

## HUMAN SECURITY: A NEW REGIONALISM FOR THE CARIBBEAN

*Ashaki L. Dore*

**S**ecurity is defined as protection and preservation of a peoples' freedom from external military attack and coercion, from internal subversion and from the erosion of cherished economic, political and social values (Griffith 1997). The concept of security is undergoing changes in perspective as old assumptions are questioned and challenged. Traditional conceptions of security are based on the realist paradigm in which the concept of security refers mainly to the prospects of military conflict between states. However, while realism has dominated policymaking and security thinking, the end of the Cold War has brought with it, increased criticism of the realist interpretation of security. Consequently, this has seen the broadening of the security agenda to include or accommodate 'new' threats that range from the illegal drug trade to global warming; with the aim of addressing these multidimensional aspects with a multidimensional approach to security.

Contrary to the traditional view of security, the broader definitions of security affirm that security or insecurity is defined in relation to a country's vulnerabilities to internal and external threats (Ayooob 1995). This broadening of security thinking recognises that security is a concept that is always relative to problems, perceptions and the capabilities of the political and bureaucratic elites. It is a

relational concept since it is difficult to understand the national security dilemmas of a state without understanding its security realities, nor is it possible to address these issues without first understanding the level of political, economic and cultural interdependence that exists within the state or region given the advances in communication and transportation.

The lowering of barriers to trade has made borders more porous, thus facilitating the entry of illicit drugs, and illegal immigration, and the deregulation of financial systems. Capital flows have also facilitated money laundering which has been a catalyst of criminal activity in the Caribbean region (Girvan 2003). This not only highlights the multidimensional nature of security, but also indicates that essentially all states experience some level of insecurity.

The Caribbean is recognized as the leading transshipment point of illegal drugs and small arms, as it sits between the main producing and consuming centres. However, the insecurities that threaten the Caribbean region also include environmental threats which have become evident as a result of the Caribbean's vulnerability to climate change; and which has seen the Caribbean become victim to natural disasters such as hurricanes, and earthquakes. This has led to infrastructural damage as result of the flooding incidents, displacement as homes have been damaged, and the damage of crops which contributes to food insecurity. All these

insecurities are of paramount importance when considering how they could directly and indirectly affect human quality of life and how these can morph into internal conflict and thus threaten national security.

Realism and Liberalism have traditionally shaped the epistemological and ontological basis of security studies. The meaning of security has always been contested and this has intensified even more so following the end of the Cold War as new security concepts have emerged as a result of an increase in awareness of the number of dangers that are posed by new phenomena in unprecedented ways.

Consequently, this has led to a rethinking of the concept of state security, beyond the traditional paradigm and, as a result, this new security concept asserts that the present realities warrant the introduction of non-military threats into security dialogues which signals the realization that protecting the state may no longer be the principal objective of security. A myriad of factors ultimately affect the state and its citizens. Consequently, this debate questions the role of the nation-state and its capacity to provide security. The nature of conflicts in the international system require that the state look beyond the traditional preservation of state monopoly and military might, to address other critical issues such as environmental pollution, global warming, population explosion and migration all of which can result in a direct threat to human life and the stability of the nation-state. In consequence, at the centre of new critical issues, is the need to protect the individual as opposed to the state.

Regionalism has become an integral part of contemporary multilayered and multiactor governance. Many countries share common security problems and approaches on a regional

scale that are not common on a global scale. New regionalism reflects the type of multidimensionality, comprehensiveness, and diversity that is in accordance with the peculiarities of the Caribbean region. Moreover, new regionalism is conducive to the type of security threats that have emerged in the Caribbean region and consequently, lends itself to the adoption of human security as an approach to regional security.

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the subsequent end of the Cold war signalled a shift in security thinking. It marked the moment when, issues that were once put aside could be viewed in full light. The Concept of Human Security emerged in the writings of the United Nations Development Report (UNDP) in which it placed major emphasis on the security of the individual, given that it was observed that the individual had become the victim of violent conflicts and the prime target of violence (Fierke 2007). The concept aims to reduce the risks to human existence, seeks to increase the quality of life of the individual and foster the realization and expansion of human potential for present and future generations. Thus, the human security concept is a comprehensive approach which includes a larger number of issues that range from poverty, unemployment, natural disasters, crime, political injustice, and social discrimination. The focus of human security is not only to widen the scope of security policy to include non-military threats, but also to embark on a broader and more comprehensive approach to security policy making.

Security was once synonymous with the defence of territory from external threat. However, the requirements of security today have come to embrace the protection of individuals from internal and external threats. This change in perspective comes following the

realization that state-centric security has failed to fulfil its social contract, which was established following the treaty of the Westphalia 1648, which is characterized by the exchange of security for its citizens against the legitimate monopoly of violence within its borders (Amouyel 2006). Failure to recognize the importance of this paradigm shift could mean the inadequate treatment of issues and the prolonging and creation of crisis. This concept is a useful instrument that could enhance cooperation and the integration process in the region as it advocates integration, and approaches that are interdisciplinary and are based on cooperation.

One of the major stumbling blocks to interstate cooperation is a fixation on sovereignty and autonomy which prevents the creation of effective international laws, and binding treaties on issues of mutual benefit. Consequently cooperation among states is limited to a small group of states in the form of alliances. Moreover, many states seek to enjoy the benefits of an alliance but evade the cost, which limits the benefit and durability of cooperation, which generally goes back to the realist argument of selfishness and self-seeking nature of states.

The scope of security is broadening to include a diverse range of threats and dangers which ultimately threaten human security. However, as the understanding of security widens to embrace a more comprehensive set of values, it also causes the subject of security to become blurred and as a result many scholars challenge the inclusion of non-military threats particularly as a result of its broadness or inclusiveness. Despite the contested nature of security and the attempt to include threats that were not considered to be of a security concern, scholars agree that there are other referent objects under threat and, as a result, this has

lead to changes in perception between subscribers to the traditional paradigm and those of the contemporary school. This has led many to fear that the concept of security may be taken for granted (Sheehan 2005).

The alternative security paradigm that is now emerging is based on the liberal school of thought, which sees the world as shaped by order and cooperation rather than conflict. Thus, the traditional security paradigm of defending the nation state from attack from others is seen as inappropriate and somewhat obsolete. This is due to the progressive broadening of democracy and the evolution of the ability to restrain territorial expansion and general warfare. However, the lessened probability of interstate warfare does not signify that there is an absence of conflict or violence in the world. On the contrary, there is no better evidence than the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center, on September 9, 2011.

Today, security proponents advocate that states in conjunction with non-state actors develop the necessary capabilities and political will to address the causes and results that threaten the human quality of life. Consequently, regionalism has emerged as an important concept, given its comprehensive, multifaceted and diverse nature. In its broad sense, it is a contested concept; it is the expression of a common sense of identity and the creation and implementation of institutions that communicate a particular identity and collective action. It refers to a geographical area and to a type of world order. Consequently, there may be many regionalisms (Hettne and Soderbaum 2012). While some scholars argue that regionalism has made a comeback, others consider it to be a qualitatively new phenomenon. This difference is highlighted by the Old and New Regionalism debates.

Consequently, it is necessary to highlight these different characteristics. Old Regionalism existed in a bipolar era, emerged in the 1950s and declined during the 1970s. It was a top down approach, which focused specifically on set objectives. Consequently, in retrospect, old regionalism is considered to be inward looking, as it centered on specific issues; particularly, trade and security. On the other hand, New Regionalism emerged in a multipolar era; it emerged around the 1980s following the end of the Cold War. One of the most prominent characteristics of New Regionalism is that it is internally driven. Furthermore, it is comprehensive in nature as it includes areas that were not previously addressed in regionalism such as health and education. Moreover, the concept recognizes other actors which, consequently, makes it an appropriate tool in the context of the Caribbean region given the region's diverse geographic layout and composition. The benefits of regionalism as a tool for cooperation and collective action include: an increased market size, bargaining power, the pooling of resources, economic development and most importantly, for the purposes of the study, increased security. Consequently, the benefit of an increased capacity to secure the region makes regionalism a suitable model for the adoption and implementation of human security as a conceptual framework to address security threats in the Caribbean region.

In 1994, the UNDP report argued that the concept of security had been argued too narrowly; defined generally as territorial security seeking protection from external aggression, the protection of national interests in foreign policy, and the protection from nuclear proliferation in global security (Kaldor 2007). The report presented seven areas that constitute the concept of human security: economic, food,

health, environmental, personal, community and political security. However, four essential characteristics are highlighted: it is a universal concern; its components are interdependent, it is geared towards prevention rather than intervention, and most importantly, the security of the people (Akiyama 2004). Human security is concerned with the safety and the expansion of vital freedoms. The primacy of human rights is what distinguishes the human-centric approach from the state-centric approach. It focuses on protecting individuals rather than punishing the perpetrator. It has been suggested to express the need for individual safety and access to basic needs such as clean food and water, environmental and energy security, freedom from economic exploitation, freedom from gang violence, domestic violence and police abuse. "People must be at the center of all development..." (Fierke 2007). Consequently, it is concerned with adding a new dimension to development thinking as it focuses on human development and empowerment as a means of reducing and eliminating crime, protecting people from pervasive threats by fostering integration and cooperation among various institutions and policies that are essential to its realization (Commission on Human Security 2003).

The concept of human security is people-centered not threat-centered and it focuses on creating a condition that results from an effective political, economic, social, cultural and natural environment; not as result of a series of administrative procedures (Alkire 2003). Consequently, the concept is not intended to supplant state security; rather, it seeks to complement it and, as a result, it encourages the state to revisit its existing security, economic, development and social policies. The principal objectives of such policies should be to positively impact human livelihood and dignity. Non-military threats are becoming ever more

dangerous to neglect and if left untreated can become extremely difficult to resolve. The concept of human security may appear to be extremely pessimistic given that it sees a security threat in every aspect of life. However, it is not as radical a concept as it is perceived to be since it aims to achieve the same ends as the traditional paradigm.

Traditional and contemporary securities are both rooted in a concern for national security; thus the difference exists only in the methods employed. Furthermore, the debate between traditional security *vis-à-vis* contemporary security should go beyond the argument of what constitutes a security threat and instead recognize that what is of importance is the way in which the quality of life of the individual is threatened or affected and what can be done to improve it. "The underlying cause of turmoil is often ignored and instead governments address the poverty and instability that are its results" (Sachs 2003).

There have been several significant achievements in the field of Human security; the first is the creation of the 1999 Human Security Network and secondly, the publication of the 2003 Report by the Commission of Human Security; "Human Security Now: Protecting and Empowering people." These achievements call for a global approach to promote human security. Furthermore, other successes include the Ottawa Process which entails the banning of Anti-personal Landmines, the Kimberly process and the International Criminal Court. These achievements highlight what can be achieved through integration and interdisciplinarity, as the actors involved in these processes not only included states, but also nongovernmental organizations (NGO's) and International Organizations.

The concept of human security has taken two different directions: the Canadian interpretation which places great emphasis on peace building and freedom from political violence and focuses specifically on the individual. Japan's interpretation however, remains very closely linked to the target of the Commission on Human Security in which the community as well as the individual are principal targets. The interpretations differ in their definitions and subsequently in the core values.

### **The Canadian Approach**

The approach adopted by the Canadian government is reflected in the Human Security Report 2005. Canada has emphasized the 'freedom from fear' aspect of human security. It relates to the notion of responsibility to protect individuals as opposed to state security. This interpretation focuses primarily on securing individuals from political violence. This approach is linked to the concept of structural violence which is able to reduce the life span of people who are socially oppressed, economically exploited, marginalized, and politically oppressed. Consequently, the Canadian approach highlights complementarity between human security and national security.

### **The Japanese Approach**

Japan's human security approach emerged as a result of a need to reflect a 'culture of anti-militarism' as a result of the devastation following World War II (Atanassova-Cornelis 2005). Japan's approach offers a broader view that places more emphasis on development. This approach emphasizes the 'freedom from want' aspect. Japan is considered to be a major contributor to the concept of human security and the implementation of this concept through its financial support to the United Nations Thrust

Fund for Human Security, the establishment of the Commission on Human security and revision of its Official Development Assistance charter to meet human security guidelines (Clausen 2009).

### **Security in the Caribbean Region**

The Caribbean is traditionally known as the area made up of the heterogeneous group of the smallest states in the Americas that share a variety of climatic and cultural features, and whose coasts are in the Caribbean Sea. It has been asserted that the conception of the Caribbean as a single region is an externally imposed idea (Lowenthal 1987). On the contrary, the Caribbean territories are not only geographically insular but also socially and culturally diverse; given the differing cultural and colonial backgrounds. The United States' geo-strategic vision of the region has continually referred to the region as the Caribbean Basin in order to include the Central American State of Panama given its strategic value (Torrijos 2008). However, "Analysts differ as to how to define the Caribbean Basin or even whether the concept makes any sense at all" (Lowenthal 1987, 137). The US has historically displayed a special security interest in the region arising primarily from their proximity and presumed vulnerability to external penetration.

The definition of what constitutes the Caribbean is dependent on context and perspective (Girvan 2001). Anglophones in the region tend to view the Caribbean as the members of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). Consequently the term "wider Caribbean" is employed to include the others. Similarly, Hispanic literature speak of the Caribbean in the context of Spanish speaking states or the Antilles (Las Antillas) to refer to the entire chain of islands. Among scholars, the

Caribbean refers to a cultural zone which is characterized by the legacy of slavery and the plantation system. The definition of Caribbean is undergoing change, a point that is further corroborated by other scholars; hence the assertion which affirms that "there are many Caribbeans" (Girvan 2001). This multiplicity is evident in the many groupings that take place in the Caribbean region, such as CARICOM, CARIFORUM which includes the Dominican Republic and Haiti, The Association of Caribbean States (ACS) which embraces the entire Caribbean region. Furthermore, it is important to recognize the Caribbean's diversity in which there is no unifying culture. Consequently, the Caribbean can be defined by historical, geographical, geo-political, geo-economic, and organizational principles.

Security has been the dominant motive for US-Caribbean relations. This motivation can be attributed to a desire to maintain the region from being exploited by other hostile states and individuals. US interests in the region have increased with the advent of new issues such as the creation of new relationships between the Caribbean states and adversaries, as evidenced by the relationship between Cuba and Nicaragua with the Soviet Union. A more contemporary example of such an alliance is the Venezuela – Iran relations which is said to be a high security risk and Venezuela – China which poses an economic and hegemonic threat to the US. Consequently, US attention towards the region has ebbed and flowed while the US interests in the region increase with the perception of new security threats, it diminishes just as quickly as threats dissipate.

There has been an ongoing process of regional integration in the Caribbean, partly as a response to perceived security threats. This type of thinking was evident in CARICOM's

involvement in Guyana's explosive racial conflict following the December 15 1997 general elections, which attests to the potential and commitment towards the creation of a security framework. Consequently, it demonstrates the benefit of adopting a collective approach to security. Furthermore, it also speaks to the type of insecurity that emerges as a result of non-military threats.

In the Caribbean, as around the world, security concerns regarding state-based military conflict have been replaced by less institutionalized transnational threats. . . . These dangers constitute a new security agenda for the region, and require the revision of traditional concepts of national and regional security with a view to new ones that include, but are no longer centered around traditional state-based threats. (Griffith 2004, 4-5).

Security has become even more complex in the age of globalization. While it continues to include traditional issues, it must now be extended to encompass several non-traditional security threats. Small states face a myriad of limitations when dealing with critical security challenges. Small states are considered to be vulnerable as a result of the geographic, political and economic factors, reliance on foreign trade, limited export diversification and its susceptibility to natural disasters. The Caribbean's security agenda is shaped by issues such as the illegal drug trade, gun smuggling, and illegal immigration (Lewis 2000, 177). The struggle against the trafficking of narcotics has become the most important issue in US-Caribbean relations. Long term effectiveness can only be achieved via implementing aggressive measures against drug cartels and trafficking channels in the Caribbean, coupled with increased resources for education, social

programs and with policies that promote job creation and development and which provide wages that are geared towards creating and maintaining a decent standard of living and thus human security (Tulchin 2000).

### **Debates on Human Security**

Security, which was once synonymous with the defence of territory from external attack, has come to embrace the protection of the community and the individual from internal violence. When the concept of human security was presented in the UNDP report in 1994, it highlighted that the concept had two components or two freedoms; freedom from fear and freedom from want. It recognized that a feeling of insecurity emerged as a result of issues in daily life rather than from catastrophic world events as in earlier times. While it is recognized that both components are equally important, it is also recognized that one component may gain more prominence than the other dependent on the type of threat or insecurity. Consequently, it is this lack of exclusivity that has created a great divide within the Human security paradigm thus giving rise to a Narrow school and a Broad school of thought.

Advocates of the human security concept emphasize that the concept of human security has been interpreted too narrowly for too long and affirm that current approaches to security have been unsuccessful and, at times, have even been responsible for exacerbating the insecurity that is experienced by the world's peoples. The proponents of this school, stress on the nexus that exists between security and development, which involves more than achieving a decent standard of living; it also involves the ability to feel safe and protected and be able to positively influence the political decision making process. Consequently, they affirm that security should

go beyond territorial security to confront extreme vulnerabilities that result not only from external threats but also from manmade and natural disasters (Kerr 2007).

However, the argument of extreme inclusivity and broadness then leads to another debate; that of vagueness. Many argue that the concept of human security is overly ambiguous, which is attributed to the fact that there is no established definition (Alkire 2003). Consequently, scholars argue that while the concept is useful in highlighting the variety of human needs that must be addressed, it does not offer a practical alternative to traditional conceptions of security as a result of its expansiveness, which makes it ineffective for policy goals (Sachs 2003). It is argued that the concept of human security detracts from its utility as an analytical tool owing to its all inclusive definition of security which runs the risk of becoming too elastic a concept. While policy must address many issues, security is only one of these issues. Thus, advocates of the traditional perspective of security view the effort of redefining the objectives of security to be misguided. It is agreed that traditional security must be revised but only to the extent that greater and more efficient security is achieved, not by generalizing the concept to the extent that it loses its focus.

The advocates of the traditional security paradigm affirm that the narrow definition of security does not mean that all other goals are subordinate to it; rather, it is believed that it allows for the accomplishment of goals without asserting that they can all be met simultaneously. In addition to threats of direct violence, the spread of pandemics such as HIV/Aids, the occurrence of natural disasters such as earthquakes, floods, political instability, transnational crime, and drug trade all pose

different types of threats and, as such, require different strategies that can ultimately lead to the development of problem solving abilities and early warning systems. It becomes apparent that as modern risks emerge and become more diversified, a collective approach and treatment is needed to go beyond the boundaries of the nation-state. No one government is able to deal with the crisis that new risks present today.

Security threats have changed over time. The majority of deaths in the world occur as a result of deliberate acts of violence as a result of crime, drugs or the indirect effects of war; as a result of a lack of access to health care, the spread of diseases, hunger, displacement which occurs as a result of war and natural disasters and all of which result in victims of physical and material insecurity. Consequently, security goes beyond the absence of physical violence, and instead focuses on confronting extreme vulnerabilities, not only as a result of war as advanced by the realist perspective, but also the vulnerabilities that result from manmade and natural disasters. This is why development is at the heart of human security, because it possesses the resources that are needed to enable human security.

The development goals of a region and a nation are dependent on the capacity to develop the human capital, the institutional capacity to provide the critical services that are necessary to achieve this goal. Human development is linked to poverty reduction and eradication to the extent that it seeks to increase the number of choices and opportunities that are available to the individual. Human development is focused on progress and augmentation and, as a result, it is unable to address issues relating to the security of those who are undergoing the process of development. Human security protects the individual from threats that can hinder the

achievement of development and empowers the individual to overcome threats and embark on the journey of development. This is particularly important given that the most underdeveloped segments of society are often the most affected by insecurity.

Another debate states that human security is an attempt to securitize development, given that the issues that are highlighted belong to the development realm. This belief is shared by the proponents of the Copenhagen School, in which it is stated that an issue only becomes securitised when it is articulated as a security threat. This school of thought places primary importance on determining how an issue becomes a security issue. According to the proponents of this School of thought, issues became securitized as a result of the way in which the elite articulate issues and consequently convince its audience that there is a threat. Political leaders form part of such an elite, in which their speech acts give rise to categorizing an issue as a security threat (Emmers 2007). This thinking can be taken further, as the most powerful states are the elites among smaller and weaker states. These powerful states are able to articulate issues as threats to security in a far more convincing way than weaker states can. Consequently, the United States can be more successful in articulating terrorism as a global threat than a weak state articulating global poverty as one; in spite of the fact that poverty is responsible for more deaths over any period (MUTIMER 2007).

The lack of success of previous attempts to redefine security allows for the manipulation of the discourse of new threats "New threats are mobilized to realize old agendas" (Honna 2007, 111). This highlights the fact that a government may be able to obscure its true agenda by using the human security vernacular.

It can be argued that the introduction of the idea of non-military threats can allow the military to re-expand its role in the polity by blurring the lines between what constitutes a domestic threat and what constitutes an external threat. Consequently, it may become a case of seizing new security discourse under the pretext of regionalism. This in turn can give rise to other issues such as abuse of securitization or over-securitization. This scenario is exacerbated by the fact that there is no consensus on a definition of human security. However, a number of countries have demonstrated that it is possible to not only conceptualize the concept to represent the peculiarities of the state in question, but they have also demonstrated that successful implementation is possible.

### **Regional Security Initiatives**

This study argues that the impetus to re-conceptualize security in the Caribbean region has not been as obvious and decisive as it has been in other regions of the international global system. The Caribbean security approach remains delimited by the traditional security paradigm and has not made the same transition in security thinking. Consequently, it seeks to answer questions such as: Does the Caribbean possess the necessary conditions to adopt a human security approach to regional security? Could the Caribbean experience successful security re-orientation? Can human security emerge as a new regionalism in the Caribbean region? In an attempt to provide an answer to these questions, the role, function and impact of security initiatives in the Caribbean region were examined in an attempt to ascertain to what extent they represent a shift in security thinking, more specifically, how they address the traditional and citizen security issues and to understand this in the context of human security and new regionalism.

A series of security initiatives have been undertaken in the Caribbean Basin in an attempt to address these various security challenges. The 1970s decade proved to be a turbulent period for the Caribbean region, this period saw the emergence of the 1979 Grenada Revolution. This event proved to be a decisive factor in the move towards the unified response to security in the region; particularly in the Eastern Caribbean States, which led to the formation of the Eastern Caribbean States Regional Security System (RSS) in 1982. However, the beginning of the 1990's has seen a change in focus on the containment of socialism to countering the trafficking of illegal drugs (Lewis 2000, 177).

The Regional Security System is a hybrid organization which is comprised of military and police personnel under the command of their respective chiefs (RSS 2012). This initiative is regarded as the most important, collective and productive security arrangement. The RSS Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed in October 1982 as a response to the 1979 *coup d'état* by the People's Revolutionary Government (PRG) in Grenada, the temporary seizure of Union island in that same year and the 1981 *coup d'état* in Dominica as a result of instigation by the US, the United Kingdom (UK) and Canada, which consequently heightened focus on security issues. The membership was comprised of four states of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) and Barbados, which were later joined by St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Dominica, Antigua and Barbuda and St. Lucia. The MOU was updated in 1992 and acquired juridical status in March 1996 under the St. Georges treaty in Grenada. The principal function of the RSS is to ensure stability, achieve social and economic development, maintain the principles of democracy, liberty of the individual, and the rule of law. These objectives are to be achieved

through mutual cooperation which would prevent and criminalize the trafficking of illegal drugs, promote cooperation in issues of national emergencies (CARICOM Regional Task Force on Crime and Security 2004).

The Caribbean Basin Security Initiative (CBSI) is the most recent security initiative in the Caribbean basin, instituted under President Barack Obama's administration. The initiative was presented by the Barack Obama administration in 2009 at the Fifth Summit of the Americas, held in Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago. The initiative has three key objectives which are to substantially reduce drug trafficking and other transborder threats, increase public safety and security and promote social justice. Consequently, the initiative aims at enhancing citizen safety, by complimenting other security initiatives between the US and other partners in the Caribbean region. US reengagement of the Caribbean is predicated on mitigating the violence, arms trafficking and crime which have become prevalent in the region. The initiative seeks to build law enforcement capacity through regional data sharing, police professionalization, and border security. Furthermore it seeks to expand educational, social, and workforce development opportunities for young people and their communities as an alternative to crime and other illegal activities (US Department of State 2011).

The issues that have been debated in this study highlight that Security is a subjective approach to determining what constitutes a security threat. The Concept of human security underscores that issues that directly affect the quality of life of the individual have serious national, regional and international effects. It sees security as revolving around the individual, and addresses these issues in broad categories, which is an important development, given the range of

issues that threaten security today. More importantly, it is an approach that is compatible with cooperation; it is conducive to regional integration and regionalism as it includes a number of non-state actors all of which are pivotal in providing effective security. It is a bottom up approach that is very much welcomed, given the increasing role of civil society. All of which deems the Caribbean a suitable candidate for the adoption of human security as a security approach.

While a consensus may not exist in defining what human security is, the objectives and the outcomes that have been obtained thus far are laudable. The argument that human security is an ambiguous and difficult concept to implement is moot. In reality what is viewed by some scholars as a lack of consensus can be interpreted as the option to conceptualise security in the manner that is most characteristic of the particular state. It provides a state with the opportunity to develop its own interpretation of what should constitute a security risk, and who should be protected and in what way. Consequently, human security provides the opportunity to augment already established security and development policies. The consensus that is required is whether the individual security supersedes that of the state. Consequently, the concept allows each state to detect and treat its own issues, without the need for a blanket concept that is not representative of its needs.

The adaptation and implementation of human security in the Caribbean region will entail the reallocation of resources away from the traditional institutions and the creation of institutes geared towards the human development and security of the individual. The concept is intended to complement traditional security approaches and, as a result, it encourages countries whether

developed or developing, to revisit their existing security policies. The principal objectives of such policies should be to positively impact human livelihood and dignity. Consequently, the role of the state is not meant to be relegated; rather it will be transformed to become more human and development oriented, this is what a collective security paradigm is supposed to offer.

In the context of the Caribbean region, crime is the manifestation and the convergence of both freedom from fear and freedom from want since poverty and crime have become the sources of want and fear in the region. Similarly, where the human security definition of freedom from want may be sufficient to deal with security threats in part of the world, another part of the world can adapt the concept to treat with freedom from fear. Consequently, it is a strategic concept which promotes political, economic, social and cultural development and which can be realized in the context of specific states and their realities.

The regional security initiatives undertaken in the Caribbean region reflect the dichotomy of approaches. They however, continue to advocate the same state-centric approach to security. Inherently, the RSS and the CBSI security initiatives are geared towards human security. However, the security of the state continues to take precedence, in spite of the fact that the majority of threats that result today are a direct result of human interaction, and not a result of interstate conflict. Consequently, this speaks to the question of whether the Caribbean can experience successful security re-orientation. This argument does not imply that there is no place for traditional, realist security; on the contrary, realism continues to have its place in security discussions. The criticism is directed at the slow rate with which the regional security initiatives transition towards becoming more

representative of the type of threats that are dominant in the region and the global system.

The call for a new security consensus may appear ill timed following the events of 9/11 and this may render the move to introduce non-military threats under the security framework somewhat moot. However, the State of Emergency which was implemented in Trinidad and Tobago, on August 22nd 2011, demonstrates the type of insecurity that emerges from manmade security threats; given the alarming crime rate the state is currently experiencing. While the state attempts to mitigate the degree of criminal activity, it inadvertently awakens fear among the citizenry as the government security forces become ever more powerful and perhaps less accountable. Consequently, it speaks to the type of insecurity which occurs as a result of traditional security

approaches. Thus, hard power alone will not win the minds and the confidence of people and it is incumbent on the state to recognize the saliency of the objectives of human security (Morgan 2006).

Finding a security paradigm that is representative of all the insecurities and threats may never occur. Consequently, waiting on a consensus is also fruitless. However, if security could be conceptualised as a subjective condition, in which no two regions, states, nor individuals are faced with the same insecurity, then that in itself would be the beginning of a security framework that is realistic and representative of the realities of the region, which can then see the emergence of human security as a comprehensive and collective regional approach to security in the Caribbean region.

## References

- Akiyama, Nobumasa. 2004. *Human Security at the Crossroad: Human Security in the Japanese Foreign Policy Context*. IPSHU English Research Report Series 19. Conflict and Human Security: A Search for new Approaches of peace-building.
- Alkire, Sabine. 2003. "A conceptual Framework for Human Security." Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity, CRISE. University of Oxford.
- Amouyel, Alexandra. 2006. "What is Human Security?" *Revue de Sécurité Humaine/Human Security Journal*. Issue 1.
- Atanassova-Cornelis, Elena. 2005. "Japan and the 'Human Security' Debate: History, Norms and Pro-active Foreign Policy." *Graduate Journal of Asia-Pacific Studies* 3:2, 58-74.
- Ayoob, Mohammed. 1995. *The third Security Predicament*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- CARICOM. 2004. Regional Task Force on Crime and Security: Regional Security Institutions. Georgetown: CARICOM.
- Clausen, Daniel. 2009. "Japan and Human Security: A powerful Discourse or a coping Mechanism?" *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies* (accessed 26 April 2011).
- Commission on Human Security. 2003. *Human Security Now*. New York.
- Emmers, Ralf. 2007. "Securitization." In *Contemporary Security Studies*, edited by Alan Collins, 109-125. Oxford University Press.
- Fierke, K.M. 2007. *Critical Approaches to International Security*. Polity Press.
- Girvan, Norman. 2001. "Reinterpreting the Caribbean." In *New Caribbean thought*, edited by Brian Meeks and Folke Lindahl. Kingston: University of the West Indies Press.
- Girvan, Norman. 2003. "Crime and Human Security in the Caribbean." *The Guyana Chronicle*, 6 February.
- Griffith, Ivelaw L. 1995. "Caribbean Security: Retrospect and Prospect." *Latin American Research Review* 30 (2).
- Griffith, Ivelaw Lloyd. 1997. *Drugs and Security in the Caribbean: Security under Siege*. Pennsylvania State University Press.

- Griffith, Ivelaw Lloyd, ed. 2004. *Caribbean Security in the Age of Terror: Challenge and Charge*. Miami: Ian Randle Publishers.
- Griffith, Ivelaw. 2004. "Security in the Caribbean: State Sovereignty or Public Order?" In *Public Security in the Americas: New Challenges in the South-North Dialogue*, edited by John Bailey and Roy Godson. Washington, DC: Center for Latin American Studies, Georgetown University. Available from: <[pdba.georgetown.edu/Pubsecurity/ch3.pdf](http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Pubsecurity/ch3.pdf)>
- Griffith, Ivelaw. 2010. Barack Obama and US Reengagement in the Caribbean Basin. November 3. available from: <<https://www.york.cuny.edu/.../barack-obama...reengage...united states>>
- Hettne, Bjorn and Fredrik Soderbaum. 2012. "The New Regionalism Approach." <[asrudiancenter.wordpress.com/2009/.../the-new-regionalism.approach/](http://asrudiancenter.wordpress.com/2009/.../the-new-regionalism.approach/)> (Accessed April 5 2012)
- Honna, Jun. 2007. "Transnational Crime and Human Insecurity in South East Asia" In *Protecting Human Security in a Post 9/11 World: Critical and Global Insights*, edited by Giorgio Shani, Makoto Sato and Mustapha Kamal Pasha, 97-114. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Human Development Report. 1994. *New Dimensions of Human Security*. Oxford University Press. Available from: <[hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr\\_1994\\_en\\_chapt2.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_1994_en_chapt2.pdf)>
- Kaldor, Mary. 2007. *Human Security: Reflections on Globalization and Intervention*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kerr, Pauline. 2007. "Human Security." In *Contemporary Security Studies*, edited by Alan Collins, 91-108. Oxford University Press.
- Konrad, Coninna. 2006. "The Japanese Approach: Tracks of Human Security Implementation." *Human Security Perspectives* 1(3).
- Lewis, Rudyard. 2000. "Initiatives for Cooperative Regional Security: The Eastern Caribbean Regional Security System." In *Security in the Caribbean Basin: The Challenge of Regional Cooperation*, edited by Joseph S. Tulchin and Ralph H. Espach, 177-183. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Lowenthal, Abraham F. 1987. *Partners in Conflict: The United States and Latin America*. London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Morgan, Patrick M. 2006. *International Security: Problems and Solutions*. Washington: CQ Press.

- Mutimer, David. 2007. "Critical Security Studies: A Schismatic History" In *Contemporary Security Studies*, edited by Alan Collins, 53-73. Oxford University Press.
- Regional Security System. 2012. Available from: <[www.RSS.org.bb/history.htm](http://www.RSS.org.bb/history.htm)>
- Sachs, Stephen E. 2003. *The Changing Definition of Security*. Oxford: Merton College.
- Sheehan, Michael. 2005. *International Security: An Analytical Survey*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Tulchin, Joseph S. and Ralph H Espach, eds. 2000. "Looking Ahead: Regional Relations in the Post-Cold War Era." In *Security in the Caribbean Basin: The Challenge of Regional Cooperation*, edited by S. Tulchin and R. Espach, 205-210. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Torrijos, Giancarlos Soler. 2008. *In the Shadow of the United States*. Florida: Brown Walker Press.
- Woolner, Christina. 2011. "Security as a Commodity: The Global Growth of Private Security Companies." *Conventional Weapons* 32 (1).