

From State to Human Security: Paradigm Shift in Security Theorizing and Problematic of Weak State

Rafida Nawaz

Assistant Professor

Department of International Relations

Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan

Lubna Kanwal

Associate Professor

Department of Pakistan Studies

Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan.

Syed Hussain Murtaza

Research Scholar

International Relations

Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan Pakistan

Abstract:

Post-Cold War years has witnessed many shifts, breaks and rupture in theorizing about the state, security, and state responsibilities. Previously state was considered to be a totality; the home of a nation with the prime national objective of providing security from threats coming from outside international anarchy and economic development. As Cold War descended into history, so were the discursive formations associated with that particular episteme and in a new era the established concepts related to state and its responsibilities i.e. security and development are contested. On one side liberal Metanarrative is telling the tale of State as a concept of bygone years, and insisting on rolling back state roles; while the other side of stereo is lamenting on postcolonial state's weakness and failure to deliver promised social contract to their populace. Hence the State fragility is considered to be a threat for the peaceful working of neoliberal world order. The paper aims to deconstruct Cold War discursivities about security and development; cast a gaze on emergent shifts in security development literature with a shift in referent of security from state to individual; as well as the perceived role of state with paradigm shift to human security and human development, at the same time finding what caused the state failure. Though, the

general focus of the paper will be on fragile Postcolonial states marred with legitimacy, authority and service failure, the special reference of paper is Pakistan.

Key Words: Cold War, State, Security, Development, Fragile States, Pakistan

Introduction

The state is considered to be the “guardian angel” since the treaty of Westphalia in 1648. The Hobbesian model, Eurocentric, state operating in an anarchic outside resorting to self-help in face of “security dilemma” has been central to the traditional security paradigm. Anarchy prevails in the international system as no authority can be imposed above the sovereign state and no supranational organization can regulate interstate relations, so the state has to assure its security and survival against the military threats emanating from outside. (Wheeler 2008) The state referent has been considered responsible for security to individuals living in its territory giving the state a monopoly on coercive force to be used on its population as a covenant of social contract. (Manro) Bradley Klein drawing on the philosophy of state making of Realist fathers, i.e. Hobbes and Machiavelli articulated the basis on which state power must be exercised on its civil society and outside its territorial bound in form of influence on other actors of international order. The state prime function is the creation of identity for its populace and enabling environment for the commercial activities within to sustain itself over time. The other prime obligation of the state is the defense of a republic from outside threats. (Klein 2010)

Inside/Outside binary is an integral component of state sovereignty. Along with the binary of self and others, the Realist paradigm of international politics adds sub-state, inter-state and supra-state levels of analysis. Strategic and policy discourses of international politics focused on inter-state bilateral dynamics of state relation as well as the alliance politics of two superpowers ignoring the politics within the nation-state. To Realists, politics within the state may be interesting but it does not imply international relations. As all

state behaves alike externally strategic theorist must be least concerned with “who” is bearing the office, and how he has assumed power. (Walker 1997)

Inside/outside dichotomy was primary to Cold war theorizing on state security. But in the last decade of 20th century, the discourses on state fragility and weakness appeared in security literature. Post-cold war narrative tells that the stability of international order is at risk due to these states. Collier is of the view that in a group of 30 to 50 fragile states, 340 million of world extreme poor population resides. He considers state failure to provide a life signifying prosperity, happiness and good life due to failed economic development policies, responsible for the poverty of bottom billion population of the world. (Collier 2007) Sørensen applied this term to states with colonial past and featuring a combination of formal juridical sovereignty (constitutional independence) with a lack of substance in empirical statehood. (Sørensen 2000)

The worst form of weak state is one that cannot assure its basic obligatory functions for its population but uses its force and infrastructure to scare its people. Amitav Acharya believes that repression by the state is a major source of insecurity. (Acharya 2000) Fragility is a condition of being underdeveloped and insecure but sources of insecurities remain internal rather than external. Ayoob proclaim such condition as a failure of Stateness. (M. Ayoob 1995) Stewart F and Brown G identify three state failures i.e., authority; service; and legitimacy failure. These failures have to do with domestic state apparatus. (Brown 2010)

The emergence of weak, fragile, failing, crisis state phenomena in policy discourses has direct repercussion that established inside/outside dichotomy is not existent anymore and narrow realistic vision of security depending on power and diplomacy is not so realistic. (Booth, Security And Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realist 1997) Moreover different fragility indexes reveal that States with higher scores have strong traditional security apparatus and military pileups as well as the previous allies of Cold War superpowers. Simon Dalby believes that present-day

security paradox is not a mere contest for global supremacy signified as superpower rivalry. The security agenda of the state now includes concerns like drug threats, human right violation, economic instability and environmental hazards. (Dalby 1997)

Thus human insecurities are wide in a range comprised of a multitude of different threats beyond military or traditional risks from a state other (other states). Established security paradigm cannot serve as priori due to its incapacity to explain threats to security that are transnational (environmental degradation, upheavals in global political economy and natural calamities) as well as sub-national (human rights violation, marginalization of minority groups and state failure to secure development and provide welfare services i.e. health and education) in character. So a shift in security theorizing is need of the knowledge regime of Post-Cold war years.

Due to change in reality and narrative after cold war a new paradigm of human security is about to replace the traditional focus to *raison d'être* of security of people from *raison d'état* that was the focus of realist paradigm in cold war years. The study is an attempt to trace the genealogy of Human Security-Development paradigm and its significance for weak states and 'bottom billion' PEOPLE living in these states. (Collier 2007)

The study is divided in three interlinked and connected parts.

1. Deconstructing the problematic of Security Development Paradigm of Cold War years.
2. Emergent shifts in Security Development Discourses
3. Crisis of Fragility, State Failure and its Implications for World Peace

Deconstructing the Problematic of Security Development Paradigm of Cold War Years

Postmodernists believe that Realist security narrative is part of Metanarrative of the modern Western understanding and self-interest and the Cold War is a triumph of Western capitalist values. (Chenoy 2007) Realists persuade security as policy science; meant to create order in an anarchic world of the state facing security dilemma. The objective is to protect and promote the norms of stability, order, and preserving the

hierarchical power structure of the world. Both variants of realism (defensive and offensive) are agreed that monopoly on organized violence internally, provides state not only security and survival but also deterrence and influence in the outside domain. (Klein 2010)

The other prime focus of the cold war state making theorizing was on development. Development studies were the child of the post-second world war period when development narrative gained its present status in Meta-narrative of Cold war. The birth timing is about the same as Security Studies replaced strategic studies and departments of Wars were replaced by the departments of Defense in the liberal world. In post-world war II episteme between paradigms of security and development were necessarily constructed to sustain the global order. When western colonization ended the twin paradigms served as instruments of control for post-colonial world. (Escobar 1995)

The post-colonial state concerns about the security and development as the crucial element that sustained hegemonic world order and economic inequality between core and peripheral states. For purpose 'self-help' clause of the Realist security doctrine was replaced by the strategies leading to the alliance system of the Cold War. Foster Dulles advocated the doctrine of collective security for free nations in Post WWII environment. In his view the security of sovereign nations can be achieved only through collective defense system; as no nation has enough resources to develop its defense and resort on self-help mechanism. If a state tries to do so it will essentially become a garrison state. In this manner, no state would be able to secure itself. Security of the free world rests on development of collective security apparatus and power of a community of states rather than a pure national concern. Hence each nation must share in security, dispensation and contribute according to its capabilities. (Dulles 1977)

The doctrine of security in all its variants was instrumental in the construction of hegemony that operated not only on the interstate level but vertically penetrated, binding the west with its aspiring allies in the south. Security theorizing created images of threat in the cognition of elite and masses, and

security dilemma penetrated in practices of state-making elite recruitment, development/modernization discourses. Discursive formations of Security Development discourse were a prism providing reflective interpretations of what is meant by a state to “weak intruder majority of post-colonial states” entering in the state-system in the second half of 20th century. (M. Ayoob 1997)

Because of recent critical security and Development studies, the discourses of security and development were part of “Orientalizing” the dynamics of postcolonial Societies. In an anarchic Hobbesian World where states have to rely on self-help mechanism Development and modernization were in fact strategies to protect the alliance system of the cold war. The terms were coined by the spokespersons of the west to characterize the efforts of ‘others’ left behind in the race of progress, to follow and catch up the developed nations with the aid of more advanced technological states. Escobar drawing on Rahnema studies narrates the Political and economic atmosphere of the 1960s in the third world when researchers in a state like Iran were searching for a local Persian term to record the essence of development, that was a synonym of prosperity, good life and beneficial flow of life. Development was an umbrella term encompassing everything that gave meaning to dreams and well-being of a happy community. On the other hand in western society, narrative of development created an image of the *Other, out there* as overpopulated, facing the menace of famine, illiteracy and poverty, in need of help from the prosperous modern developed states. In Postcolonial world free from colonizer, poverty in words of Escobar was “a new mechanism of control”. Escobar believes there is a direct relationship between military concerns and birth of “Development” discourse, North-South phenomena and Cold-War’s east-west binary. So Pacts of military assistance, doctrines of national security were intrinsic to development strategy. Third World sustained the “War Economies” of 1st and 2nd World with the development aid. (Escobar 1995)

According to Dalby political division of space in the colonial world shaped the security doctrine during the cold war. (Dalby

1997) With bones of contention left all over the post-colonial world by the colonial masters as unfinished business of independence a life free from want became a vague dream and military expenses for sake of national security a hard reality for new entrant of the state system. So the new entrants of state system the post-colonial states were treated by the established actors as new markets and safe battle fields. (Escobar 1995)

The process of exclusion and inclusion is central to discourse and development discourse legitimized and privileged certain processes at the cost of others. The policy promoted cash-crops at the cost of food-crops; centralized planning in place of participatory approaches; machined farming sacrificing ecological considerations; economic growth excluding the internal markets and majority of people. Hence development was not meant for PEOPLE. It remained an up-bottom technocratic approach treating people as numbers on progress charts. Peter Uvin describe the condition using the case study of Rwanda that before the 1994 genocide, it was a model developing country doing well on development charts but it fell apart in the spasm of violence and destruction. The resultant impact of ignoring local dynamics of power and exclusion by development enterprise was genocide. (Krause 1997)

Walker believes that Hobbes's 'Leviathan' explicitly recognized the fact that state can become a likely source of insecurity; however, it is the only s, solution to creating order in anarchy and secure life of an individual. (Walker 1997) Development-Security Discourse of cold war era legitimized the hegemony of the dominant ethnic group in these states. Myron Weiner concluded postcolonial condition as ethnic politics remains hegemonic in new states. A single ethnic group monopolizes state and uses its cohesive apparatus to exercise control on other ethnic groups. Hence there has been less nation-building and state-making practices render many ethnic groups divide of any share in political power. (Weiner 1978)

As post-colonial states were multi-ethnic the state elite denied the reality and tried to construct the states as mono-ethnic states. A single ethno-linguistic or ethno-religious group

dominated the power and policy, distributing resources unevenly between regions and groups. Hence multi-ethnic post-colonial states, uneven development and inequality in political and economic power became the norm. The problem of Postcolonial states become more acute when western discourses equate emancipation and right of self-determination of every ethnic group with security. According to Minorities at Risk project "Seventy-three of the 98 largest Third World countries have one or more significant minorities at risk; . . . in 14, more than half the population is at risk." Furthermore, Gurr estimated that 'more than 60 per cent (108 of 179) of the Third World minorities took some kind of violent political action against authorities between 1945 and 1989. Forty-five of them supported serious insurgencies. (Gurr 1993)

Another dilemma of post-colonial states is the lack of capabilities to ensure habitual allegiance and identification of inhabitants with state structures and colonially crafted boundaries while the creation of identity is the basic function as described by the authors of state discourse i.e. Machiavelli and Hobbes. Hence the identity crises are the major threat to third world security. (M. Ayooob 1997)

An internet search on countries suffering from armed conflict reveals that countries like Afghanistan, Syria, Yemen, Somalia, Nigeria, South Sudan, Ukraine, and Libya are suffering from violence, anarchy, and the Civil War. Conflict in Afghanistan, Iraq and Somalia is two-decades old. While some conflicts like Israel-Palestine and India Pakistan is not only a bilateral state conflict but affecting the internal stability of states as well. Conflict in Syria and Myanmar generated a grave humanitarian problem due to mass evacuation of a particular ethnic/religious group fearing or suffering genocide/ethnocide. A solution of these conflicts in the near future is a far possibility. Ayooob (M. Ayooob 1997) calls these states "Subaltern" states because of their weakness and inferiority of ranks in the global hierarchy. Ayooob believes that major security preoccupation of these states is internal rather than external in spirit. These states can be termed 'unwilling', 'incapable', 'weak', and in the worst case failed states due to their inability and incapacity to protect

rights and ensure a life free from fear and want to be promised in a social contract with PEOPLE. (Klein 2010)

Drawing from Hobbes indicates that real threat to international peace emanates less from interstate use of arms and violence than from the loss of state to internal chaos and anarchy. State centric approaches to development and security ignored the multi-faceted realities of post-colonial world. Economic and social disparities among major ethnic groups and regions become a catastrophe for prototype postcolonial state enjoying only limited legitimacy for state boundaries, state institutions, and governing elites. These states are prone to internal chaos and structural violence.

Ethical, Methodological Rupture in Development Security Discourses

Shift in security and development discourse emerged in Post-Cold War years with the demise of bipolar order. The agenda of security were broadened including a range of new concerns, fears and threats; in post-colonial states of global south. The global security problematic now included more than inter-state and super power rivalry. The themes of economic environmental and personal human security are included in reformulation of security paradigm. Human Security advocates tend to be dismissive of “the old geopolitics” and its tendency to built fault lines around individual nation states; armed conflicts between states; power balancing and anarchy.

Locating World’s fault lines is less important than identifying the sources of State failure and alleviates them. Security dilemma with contending national interests are still with us but cannot be denied that various states constitute the most serious threat to their subjects through the neglect or outright violation of their safety and welfare. While the traditional conception of security may be a necessary condition, they cannot be sufficient one for human survival. An over-emphasis on statist security can be detrimental to human security needs. Greatest threats to security come from disease, hunger, environmental contamination, unorganized crime as well as structural violence. The state survival is not the soul national interest and

the only source of power is not gun. Hence, the possible meanings of security have social-cultural and ecological as well as the geopolitical threats of outside states. The problem solving of security dilemma doesn't lie only in armament but economic and human development. (Anuradha M. Chenoy 2007)

According to the human security approach, the declaration of united nation chartered in 1948 that linked war with development failure and human rights abuses was the first attempt to add in notion of security. In 1960 the universal declaration of human rights included 'security of person' and 'social security'. In the 1970s, the Food and Agricultural Organization coined the concept of 'food security' merging the notion of development and security. In 1980, the Brandt Commission explicitly connected insecurity in the world with global inequality and underdevelopment. However, during 1945 and 1989, development and security discourses were compartmentalized, both conceptually and in practice.

National security was framed within East-West debate, while North-South was a 'development' problem. After 1989 security focus shifted to internal dynamics, civil wars and ethnic strives. The major threat to the security of the West comes from underdeveloped South. So there is a need to rephrase narratives of security and development. Hence security/development paradigm re-conceptualized North/South 'development' and East/West 'security' with core peripheral model based on the idea of mutual vulnerability. (Buzan 1983)

Orthodox models saw backwardness resulting from the legacy of traditional society. The panacea of ills of tradition is the adoption of western modernity. On the other hand dependency school sees backwardness as a result of western domination over the Southern periphery. Both presume development as an irrevocable continuum of history. Developed regions were secure and while the source of insecurity is 'other'. Core countries of the North came to be increasingly vulnerable to events in insecure underdeveloped regions of the South.

The 1990s a human-centered approach to development was thus a natural extension of failed efforts of the past – a merger between a philosopher Amartya Sen and a practitioner Mahbub-Ul-Haq. It parted its ways from old development thinking based on the economic growth of urban centers. Haq deviated that economic growth will not automatically trickle down to the bottom. Haq is of the view that true wealth of a country is its PEOPLE while Sen brings ethics in economics by shifting its prima foci from the study of national accounts to a search for freedom. Both bring PEOPLE to a central point of reference and bringing a humane change in lives of people as a core development objective. Sen, visions the social commitments to individual freedoms and dignity enhancing people's entitlements and capabilities' as real development. Thus Sen-Haq approach advocates development models that believe in growth with equity.

'Human Development' revisits the purpose of development as well as the routes through which development can be attained by emphasizing on individual playing the pivotal role as both subject and object of development. The human development approach is an ethical, theoretical and methodological break from prior beliefs on development.

- Ethically it placed people's well-being as the ultimate end and proposes that development is not meant for increasing capital but for increasing people's choice and to give them freedom.
- Theoretically it reconsiders the questions about different levels of growth and why development failed.
- Methodologically it proposes new ways to development by proposing people's role as agents of change. For Sen "Development is increasing of human freedom using human freedom". (Anuradha M. Chenoy 2007)

Means for development is individual freedom obtained through adoption of Haq-Sen people centered development security approach. Human security narrative is resting on three beliefs

- Freedom from fear: safety of people.
- Freedom from want: equity and distributive justice
- Liberty: rights and rule of law.

Thus human security approach is a prerequisite to the new normative development paradigm aiming to increase People's choices and freedom. Its end is a life of dignity free from both fear and want. The Security discourse in the Post-Cold War era has also undergone a shift as referent of security has been changed from state to individual and in turn, global security depends on its weakest link i.e. an individual. Ken Booth argues that privileging state is synonym to confuse a means with an end he believes that provision of security to citizens is an end for which state was created. Hence, the referent of security must be changed from state to individual. (Booth, *Realism redux: Context, concepts, contests* 2011)

Human security approach deals not only with territorial survival of state but also addresses the roots of deprivation and economic inequality. This approach to security is signified as *human* due to its focus on individual people rights, dignity, equality, equity and solidarity. It also considers other communal organizations like a clan, tribe etc. as referent along with the state. New normative framework of world politics advocated by the 'human security' approach proposes three main shifts in traditional security theorizing. The first shift assigns moral priority to the security of individual human beings by out setting the Cold War assumption that sovereign states are paramount moral political community worth protecting. The human approach to security laid bare the moral dilemma between the rights of states and the rights of human beings. Human sufferings cannot be ignored for the sake of state sovereignty. The second shifts link the individual with global security by proposing an interdependence of all actors and levels. The third shift from national to universal values is a vision for a world in which rights, dignity, rule of law and good governance are respected and human beings live a life 'free from want' and 'free from fear'.

The security development indicates the problem areas where the state must work to address the problems of people. The state failure, weakness and fragility do not indicate that a state is failed to protect its territorial boundaries but failed to provide human development to its population.

Crisis of Fragility, State Failure and its Implications for World Peace

Today's failed states are incapable of creating an identity bond with state structure, as well as ensuring legitimacy by providing PEOPLE means to be secure and developed. These states can be termed as territories governmentally empty in terms of service. To worsen the condition state authority is used for the disadvantage of already alienated masses. Fragility and incapacity turn into a failure when humanly insecure underdeveloped non-privileged marginalized groups take solace in a human organization (Tribe, Clan, Ethnicity, and Religion) other than the state. The consequences of this governmental vacuum are a threat to world peace, order and security that count on state capability to provide order within its territorial boundaries. The failed states with armed conflicts are considered to be the grounds of instability, mass murder, massive migration and most of all the nurseries and exporter of terrorist tendencies.

But how the state fails in creating order and fell victim to anarchy and civil war? In theorizing about the state making the state is considered to be an ordered whole, home of a nation with the rule of law providing a good life to its citizens. The question remains that why citizen body within state contests the social contract. The answers lie in the fact that a sizable segment of the population feels deprived and excluded. Stewart. F. and Brown G (2010) believe that road to state failure passes through three major milestones to state road to failure, i.e. Authority, Service and legitimacy.

Authority Failure:

Subversion of democratic norms is at the root of authority failure. When rule become personal and autonomy of institutions like legislature and judiciary is subverted, civil society has to face restrictions on basic freedoms state authority failure begins. But the worst form of authority failure is when democratic institutions become subordinate to non-elected pressure groups especially the defense forces. Kinship, ethnic and personal bonds replace merit and influence every aspect of

governance. Economic rewards remain limited to a restricted class inequality become more acute leading to disasters like famine. The common man has to bear the cost of corruption and nepotism Freedom from fear a basic security condition vanishes making room for want and basic human needs.

Service Failure:

In failed states living standard of common populace declines rapidly as financial rewards are limited through a small group of elites. Foreign exchange reserve decline leads to food and fuel scarcity and cut down in governmental subsidies on essential services like health and education make the life miserable. Corruption in ruling strata systematically squeezes the income of ordinary people. The middle class that was previously habitual to a convenient lifestyle feels excluded due to greed of elits in power.

Legitimacy Failure:

The last stage of state failure is legitimacy question. Ineffective governmental means, to redress the grievance of ordinary people leads to massive protests. Identification with state eliminates and protesters are mobilized on ethnic, religious and lingual lines. To further their interest the protesters resort to anomic means and start to arm them. The references to history are manufactured and employed to promote the agenda of secession. The violent conflicts and civil wars revolving around the claims of self-determination and national liberation cause the legitimacy failure of the state. But the third stage is built on the first two stages when the state develops unevenly, and regional and ethnic disparities become so acute making room for political compromise impossible. It is the responsibility of the state to ensure that citizen is free from fear and wants but internal structural flaws make state fragile leading to breach in the social contract. (SØRENSEN SEPTEMBER 2001)

State Failure as Threat to Peace:

Yugoslavia was perhaps the first country in immediate post-cold war environment that was categorized as a failed state. The country was a federation of eight federal entities with clear

ethnic demarcation the country was ruled by a despotic regime of Martial Tito. With the death of the general economic crisis started leading to grave disparities between ethnic and religious groups. In the final stage of the crisis, the Serbs tried to keep the federation intact and the country fell victim to civil war. Bosnian Muslims faced genocide by the Serb army in civil war from 1990 to 1992. The conflict was resolved by the interventions of United Nations Peace Keeping Forces.

Another example of authority and service failures leading to the anti-government uprising and armed rebellion was the Arab Spring that penetrated across the Middle East in early 2010. In response to oppressive state structures and low standard of life the protest started in Tunisia and through social media the news of revolution spread caused a domino effect. The regimes in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Yemen and Syria either ousted or faced severe resistance in the form of armed uprising and civil wars. The conflict in Middle East is still ongoing. In Syria the parties of civil war are backed by major powers like Russia and Regional Powers like Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Turkey. Signifiers like Failed, Fragile, Incapable, Weak state; stand for tense, conflicted, and dangerous spaces having a spillover effect. The anarchy in these states has a spillover impact on other regional states. A half-century of conflict and civil war in Afghanistan had direct implications for Pakistan. Pakistan hosted the refugees after the 1979 crisis. In the second round of Afghan conflict, the neighboring region of Pakistan had to face the wrath of radical terrorist groups. Pakistan had to resort on a military solution in North and South Waziristan regions as well as in Swat to eradicate the menace of terrorism caused by a failing state (Afghanistan). During the period 2008 to 2012, Pakistan remained amongst first ten states on failed state index of Foreign policy magazine, only due to spillover effect of a failed, ungoverned, anarchic state of Afghanistan. The super power rivalry of cold war years made Afghanistan an anarchic space. The territory was divided between warlords fighting as proxy of super power i.e. USA and USSR. The failure to achieve consensus on power sharing between warlords, after evacuation of Soviet Union led to crises of authority and legitimacy and room was made for international terrorist

organizations like Al-Qaida that threatened the security of USA on 9/11. Pakistan had to bear the brunt of terrorist organizations challenging the US hegemony as US ally and frontline state.

Conclusion:

Statism is the primary focus of the traditional security paradigm. The state will remain the primary referent of security in the human security paradigm as well; but the level of analysis will be shifted to sub-state level revolving around the individual, ethnic groups and regions.

States with human Security-Development dilemma becomes a risk for international security when their very legitimacy is challenged by marginalized and excluded groups of people. Domestic anarchy sets in paving the way to internal schism. The adoption of anomic means to record protests and secure rights leads to terrorist tendencies, transmitting insecurity syndrome to regional and global levels. Mounting concern about weak states is evident that inside/outside dichotomy of Cold War narrative is now a blurred concept and no more existent.

The Foreign policy analysis also underwent a major break and realist assumption that state internal dynamics are an insignificant indicator to understand the behavior of state in the international arena. As a prime threat to the security of the state as well as to international order that is originated from dissatisfied marginalized groups, living in incapable states, ambitious to overthrow the structure that denied them an environment conducive of being human. Fragile, weak, incapable and failed states in the global south drew the attention of policy narratives and think tanks of global North. Indicators like group grievances, uneven development, failure to provide public services, violation of human rights, elites working for the personal interest that were previously concern of domestic, not international politics has gained currency to understand the behavior of states as well as to counter security threats caused by state failure. Performance of states is evaluated on these indicators of human (security) development. A state success is determined on the basis of its effectiveness in purveying human security to its populace. Provision of human security and development is necessary to keep state bonded, as

the crisis at state-level with sub-state dynamics have alarming repercussions for international peace and stability.

Some internal fissures and conflicts draw the attention of regional and international power players and state become a battleground for the proxy war of interest of foreign powers. Whatever may be the case state failure lead to violence, displacement and disharmony in state affairs. Furthermore, human grievances are generated by the destruction of infrastructure and the economic system. In this situation of the humanitarian crisis, the international community responds in the form of peacekeeping missions. United Nations also provides makeshift camps for the displaced refugee population and provides the basic need that is the primary responsibility of the state. In the post-conflict scenario international community try to restore political order by conducting elections. The establishment of democratic elections and restoration of constitutional order under the auspices of the United Nations in Afghanistan and Iraq is an example of (re)establishing state on sound bases. Economic development and reconstruction in post-conflict states is an attempt to provide economic opportunities to affected people. Hence, political, economic and social systems of the state are established again to overcome states fragility to avoid future conflicts.

References

1. Achary, Amitav. "Periphery as Core." In *Towards Critical Security Studies*, by Michael C. Williams & Keith Krause, 299-328. London: UCL Press, 1997.
2. Acharya, Amitav. "Ethnocentrism and Emancipatory IR Theory." *York Centre for International and Security Studies*. Zurich: York Centre for International and Security Studies, 2000. 1-18.
3. Anuradha M. Chenoy, Shaharbanou Tadjbakhsh. *Human Security Concepts and Implications*. London: Routledge, 2007.
4. Ayoob, Mohammed. "Defining Security: Sabaltem Realist Perspective." In *Towards Security Studies*, by Michael C. Williams Keith Krause, 121-148. London: UCL Press, 1997.
5. Ayoob, Muhammed. *The Third World Security Predicament: State making, regional conflict and the International system*. Boulder, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1995.
6. Booth, Ken. "Realism redux: Context, concepts, contests ." In *Reledgalism and World Politics*, by Ken Booth, 1-14. New York : Routledge, 2011.
7. Booth, Ken. "Security And Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realist." In *Towards Security Studies*, by Michael C. Williams Keith Krause, 83-120. London: UCL Press, 1997.
8. Bukovac, Methew. *Failed States: Unstable Countries in the 21st Century*. New York : Rosen Publishing Group, 2010.
9. Buzan, Barry. *People, States and Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations*. Sussex: Wheatsheaf Books Limited, 1983.
10. Collier, Paul. *The Bottom Billion*. Ne York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
11. Dalby, Simon. "Contesting an Essential Concept: Reading the Dilemmas in Contemperory Security Discourse." In *Critical Security Studies*, by Michael C. Williams Keith Krause, 3-32. London: UCL Press, 1997.
12. Dulles, John Foster. "Policy for Security and Peace ." In *American Defence Policy*, by Roy W. Stafford Jr. John E. Endicott, 68-69. Baltimore, London : John's Hopkins University Press, 1977.
13. Escobar, Arturo. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. United Kingdom: Princeton University Press, 1995.
14. Gram Brown, Frances Stewart. *Fragile States*. United Kingdom: Center for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity, 2010.
15. Gurr, Ted. *Minorities at Risk: A Global View of Ethno-political Conflicts*. New York: United States Institue of Peace, 1993.

16. Klein, Bradly S. *Strategic Studies and World Order The Global Politics of Deterrence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press , 2010.
17. Krause, Michael C. Williams & Keith. "Towards Critical Security Studies." In *Critical Security Studies*, by Michael C. Williams & Keith Krause, vii-xxiii. London: UCL Press, 1997.
18. Kraxberger, Brennan. *Failed States: Reality, Risk and Responces* . California : CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform , 2012.
19. L.Woodward, Susan. *The Ideology of Failed Staes: Why Intervention fails?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press , 2017.
20. Manro, Andre. www.britannica.com. March 06, 2013. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/state-monopoly-on-violence> (accessed October 30, 2019).
21. Sklein, Bradly. "Conclusion: Every Month is Security Awareness Month." In *Towards Critical Security Studies*, by Michael C. Williams Keith Krause, 359-368. London: UCL Press, 1997.
22. Sørensen, Georg. "Failed States III: Globalization and The Failed State." *Strategic Outreach Program of the U.S. Army War College and the Office of International Programs*. Florence : Purdue University, 2000. 20.
23. SØRENSEN, GEORG. "War and State-Making: Why Doesn't It Work in the Third World?" *Security Dialogue*, SEPTEMBER 2001: 341-354.
24. Walker, R. B. J. "The Subject of Security ." In *Critical Security Studies* , by Michael C. Williams & Keith Krause, 61-82. London: UCL Press , 1997.
25. Weiner, Myron. *Sons of the Soil: Migration and Ethnic Conflict in India* . Princeton: Princeton University press , 1978.
26. Wheeler, Ken Booth & Nicholas. *The Security Dilemma Fear Cooperation and Trust in World Politics*. London: Red Gobe Press, 2008.