiatives in recent years to strengthen the protection of civilians in armed conflict are relevant not only to the protection of IDPs but also of refugees, as noted above. Although IDPs may well be more likely than refugees to find themselves caught up in such a situation, armed conflict is a major cause of insecurity and flight for both refugees and IDPs. Refugees may also be intermingled with IDPs, as is the case in Darfur (Sudan), Chad, the Central African Republic or the DRC.

Especially where refugees remain in border regions or where conflict and insecurity spill over into neighbouring countries, refugees risk becoming unintended 'collateral damage' or even direct targets in the very conflict they are seeking to flee. Camps may be raided by armed groups, or become controlled by combatants who have temporarily withdrawn from the conflict to recuperate. In such unstable situations, the delivery of humanitarian assistance may be deliberately obstructed and humanitarian access denied. As the UN Secretary-General has noted access to civilians in armed conflict is anything but safe, certainly not timely, and far from unhindered. The result is millions of people excluded from access to life-saving assistance and the minimal protection provided by the mere presence of humanitarian workers.¹⁷

¹⁶ Personal Security of Refugees. No. 72 XLIV, *United Nations High Commission for Refugees, UNCHR* (New York: The UN Refugee Agency, 1993), Document No. 12A (A/48/12/Add.1).

¹⁷ Alice Edwards, Carla Ferstman, *Human Security and Non-citizens Law, Policy and International Affairs* (UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 47-50.

Human Security in South Asia

Today South Asia, despite having been independent for the last century, is the poorest and most backward region in the world after Africa. The primary goal of every nation is to protect and ensure satisfactory defence for its homeland. No state feels relaxed living in an environment (of any type) of threat. To strengthen their security environments, nations employ various strategies to find the help of an outsider in the form of a mutual alliance. States try to join a bilateral alliance for the following reasons: to support their own abilities, to induce an outsider to come into the area and act as a balancer, to isolate the adversary, to promote a regional alliance and to reconcile with the adversary even at a cost deemed to be considerably high. The third world countries join an alliance mainly to deal with a regional adversary. Therefore, the security in the third world countries (that includes Pakistan as well) is state-centered in character, in terms of both its territory and institutions and to the security of those who profess to represent the state territorially and institutionally.

Multiple Dimensions of Inter-State Conflict in South Asia

It is clear that there are multiple dimensions of inter-state conflict in the South Asian region. Many of these conflicts have serious implications for security in the region. It may also be added here that these conflicts are mainly territorial disputes. Here an attempt has been made to explore various dimensions of these conflicts and their security implications in South Asia. The comprehensive approach to security proposes that if human beings are secured, society is secured and if society is secured, state is also secured. Since it is human beings who need to be secured, all fields of their activity such as social, political, economic, environmental etc. become components of the comprehensive security approach.

South Asia is often described as the most dangerous place on earth and now there is an urgent need for the region to overcome the bitter legacies of the past in order to create peaceful and secure environment. Since the nuclear tests by India and then Pakistan in May 1998, the focus of this region has been almost exclusively on the nuclear dimensions of the confrontation between the two states. In reality security in South Asia is challenged by interplay of several factors operating at three different levels: domestic, regional and global.¹⁸ All the South Asian states have different perspectives over these three spillover factors. Here, this study aims to portray Pakistan's perspective in this respect.

¹⁸ Malheeta Lodhi, "Security Challenges in South Asia," *The Nonproliferation Review*, 8, no. 2, (Summer 2001), 118-124.

Human Security-Pakistan's Perspective

Domestic Factors

It is in the context of the comprehensive approach to security that domestic conflicts become a major challenge to human security in Pakistan. Actually domestic conflicts emanate due to various reasons that threaten human security in Pakistan. It is also implied that if the domestic conflicts are resolved amicably, the challenges of human security could be resolved to a large extent in Pakistan.

Over half a century after independence, Pakistan remains mired in a vicious cycle of poverty, deprivation, and underdevelopment. It is at the very bottom of the world league in social and human development indicators. In Pakistan only 40 percent have access to clean drinking water and fewer have nutritious food. Quality education is available only to the most fortunate and dropout rate is high. Human life in these conditions is nasty, brutish, and short.¹⁹

Thus, Pakistan is in a precarious situation today largely because of its internal problems and instability. Sectarian, ethnic and provincial conflicts are common, and terrorist activity, corruption and crime are rising in number. Pakistan has weak internal security which is damaging its international reputation. In India the situation is a bit different: it is more stable internally, developing economically and is therefore viewed as politically, economically and strategically viable, precisely what is necessary for the stability of South Asia in the eyes of US.²⁰ However, the prime fears of both countries-Pakistan and India-are currently internal rather than external which can still lead to the renewing of old wounds of enmity.

In Pakistan, at the domestic level, terrorism, religious radicalization, political instability and the unrestricted media are the main challenges to human security.

Terrorism

There are three elements of terrorism that the region is concerned about: 1) the Al-Qaeda factor, 2) what India is calling cross-border terrorism and Pakistan is calling the freedom struggle in Kashmir, 3) the sectarian (Sunni vs Shia) extremism and terrorism in Pakistan.²¹ The War on Terrorism has turned out to be the most critical clash of the 21st century and it is Pakistan that has suffered the most in this war. Pakistan's

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Umbreen Javaid, "Compulsive Peacebuilding in South Asia: Analysis of Pakistan-India Relations", in *South Asia in Perspective*, ed. Dr. Umbreen Javaid (Lahore: Center for South Asian Studies, University of the Punjab, 2013), 12-14.

²¹ Steve Coll, "Between India and Pakistan, A Changing Role for the US," *Washington Post*, May 26, 2002.

role in this war has caused multi-dimensional exterior security coercion for the country. It has been the greatest victim in this entire war in terms of irrecoverable loss of human capital more than 45000 in number. Pakistan, as compared to the other actors in Afghanistan, has also taken serious beatings.²² By making Pakistan a front line state, such a game is being played that Pakistan is American friend and foe at the same time. After 9/11, Pakistan has become the theater of a blind war. It is becoming difficult to assess with every passing day that who is against whom.²³

Religious Radicalization

Religious radicalization and its violent eruption have been developing along two levels in Pakistan: the domestic level and the international level. Pakistan's leadership, both military and civilian, has done its best to prevent social and political chaos and its major goals have little to do with development in structures of civil society, rather it has been applying all its energies for reigning in bothersome ethnic groups. Separation from East Pakistan, tensions and wars with India and outstanding issue of Kashmir between India and Pakistan have contributed to the emergence of an unstable regional environment. Similarly, the Afghan war has had a strong impact on internal security, having been strictly connected with growing Islamic militancy, drug trafficking and smuggling.

Political Instability

The concept of comprehensive security led to a broader and more holistic approach. It was recognized that security is affected not only by the military balance of power, but also by instability resulting from mutual clash, communal strength, poverty, joblessness, planned criminality, terrorism and conservational deprivation, as well as by mass population movement. Human security thus came to be seen as requiring the establishment of both security from such continuing fears as starvation, illness and protection from abrupt turbulence in daily routine life. Currently, Pakistan is facing various kinds of security as well as terrorist threats from several Taliban groups. In the tribal parts of Pakistan, many terrorist groups are active and trying to weaken Pakistan with acts of terrorism. Pakistan also has many issues with respect to its sovereignty and survival in this situation. So, there are different types of internal and

²² Muhammad Saleem Mazhar, Samee Ozair Khan and Naheed Goraya, "Post-2014 Afghanistan", *Journal of South Asian Studies*, 28, no. 1, (2013) 67-82 (Lahore: University of the Punjab, Lahore).

²³ Dr. Naheed Shabir Goraya, "Global War against Terrorism: A Security Threat to Pakistan", in *South Asia in Perspective ed.*, Dr. Umbreen Javaid (Lahore: CSAS, University of the Punjab, 2013), 86.

external players who want to play a very negative role in the survival, trade and economy of Pakistan.²⁴

There are different types of political, religious and ethnic organizations, which have been growing by utilizing Information Technology (IT) tools effectively for creating political chaos and instability for the last fifteen years. There have been ethno-linguistic movements in all the provinces, as well as sectarian and tribal conflicts in many areas, resulting in the convergence of multiple typologies and a widespread Islamic radicalization. The reasons for this situation are multi-dimensional and represent a complex phenomenon, to be considered as a part of an unmanageable process of socio-cultural change creating tension and social crisis.

Human Security and the Role of Media

The role of media has domestic, regional and global implications for human security. However, domestic and regional role of media is more relevant to human security issues in the context of Pakistan. At the domestic level, Pakistan has a plural culture across several religious sects. Radio and TV stations broadcast many programs based on religion and culture. The lack of debate on religious issues and certain cultural taboos forces people to rely on the given interpretations of religious issues unquestioningly. The ill-informed and conservative religious teachers are totally free to misuse the loud speakers of mosques to propagate their extremist viewpoints on world affairs, without any checks and balances. Resultantly, the population encounters manipulated news and fundamentalist ideas, which cause flawed perceptions, unrealistic expectations, sensationalism, fanaticism, and sectarianism.²⁵ In this way, media at the domestic level contributes to the factors which have been posing threat to human security in Pakistan since its inception.

Apart from the domestic factors, external developments at the regional level, such as events in Iran, Afghanistan and China could also be key concerns for human security in Pakistan.²⁶ Overall, at the regional level, the Indian traditional rivalry against Pakistan poses a greater threat to the human security of the Pakistani nation, owing to nuclear capability of India and Pakistan.

²⁴ Muhammad Jahangir Tamimi, "India's Foreign Policy towards South Asia and Pakistan," in *South Asia in Perspective*, ed. Dr. Umbreen Javaid (Lahore: CSAS, University of the Punjab, 2013), 34.

²⁵ Yoginder Sikand, "Pakistan, Islam and Indian Media Stereotypes," Countercurrents.org, January 21 2006, <https://www.countercurrents.org/ipk-sikand210106.htm>.

²⁶ Michael Krepon and Alex Stolar, "Outlook for Regional Security in South Asia", *Pakistan Horizon*, 60, no. 3, (2007), 73-82.

Regional Factors

At the regional level, the pursuit of domination by one state over its neighbours is a recipe for insecurity and instability. The prevailing asymmetry with regard to both strategic objectives and the relationship between military forces of the largest country in South Asia, i.e. India and its smaller neighbours is a structural factor for instability and has been exacerbated by Delhi's desire to dominate. Certainly, attempts at domination can be destabilizing and thus highly dangerous in terms of human security provision, particularly for Pakistan. The Indian rivalry factor has also been important in aggravating conflicts generally in the region and particularly in Pakistan, thereby posing serious challenges to human security. Indian interference plays a negative role in aggravating domestic conflicts in some areas of Pakistan like Baluchistan.

Pakistan and India have engaged themselves in a number of conflict management talks, negotiations and agreements but all of them proved to be futile in the end. Agreements and summits like the Tashkent Agreement in 1965, the Shimla Accord in 1972, the Lahore Declaration in 1998, the Agra Summit in 2001 and Composite Dialogue that began in 2004 proved to be major steps initially but in the end they could not produced desired result. This has added to the resentment between these neighbouring states. Furthermore, both sides tried to resolve their conflicts through other channels like Track II diplomacy and were engaged in extensive talks with the help of retired diplomats, former military men, business groups and other social entities, but like previous efforts, they remained unable to extract a successful or major positive result. Pakistan and India as the two most important states of the South Asian region need to manage and resolve their conflicts.²⁷ The internal terrorism menace, a significant challenge by itself, as well as external involvement by India and events in Afghanistan have complicated the task, which has been compounded by years of neglect and errors of omission and perhaps commission. While on the military front public, media and parliamentary efforts have provided the essential support needed for the Swat operation on wards, much more needs to be done.

Kashmir Dispute

Kashmir dispute has been a burning issue over the last sixty-eight years, waiting to be resolved. Under the UN resolution of 1948, on January 1, 1949, a ceasefire agreement was signed between Pakistan and India through the mediation of United Nations and it was decided that Kashmir issue will be resolved according to the wishes of the Kashmiri people

²⁷ Umbreen Javaid, "Conflict Management Between India and Pakistan: Challenges and Failures," *Journal of South Asian Studies*, 31, no. 1 (Lahore: University of the Punjab, 2016), 253 – 254.

through a plebiscite, but it was never conducted by India. Henceforth, the issue remains an unresolved and biggest conflict because both states have diverging positions and claims over the Kashmir.²⁸ The outstanding Kashmir conflict has proven threat to the human security as these two neighbouring states have fought three conventional wars in the backdrop of Kashmir dispute which had damaged not only human lives at large but stunted the growth of socio-political and economic development compatible to human security.

Siachen Conflict

Siachen conflict is a by-product of the Kashmir dispute. The conflict began in 1984 when Indian forces occupied the glacier. For its part, Pakistan asserts that Siachen is an essential part of Gilgit-Baltistan, administered by Islamabad. "Pakistan fears that India will use the passes over the glacier to invade and occupy more territory in Baltistan. Indian occupation of Siachen Glacier also represents a threat to Karakoram Highway, the major road linking Pakistan to China through the Khunjerab Pass."²⁹ In CPEC scenario, such fears have worsened. Pakistan also argues that its troops on Siachen are trying to prevent further Indian aggression in the region. The Indian condition for de-escalation in the Saltoro range has been for Pakistan to agree to a demarcation of the posts which is not acceptable for Pakistan. In a joint statement of defence secretaries of India and Pakistan after talks in June 1989 agreed on redeployment of forces and future positions on the grounds under the Simla Agreement. India however, backtracked. Again, bilateral talks were held in New Delhi in November 1992, but could not produce meaningful outcome. A hope of settlement emerged when Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh visited Siachen in 2005 and showed a gesture towards resolving the conflict with Pakistan by turning Siachen into a 'mountain of peace'. However, it did not happen due to resistance from the Indian Army. Meanwhile, conflict has claimed 2700 human lives on both side not due to combat but avalanches, exposure and altitude sickness caused by the thin, oxygen-depleted air at Siachen. The conflict continues to pose challenge to human security in both countries.

Kargil Conflict

The Kargil crisis in 1999 also reflected Pakistan and India's conflict over Kashmir. The conflict brought out the serious threat of nuclear war as

²⁸ Victoria Schofield, *Kashmir in Conflict; India, Pakistan and the Unending War* (London: I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd, 2003), 15.

²⁹ Omer Farooq Zain, "Siachen Glacier Conflict: Discordant in Pakistan-India Reconciliation," *Pakistan Horizon*, 59, no. 2 (2006), 73-82. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41394127>.

both states had tested their nuclear bombs a short time before this conflict. James Woolsey, a former head of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), termed the Kashmir issue as a flashpoint that had the probable prospects for future use of weapons of mass destruction including nuclear weapons.³⁰ The conflict ended with intervention by the international community, in particular, the United States convinced Pakistan and India to come to the negotiating table to discuss and resolve disputed issues including the Kashmir problem.³¹ The conflict claimed more 1200 human lives on both sides.

Hostility of Media and Failed Negotiations

On the other hand, the hostility of media is another challenge and reason of failure of peace efforts between both sides-India and Pakistan. Media propaganda is sustained on both sides, but more so by the Indian media. In case of any incident, militant or terrorist attack, the media starts to blame the other state, without due evidence, as in almost every case Indian media starts targeting Pakistan for the incident. The major examples are Samjhota Express blasts in 2006, in which over a hundred Pakistanis were killed but the Indian media started to blame Pakistan for the attack. However, as the investigations progressed, it proved that right wing Hindu extremists were involved in the attack. This negative media propaganda has never been controlled by either side which has resulted in more enmity between both states. This media hostility has caused the negotiations to fail on a number of occasions, as in some cases the masses were not ready to accept the proposed solution. For instance, on Musharraf's five point 'Kashmir Formula' in 2005 Indian media started negative propaganda and campaign against it, which created a negative environment for the ongoing dialogue process between the two countries.³²

The electronic and print media in India and Pakistan has been contributing to the exacerbation of existing misperceptions on both sides. Mishandling of various issues by media has proved to be a major obstacle in the way of normalization of relations between India and Pakistan. Exaggerated facts and propaganda do not necessarily always produce

³⁰ Rashid Ahmad Siddiqi, *Deterrence Stability in Nuclear South Asia-A Study of Post 1998 India-Pakistan Conflict and US Role*, PhD Thesis (New Zealand: University of Auckland, 2011), 72-119.

³¹ Muhammad Jahangir Tamimi, India's Foreign Policy towards South Asia and Pakistan," in *South Asia in Perspective*, ed., (Lahore: CSAS, University of the Punjab, 2013), 21.

³² Umbreen Javaid, "Conflict Management Between India and Pakistan: Challenges and Failures", *Journal of South Asian Studies*, 31, no. 1, (Lahore: University of the Punjab, 2016), 253-254.

fruitful results. The role of media can be highly constructive regarding resolution of various issues by highlighting different aspects of the issues and discussing possible options available to solve problems. This is one of the major responsibilities upon the shoulders of the media of both India and Pakistan in securing durable peace in the region of South Asia.³³

For this, the role of media at regional level is more relevant and important because it has been making the people of India and Pakistan perceive each other in a hostile way for a long time. This perceived antagonism poses challenges to human security policies formulation and implementation in Pakistan.

Global Factors: International Involvements and Interventions

Pakistan, due to its geo-political and strategic location, has been the pivot of world politics since independence. It soon became a part of the block politics by joining SEATO and CENTO. Pakistan played a role as part of the US-led capitalist block against the USSR throughout the Cold War period, but in particular during the Afghan war followed by USSR's invasion in Afghanistan in 1979. Pakistan thus played a pivotal role in converting the global power structure from bipolar to unipolar corresponding to the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991. During the period of Cold War, human security in Pakistan remained at stake and Pakistan not only sacrificed lives in support of Afghan Jihad but also bore the burden of Afghan refugees which later converted into a threat to the socio-political and economic security of its own people. Pakistan had not fully overcome the spillover effects of Afghan war when the incident of 9/11 took place which put Pakistan into another global conflict: war on terrorism.

Thus, post 9/11 Pakistan witnessed human security threat on Western border as well. Because of joining hands in the US led war on terrorism, Pakistan sacrificed on socio-political and economic fronts which damaged the human security badly in Pakistan. After 9/11, the threat for Pakistan rapidly expanded from the state-centric Indian conventional threat at the Eastern border to a trans- border asymmetric threat from the Western front. This altered the dynamics of internal and external security for Pakistan.³⁴

This state of play in South Asia, described above, has an obvious bearing on the international environment, including security in adjacent regions. The reverse also holds true. The pursuit of a lopsided approach in South Asia by the world's primary power, the United States, could undermine security and compound regional tensions. For instance, the suggestion made by some to build up India as a counterweight to China could prove to be destabilizing and counterproductive for the region and

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Muhammad Saleem Mazhar, Samee Ozair Khan and Naheed Goraya, "Post-2014 Afghanistan", *Journal of South Asian Studies*, 28, no. 1, 67-84 (2013), 67-82.

indeed for US interests globally. Instead of pursuing an outdated balance of power approach, American interests would be better served by a partnership with South Asia as a whole.

Many terrorist groups and organizations, influenced by or affiliated with Al-Qaeda, exist in different parts of the world. They are not only in the Muslim majority countries, but many cells also exist in non-Muslim western countries like the United Kingdom, France, and Spain etc. Pakistan has been blamed by US led allies that madrassas in Pakistan are facilitating the recruitment process of members of banned organizations. This is also because of the perceived notion of a defensive jihad by the Muslim Ummah. Consequently, some members of these organizations had been travelling to Pakistan to join banned organizations³⁵.

In recent years, Pakistan has joined CPEC-a flagship project of Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) led by China, which will promote people centric economic development. This will have positive impact on the demographic, social, economic and political aspects of the lives of Pakistani people. At the same time, pollution due to some energy projects and human displacement is expected to impact human security in Pakistan.

The Way Forward: Ensuring Human Security

Human security operates more as a unifying, 'umbrella' concept and encompasses threats to social and economic security as well as to physical security.³⁶ Therefore, both human security and human responsibility go side by side while focusing on human security measures at the bilateral, regional and global levels. Pakistan and India must resolve conflicts at the bilateral level. At the regional level, Afghanistan along with India and Pakistan must play a role to curtail terrorism so that threat to human security from the western border of Pakistan may be reduced. Further, India must play a role in Afghanistan's stability with Pakistan's cooperation but not the role in Pakistan's destruction through supporting anti-Pakistan terrorist groups. Also at the regional level, the key players China and USA, must understand the human security dimension in South Asia and try to bring the South Asian nations together for regional development and comprehensive security through trade and investment.

This is the time for regional countries, particularly Pakistan to get advantage of the emerging economic opportunities in South Asia. In order

³⁵ Seth Jones, *Counterinsurgency in Afghanistan*, Vol. 4 (US: National Defence Research Institute, RAND Corporation, 2008), 67-111.

³⁶ *General Assembly Thematic Debate on Human Security*, UNGA, 22 May 2008, at www.un.org/ga/president/62/ThematicDebates/humansecurity.shtml, fulfilling the commitment of the World Summit Outcome document, UN Doc. A/RES/60/1, 'to discussing and defining the notion of human security in the General Assembly' (New York : UNGA), para 143.

to achieve its short-term as well as long-term goals in the region, the United States wants peace in South Asia. It was for this reason that US has supported Pakistan-India dialogue process. The U.S. administration is quite concerned about a number of critical challenges that Pakistan faces such as: fighting terrorism, countering extremism, preventing nuclear proliferation as well as reforming education and building viable democratic institutions in Pakistan, especially in its tribal areas (FATA). On the other hand, China wants global connectivity where Pakistan has a pivotal role to play via the Gawadar port. Pakistan should pursue a balanced approach towards both that will serve its long-term interest to promote human security in the country.

Conclusion

As the world changes, many scholars, analysts and policy makers agree that while governments need to confront external threats, creating sustainable domestic environments is an imperative policy priority. In the post-Cold War period, several conflicts, including the nuclear tests of 1998 and the post-9/11 war on terror, have made South Asia a focussed region and continue to make India and Pakistan vital states, where Pakistan has a pivotal role to play in the region. In this context, human security remains a top priority for Pakistan.

The Indo-Pak security complex has been posing new challenges for the human security in the region since nuclearization of both states, because the Kashmir dispute has often been described as a potential nuclear flash point across the region. This risk to human security can only be mitigated within the framework of cooperative security. India and Pakistan need to focus their attention on how to bring about this transformation. They must unambiguously commit themselves to seek a negotiated settlement of the Kashmir dispute. If the Kashmir issue had been resolved peacefully during 2004-2006, there would have been no further bloodshed, no political interference and no ethnic disturbances. Only peaceful, practicable, equitable, democratic and honourable actions can bring a durable solution of the Kashmir issue and this shall ensure a peaceful and prosperous future for the entire world in general and for South Asia in particular.

It is the need of the hour that India and Pakistan make progress in economic and trade relations. Both states need to realize that at present it is in the interest of not only the two states but also their huge populations to have improved relations, which will absolutely be advantageous to both Pakistan and India. It is a pity that the South Asian region lags behind in regional trade as compared to other regions and the development and progress of South Asia is directly linked with peace in this region. It is the only solution for peace and stability in South Asia.

It is high time that the leaders of both India and Pakistan initiate meaningful efforts to uplift living standards of the people. This will enhance the opportunity for India and Pakistan to cooperate in trade and development under Chinese initiated economic connectivity. India must join the CPEC. This will bring peace in the region. Pakistan must also change the direction of its policies to overcome the challenges it faces internally and externally.

