

needed on how human security thinking had changed in light of new policy priorities on terrorism.

Jean-Francois Rioux, of the University of Quebec at Montreal, underlined the benefits to be derived from the joint meeting of the Consortium with the CPCC in bringing together academics and practitioners and permitting them to exchange information. Because the Consortium is a virtual enterprise, apart from the holding of seminars, communication is through sharing of documents and bulletins by electronic mail. The Consultations, therefore, represent a good opportunity for networking.

*Rapporteur: Julie Gagné, Université Laval*

## SESSION 2: Measuring Human Security

David Malone, of the International Peace Academy, chaired the session and in his opening remarks made four key points. In the past few years the concept of human security has been enshrined in foreign policy dialogues despite initial and ongoing hesitancy within some official circles. It is encouraging and exciting to see that new conceptions of human security are being worked on and implemented within numerous jurisdictions and institutional sites around the globe. The acceptance of *The Responsibility to Protect* report released by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) is one example of how the conceptual framework of human security is being implemented within some institutional and governmental circles. Human security has the ability to mobilize support from the general public, even in the absence of a commonly agreed definition.

In her presentation, Sabina Alkire, of the Commission on Human Security, noted that human security is a concept without a universally accepted definition. Currently there are over 25 definitions in circulation. However, the benchmark definition is contained in the 1994 United Nations Development Report. It emphasizes safety from chronic threats, protection from sudden and harmful disruptions, freedom from fear, and freedom from want. Human security is argued to be universal rather than territorially bound, multi-dimensional, interdependent, preventive rather than reactive, and people-centred. Definitions of human security can generally be seen to branch out in two directions. The first emphasizes poverty (e.g. Caroline Thomas, Fen Hampson) and the second emphasizes violence (e.g. official Canadian and Norwegian conceptions). The official Japanese and World Bank definitions incorporate both strands in different ways. The Commission on Human Security has struggled to develop a working definition of human security that is a) robust in the diversity of threats it can encompass; and b) functional as the basis for operational responses by different institutions to human security threats. The proposed working definition adopted by the Commission on Human Security is: "the objective of human security is to protect the vital core of all human lives from critical pervasive threats, in a way that is consistent with long-term human fulfilment." The key here is to be proactive rather than reactive.

According to Andrew Mack, of the University of British Columbia, regardless of the definition of human security being utilized, it is paramount that policy-makers have access to good data, which in turn can generate good analysis that can inform and shape good policy. Econometric