

community has been that the norms of sovereignty and non-intervention trump human rights. This has been the basis for international order for the past 300 years. Increasingly, however, there may be an acceptance that intervention in cases of humanitarian crisis is legitimate.

Conclusions/ Summary

Human security remains a contested concept in both theory and practice, although several areas of consensus did emerge around possible definitions and a basic agenda for human security, in practise. A majority of participants agreed that human security can be thought of as a paradigm shift, a changing lens that gives policy makers a new perspective in their policy making process. Foreign policy which works within the human security framework is foreign policy which takes into account the multifaceted security needs of individuals and communities in a contextualized and culturally sensitive way. In this sense human security is not a set of universally and uniformly applied policy options.

Several specific suggestions were made as to what might constitute the core components of such a lens. Securing people's lives and livelihoods could be taken as the central goal – where both objective and subjective perceptions of the sources of insecurity are analysed. Secondly, human security, as a collective responsibility, requires the participation of a wide range of actors including individuals, communities, civil society, states and international organizations. Thirdly, security must be defined in terms broader than a militarized conception of state security. Fourthly, the state in any given region can be both be an obstacle to, and a vehicle for, creating the conditions for human security: thus the role of the state (and the market) must be incorporated into the analysis. Forcible humanitarian intervention was seen by most participants as a last, but legitimate, resort in securing people's lives, when the most extreme forms of human insecurity are observed. Finally, in applying this lens, it is necessary to do so in a preventative, pro-active way.

While consensus did emerge around definitions and a basic framework for human security, in practise, it also became clear that a thorough theoretical analysis of the term is lagging far behind. As Minister Axworthy has noted, the practice of human security has led theory.¹¹ This is a clarion call to the academic community, particularly those involved in international relations theory, to address the thorny theoretical questions posed by human security (many of which were raised during the course of this symposium): is human security a northern/ neo-colonial/ paternalistic concept? With its strong relationship to human rights, is human security a categorical imperative which demands consistent application? Could such a foundation be abused by powerful states? If, on the other hand, we accept that human security, applied as a lens, "will differ in different contexts", do we risk the charge that the lens is applied only when it is convenient or beneficial for Canada to do so? Will such an approach create inconsistencies in Canadian

¹¹ Lloyd Axworthy, "Foreword", *Human Security: Safety for People in a Changing World*, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Canada. April 1999.