

- It should be noted that human insecurity may also be caused by *the absence of a state* capable of coping with basic threats to individual safety, let alone other threats to collective security (e.g. disease, environmental problems, warlords, drugs, terrorism, etc.). Using a human security lens to consider any given problem thus should not be seen as 'anti-state'. In some contexts, the application of the human security lens may result in a call for the financial and technical support of a given state, that is capacity-building, as a first priority. It may also mean bolstering the private sector, through trade agreements and economic development. Neither state-building nor trade should be seen as outside the potential tools that can be used to secure people's lives and livelihoods.
- 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.² There was much discussion about the issue of intervention and use of force in the name of human security, and the conditions under which it could be considered legitimate. All agreed that such a principle, forcible humanitarian intervention, was a profound departure from past practises with regard to state sovereignty and territorial integrity.
- Finally, a human security lens is best applied in a pro-active, preventative rather than reactive way. As such, it was argued by several participants that the current bureaucratic structure and culture of foreign ministries and multilateral organizations such as the UN can often become an impediment to the goal of human security.

In sum, there was consensus that human security has the potential to be a profound and long term shift of perspective in Canadian foreign policy. A number of issues and problems with the concept were discussed and are summarized in the following sections.

3. Human Security: A Western Agenda?

As suggested above, human security is spurred by the post-Cold War human rights regime and may be closely tied conceptually to a human development paradigm. If this is the case, human security suggests a broad agenda rooted in a particular ideological framework, linked closely to liberal notions of human rights and democracy, and committed to broadening the range of actors beyond states to civil society.

² There is some debate in the academic literature about the term 'intervention' and its meaning. We use the term 'forcible' to distinguish non-consensual, military intervention (for example NATO in Kosovo) from non-forcible, consensual intervention – such as humanitarian aid, normally consented to by the government in question. Thus, forcible humanitarian intervention means both that military force is used, and it occurs in a country which has not consented to the intervention. While making these theoretical distinctions, it should be noted that in reality, the exact line between aid and military work, or consensual and non-consensual (particularly where extraordinary pressure is applied on a government to consent to having an international team of military troops enter a sovereign territory – Indonesia and E. Timor are prime examples) is often blurred. For a discussion of the use of 'forcible humanitarian intervention', see Oliver Ramsbotham, 'Humanitarian Intervention 1990-5: a need to reconceptualize?' *Review of International Studies*, 1997, 23, 445-468.