Human Security Concerns of South Asia: (India and Pakistan's Perspective) & Holistic Approaches of EU towards Advancing Regional Security in South Asia

Sheikh Abbas Bin Mohd

Advocate, Jammu & Kashmir High Court, Srinagar
National Campaigner of Socio-Political Rights (All Indian Student Federation)
LLM Scholar

Jammu & Kashmir, India

Abstract

The South Asian states have been facing grave challenges to human security since long as a result of increasing extremism, religious intolerance, border conflicts and terrorism. These domestic, regional and global factors are a menace and main hindrance in the progress and prosperity of this region and are the most contributing factors behind the fragile establishment and non- stability of peace in the region. Terrorism has posed a serious threat to peace, security and stability of this region and the rest of the international community. Besides it has caused huge amount of loss in terms of human lives and economical terms as it has lowered the progress graph of the region to the lowest in its history at times. This article highlights the human security problems specific to India and Pakistan, though contextualized within broader human security challenges affecting South Asia. Today, both India and Pakistan are facing different types of internal and external threats ranging from cross border terrorism to internal militia groups. The South Asian region has strategically strong and weak features, where Pakistan and India are two major regional players, who always remain in tussle to manifest their hegemony in the region by gaining more and more military and other aggressive and other forms of power. Therefore, the issues regarding peace and security depend on the relationship between these two countries, even security in other small neighboring countries depend on this relationship. India and Pakistan lives in an environment lacking in human security. At present, former is suffering from radical approaches in the political system of the country and whole democratic setup is being continuously replaced by religious oriented ideology while Pakistan is facing crucial problems like political instability, socio-economic underdevelopment, energy crises, terrorism, drone attacks, suicide bombing impacting human security in the country. The authors suggest that India and Pakistan need to make progress in the field of economics and trade and realize that at present it is in the interest of not only the two states but also their huge populations. There is an urgent need for the EU to revise and update its South Asia strategy. The EU is not yet an important player in South Asia, but the region is of increasing importance to the EU – not only for economic reasons, but also for the security of the European continent. Indeed, not only does the EU rely heavily on the Indian Ocean to secure its position as a major actor in world trade, but

instability in regions like Afghanistan and Pakistan directly impact European security through their links to home-grown terrorism and similar threats.

Keywords: South Asia, Human Security, Political Instability, Economic Underdevelopment, Media, Regional Conflicts, Terrorism, Extremism

1. Introduction

South Asia has a distinctive role to play in world politics because of its geographical setting. South Asia holds a very important geopolitical position in relation to the rest of the world because it connects the East and the West, with the potential to bridge the Global South with the North. Thus, it forms an important locus for discussing the role of global powers' rivalry in the region as well as role of democracy and democratic institutions in bringing about and sustaining peace. This sets it apart from the other regions of the world. As for the history of present day South Asia, it begins with the Indus valley civilization dating back to 2350 B.C.[1] but on shifting our gaze from the larger global developments in the post-Cold War era to developments in our own region, South Asia. When India and Pakistan joined the club of nuclear powers, this region suddenly became the focus of global attention. The focus was, of course, on the various kinds of conflict in this region: there are pending border and water sharing disputes between the states of the region. Besides, there are conflicts arising out of insurgency, ethnic strife and resource sharing. This makes the region very turbulent. At the same time, many people in South Asia recognize the fact that this region can develop and prosper if the states of the region cooperate with each other South Asia is symbolic of the larger pattern. It is a region where rivalry and goodwill, hope and despair, mutual suspicion and trust coexist.[2] It is indeed one of the four oldest civilizations of the world.

The South Asian region comprises of eight countries: Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan and Maldives. The mighty Himalayas in the north and the vast Indian Ocean, the Arabian Sea and the Bay of Bengal in the south, west and east respectively provide a natural insularity to the region, which is largely responsible for the linguistic, social and cultural distinctiveness of the subcontinent. The boundaries of the region are not as clear in the east and the west, as they are in the north and the south. Afghanistan and Myanmar are often included in discussions of the region as a whole. China is an important player but is not considered to be a part of the region. South Asia hosts almost a quarter of the world's population. South Asia stands for diversity in every sense and yet constitutes one geo-political space.[3]

South Asian countries inherited a weak and backward economic infrastructure from their colonial masters or the indigenous authoritarian rulers. Despite achieving consistent economic growth, the region is marked by dense poverty and human deprivation. Except Sri Lanka and India, where some kind of infrastructural development had taken place during the colonial rule, the other countries lacked even the basic economic infrastructure. However the corrupt and mislead political system in Sri Lanka recently turned country into worst economic crisis ever faced, whole economical system has collapsed and

---

1   Muhammad Ayoob. The Third World Security Predicament: State Making, Regional Conflict, and the International System. London: Lyne Rienner, 1995, 17.
2   Contemporary World Politics, NCERT, 2015-16, 21-January-2015.
3   David Ludden. India and South Asia: A Short History. 28-February-2002, 45.

country has gone into bankruptcy.[4] All the South Asian countries began the process of modernization and development in the nineteen fifties.

There have been numerous problems and challenges which have affected the South Asian economies. The various countries in South Asia do not have the same kind of political systems. Pakistan and Bangladesh have experienced both civilian and military rulers, with Bangladesh remaining a democracy in the post-Cold War period. Pakistan began the post-Cold War period with successive democratic governments under Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif respectively. But it suffered a military coup in 1999 and has been run by a military regime since then till 2006.[5] Pakistan has proved itself as a country of perpetual fluctuations with not even a single of its elected prime Minister to complete his tenure in the power. The recent votes of no confidence run against the government run and lead by Imran Khan has also depicted Pakistani's internal instability.[6]

Nepal was a constitutional monarchy with the danger of the king taking over executive powers. In 2006, a successful popular uprising led to the restoration of democracy and reduced the king to a nominal position. From the experience of Bangladesh and Nepal, we can say that democracy is becoming an accepted norm in the entire region of South Asia.[7] Similar changes are taking place in the two smallest countries of the region. Bhutan is still a monarchy but the king has initiated plans for its transition to multi-party democracy while the Maldives, the other island nation, was a Sultanate till 1968 when it was transformed into a republic with a presidential form of government. In June 2005, the parliament of the Maldives voted unanimously to introduce a multi-party system. The Maldivian Democratic Party (MDP) dominates the political affairs of the island. Democracy strengthened in the Maldives after the 2005 elections when some opposition parties were legalized. Despite the mixed record of the democratic experience, the people in all these countries share the aspiration for democracy but the region needs to tackle the burgeoning non-traditional security threats in order to promote well-being of the people and improve the quality of their lives by investing resources in human development and implementing and strengthening constitutional provisions that protect fundamental human rights and dignity. South Asia is one of the most populous regions of the world. Despite achieving consistent and rapid economic growth over the last several years and possessing huge potential for regional development and prosperity, the region is marked by severe political, economic, social and cultural inequalities which in turn results in miseries of ordinary masses.

The political and economic policies of the governments in South Asia continue to pre-dominantly focus on the traditional state-centric security paradigm. For this, states channelize the bulk of their resources for state security while paying minimal attention to human development. This practice not only

---

4   Ayeshea Perera. Sri Lanka: Why is the country in an economic crisis? BBC, 14-July-2022. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-61028138

5   Mayank Chawla, Shreyashi Roy. 1958, 1977 & 1999: How the Pakistan Army Overthrew Civilian Govts Over the Years. The Quint, 8-April-2022. https://www.thequint.com/news/world/pakistan-prime-minister-president-government-military-takeovers-coups

6   A timeline of how Imran Khan ousted in no-confidence vote. The Economic Times, 10-April-2022 https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/world-news/a-timeline-of-how-imran-khan-ousted-in-no-confidence-vote/articleshow/90755603.cms

7   Kanak Mani Dixit. The Spring of Dissent: People's movement in Nepal. India International Centre Quarterly, Summer 2006, 33(1), pp. 113-125. https://www.jstor.org/stable/i23005861

contributes to the prevalence of dense poverty and deprivation but also contributes to inter-state conflict and rivalry in South Asia.[8]

India and Pakistan are the most prominent and rival states in the regional setting. Both the states came into being in August 1947, but have never been able to maintain cordial relations due to various issues, disputes and security challenges. Since Independence of both countries in 1947, India and Pakistan have been in four wars, including one undeclared war, and many border skirmishes and military stand-offs. The most recent one and terrifying one took place on February 27, 2019 when Indian Wing Commander Abhinandan Varthaman's plane was shot down by the Pakistani F-16 jet during aerial combat upon intrusion by India into the aerial space of Pakistan.[9]

The article argues that in South Asia the internal and external policies of states are rival centric and not people centric. As a result, human security at the community level is affected by larger geopolitical concerns. The greatest threats to human security at the local level are issues relating to geopolitics because terrorism, religious extremism and political instability are the consequences of geo-political problems.

2. Conceptualizing Human Security

The literal meaning of security or safety is freedom from various internal and external threats. It is defined as the condition of being secure from or not wide-open to menace; safety or freedom from scare, concern or anxiety; and feelings of security or freedom from danger.[10] Though the international approaches towards definition of Human security is a running on different tune and rhythm there are arguably three distinct conceptions of human security that shape current debates.

(a) The first is what might be termed the natural rights/rule of law conception of human security, anchored in the fundamental liberal assumption of basic individual rights to 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness', and of the international community's obligation to protect and promote these rights.[11]

(b) A second view of human security is humanitarian and as per the mandate of this view is to, for example, inform international efforts to deepen and strengthen international law, particularly regarding genocide and war crimes, and to abolish weapons that are especially harmful to civilians and non-combatants.[12]

(c) These two views of human security, which focus on basic human rights and their deprivation, stand in sharp contrast to a broader and third view, which suggests that human security should be widely constructed to include economic, environmental, social and other forms of harm to the overall livelihood and well-being of individuals. There is a strong social justice component in this broader conception of human security, as well as a wider consideration of threats (real and potential) to the survival and health of individuals. According to this third view, perhaps the most controversial of

---

[8] Muhammad Saleem Mazhar, Naheed Goraya. Post-2014 Afghanistan: Reflections & Off-Shoots. Lahore: University of the Punjab, 2014, 19-21.

[9] India confirms MiG 21 shot down, pilot missing. Geo News, 27-February-2019. https://www.geo.tv/latest/229475-india-confirms-mig-21-shot-down-pilot-missing

[10] John Andrew, M. Proffitt. Oxford English Dictionary, UK: Oxford University Press, 1993, 12.

[11] Alston 1992; Lauren 1998; Morsink 1998.

[12] Boutros-Ghali 1992; Moore 1996; UN 1995, 1999; UNDP 1997.

the three conceptions of human security, the state of the global economy, the forces of globalization, and the health of the environment, including the world's atmosphere and oceans, are all legitimate subjects of concern in terms of how they affect the 'security' of the individual.[13]

Analytically, the concept of security is essentially controversial in nature due to its complexity, seamlessness and lack of factual objectivity, thus the concept has to be understood with the help of broader approaches. It is a subjective problem that mainly depends on one's ontology. In other words, the concept of security has multiplicity of meanings. Thus, it needs to be contextualized. Barry Buzan[14] argues that people don't agree on a single idea of security due to their moral, ideological, and normative differences. Therefore, the security perspective is always defined with the support of other established theoretical frameworks. In the realist framework, security is seen as derivative of power or mere synonym of power.[15]

The notion of security and safety is highly relative and multifarious in nature, therefore security can be well-defined or explained in its own specific and exact surroundings; it differs according to the context. Further, there are a number of security theories that have emerged and evolved with shifting international and national priorities and as a result of domestic, regional and global key events. These theories are not static; each has its variations and permutations. Likewise, each theory is to some extent reductive and essentialist, relying upon assumptions about the nature of the world we live in. While there has been an evolution in security discourse, it is not strictly linear or time-specific but dynamic, so that some theories had greater prevalence at certain times and with particular actors. Equally, there are differing perceptions as to where we are along this evolving continuum.

(a) The Theorists of Law

Have had equally varying perspectives on security, ranging from the more traditionalist views - placing the protection of the state and state sovereignty as fundamental goals and determinants of security - to a number of broader and diverging concepts. Theorists of law have an added drawback of considering the role of law in addressing insecurity. Recurring debates on the relationship of law with politics play on in the background, such as whether law is a constraining force on state action or itself a consequence of state interests. In particular, law experts grapple with the extent to which law is a tool, or indeed the principal tool, to ensure security. Lawyers are most comfortable within the certainty and predictability of a rules-based system, but are typically frustrated when at moments of greatest political tension the rules appear flawed or lack the requisite force.[16]

(b) Critical Security Studies (CSS)

Could not sufficiently explain security in the human context, but finally the School of Critical Security Studies (CSS) provided the closest theoretical underpinnings for the shift to the concept of human security. The CSS recognizes that the bifurcation of security into the material world 'out there' and the

---

[13] UNDP 1994, Nef 2002.

[14] Barry Gordon Buzan, FBA, FAcSS is Emeritus Professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics and honorary professor at the University of Copenhagen and Jilin University.

[15] Marianne Stone. Security according to Buzan: A comprehensive security analysis. School of International and Public Affairs, Security Studies Discussion Papers Series1, Columbia University, New York: GEEST, Spring 2009, 2-4.

[16] Alice Edwards, Carla Ferstman. Human Security and Non-citizens Law, Policy and International Affairs. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009, 4.

inner world of human relationships, reflected in the nominative and adjectival forms of the word, exaggerates the gap between the two images. McSweeney argues that the assumption of security studies, which ignores the human dimension, is contradicted by the practical dependence of policy-makers and theorists alike on the human individual as the ultimate referent or subject of security. Thus, the individual is ignored in conceptualizing the idea of security at the state level only to be reinstated as its basic rationale – as it must be – in order to make sense of and legitimize the policy derived.[17] For security to make sense at the international level, critical security theorists argue that it must make sense at the basic level of the individual.

Critical Security Studies (CSS) further provides insight to the student of security studies to know that the use of 'security jargon' is a double-edged sword. This double-edged use of security terminologies can label the subjects of this security discourse as threats to security, rather than being victims or at risk of insecurity. The process of 'normalizing' the language of security can hide from view the real agendas at play and permit the erosion of fundamental rights, as states feel justified reducing or removing rights in situations of 'exception' or 'crisis'. As a collective discourse, there is concern that individuals can become voiceless or that the term may be misappropriated and misused to justify state-centric responses to the movement of people. This is not an uncommon response to migrants, asylum-seekers and refugees who have been increasingly portrayed as security threats, rather than as individuals fleeing violence, persecution or human insecurity. Thus, there is concern in framing such issues within 'security' terms.

Human security and human rights have been coexisting aims of the UN Charter since 1945. However, it is interesting to analyze that where most threats to human security can be formulated as human rights violations, at the same time human security is threatened by the acts for provision of human security.[18] Such as, the US led wars threatened human security in the name of protecting human rights. In this context, it is essential to first define the contours of human security.

According to Freedman, when anything that generates anxiety or threatens the quality of life in some respect becomes labeled as a 'security problem', the field risks losing all focus.[19] The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) Report defines human security as the security of people-their physical safety, their economic and social well-being, respect for their dignity and worth as human beings and the protection of their human rights and fundamental freedoms. However, the ICISS definition is criticized for making no explicit mention of how the state, particularly in the indebted South, can guarantee the 'economic and social well-being' of their citizens under conditions of 'predatory globalization'. By concentrating on 'freedom from fear' and effectively ignoring 'freedom from want', the 'narrow approach' may be seen as consistent with a neo-liberal framework.[20] The idea of the new security framework under Critical Security Studies is that it focuses directly and specifically on individuals and communities, as opposed to states. The traditional realist approach is not indifferent to individuals (or citizens), whom the state is charged to protect, however,

17 Bill McSweeney. Security, Identity and Interests: A Sociology of International Relations. UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 16.

18 Barbara von Tigerstrom. Human Security and International Law: Prospects and Problems. UK: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2007, 30.

19 Tadjbakhsh Shahar Banou. Human Security: Looking Back Before Looking Forward. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009, 1-2.

20 World Bank. World Development Report 2000/2001: Attacking Poverty. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001, 39.

individuals are passive in that framework. There is concern that national defense is frequently achieved at the cost of individual security or safety.

The significant feature of the human security framework is its recognition that the providers of security extend beyond the state. Security providers are said to include states, inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations and the affected individuals and communities themselves. This position is likened to liberal institutionalism, which recognizes the critical role of organizations (particularly the UN) in addressing transnational and international challenges. Yet proponents of human security go further, understanding that even in purely domestic contexts there is a need for a multiplicity of actors.[21] People rather than states as the focus of security denoted the obvious shift from traditional to non-traditional security framework. The traditional geopolitical security traits were prioritized during the Cold War era under the conventional view of security in the Westphalian state system. It considered the state as the sole actor and was centered on state's security preservation of its territorial integrity and political sovereignty against any military threats. According to the traditional security notion, the only actual security concern is for a country to preserve persistence, power, control and freedom against external pressures from rival states.[22]

The Westphalian order moved the world towards globalization, which was characterized by two synchronized trends: firstly, global politics and its existential security implications, and secondly, economic integration. In the late 1980's, economic and environmental aspects were also included in the notion of security as 'comprehensive security'. In the 1990s, the conceptual trajectory indicated an obvious paradigm shift from material security threats to normative social security threats. It appeared as a major shift in the Westphalian order of international affairs that brought the individual to the center of state's concerns. The non-traditional threats challenged the traditional concept of security; it included threats such as environmental pollution, transnational terrorism, massive population, and infectious diseases that posed a threat to the individual's security.

In warfare studies, it is established that a person's security cannot be achieved through military capabilities. Consequently, it involves the notion of human security. According to Morgenthau, the international relations of the new millennium is impelling many analysts to broaden their conception of security to include issues of human security broadly defined.[23] In 1993, a UNDP document formally articulated and stressed that the concept of security must change from an exclusive emphasis on national security to a much greater stress on people's security. It shifted focus from security through armaments to security through human development; from territorial security to food, employment and environmental security. In the Human Development Report (HDR) of 1994.[24]

3. Human Security in South Asia

Today South Asia, despite having been independent for the last century, is the poorest and most backward region in the world after Africa while India has slipped to the 101st position among 116

---

[21] Tadjbakhsh Shahar Banou. Human Security: Looking Back Before Looking Forward. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009, 15.

[22] Sung Won Kim. Human Security with an Asian Face. Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies, 2010, 17(1), 83-103.

[23] Hans Morgenthau. Politics Among the Nations : The Struggle for Power and Peace. New York: A.A. Knopf, 1948, 29.

[24] UNDP. The Human Development Report. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994, 10.

countries in the Global Hunger Index (GHI) 2021 from its 2020 ranking (94) in this way Indian has been placed even behind Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal and Pakistan ranked 92nd out of 116 with a score of 24.7, which indicated a serious level of hunger. The ranking of Pakistan is lower than all other countries of South Asia and other neighboring countries.[25] The primary goal of every nation is to protect and ensure satisfactory defence for its homeland. No state feels relaxed living in an environment of threat. To strengthen their security environments, nations employ various strategies to find the help of an outsider in the form of a mutual alliance. States try to join a bilateral alliance for the following reasons:

(a) To support their own abilities.

(b) To induce an outsider to come into the area and act as a balancer.

(c) To isolate the adversary.

(d) To promote a regional alliance and to reconcile with the adversary even at a cost deemed to be considerably high.

The third world countries join an alliance mainly to deal with a regional adversary. Therefore, the security in the third world countries that includes both India and Pakistan is state-centered in character, in terms of both its territory and institutions and to the security of those who profess to represent the state territorially and institutionally.

4. Multiple Dimensions of Inter-State Conflict in South Asia

It is clear that there are multiple dimensions of inter-state conflict in the South Asian region. Many of these conflicts have serious implications for security in the region. It may also be added here that these conflicts are mainly territorial disputes. Here an attempt has been made to explore various dimensions of these conflicts and their security implications in South Asia. The comprehensive approach to security proposes that if human beings are secured, society is secured and if society is secured, state is also secured. Since it is human beings who need to be secured, all fields of their activity such as social, political, economic, environmental etc. become components of the comprehensive security approach.

South Asia is often described as the most dangerous place on earth and now there is an urgent need for the region to overcome the bitter legacies of the past in order to create peaceful and secure environment. Since the nuclear tests by India and then Pakistan in May 1998, the focus of this region has been almost exclusively on the nuclear dimensions of the confrontation between the two states. In reality security in South Asia is challenged by interplay of several factors operating at three different levels: domestic, regional and global.[26] All the South Asian states have different perspectives over these three spillover factors. Here, this study aims to portray India and Pakistan's perspective in this respect.

(A) Domestic Factors

It is in the context of the comprehensive approach to security that domestic conflicts become a major challenge to human security in both developing countries of India and Pakistan. Actually domestic conflicts emanate due to various reasons that threaten human security in these two countries. It is also

25 Financial Express, 15-October-2021. https://www.financialexpress.com/india-news/global-hunger-index-2021-india-slips-to-101st-spot-among-116-countries-behind-pakistan-bangladesh-nepal/2350271/

26 Malheea Lodhi. Security Challenges in South Asia. The Non-proliferation Review, Summer 2001, 8(2), 118-124.

implied that if the domestic conflicts are resolved amicably, the challenges of human security could be resolved to a large extent both India and Pakistan.

Over half a century after independence, Pakistan and India remained mired in a vicious cycle of poverty, deprivation, and underdevelopment which is evident from the Global poverty Index of 2022 itself wherein has been placed after Pakistan and Bangladesh. India and Pakistan are at the very bottom of the world league in social and human development indicators.

In Pakistan only 40% have access to clean drinking water and fewer have nutritious food. Quality education is available only to the most fortunate and dropout rate is high. Human life in these conditions is nasty, brutish, and short[27] while it is estimated that waterborne diseases have an economic burden of approximately USD 600 million a year in India. This is especially true for drought- and flood-prone areas, which affected a third of the nation in the past couple of years, less than 50% of the population in India has access to safely managed drinking water. Chemical contamination of water, mainly through fluoride and arsenic, is present in 1.96 million dwellings.[28]

Thus, both Indian and Pakistan are in a precarious situation today largely because of their internal problems and instability. Sectarian, ethnic and provincial conflicts are common, and terrorist activity, corruption and crime are rising in number.

Pakistan has weak internal security which is damaging its international repute. In India the situation is a bit different: it is more stable internally, developing economically and is therefore viewed as politically, economically and strategically viable, precisely what is necessary for the stability of South Asia in the eyes of US.[29] However, the prime fears of both countries - Pakistan and India - are currently internal rather than external which can still lead to the renewing of old wounds of enmity.

In India and Pakistan, at their domestic levels, terrorism, religious radicalization, political instability and the unrestricted media are the main challenges to human security.

Terrorism in India and Pakistan
Terrorism in India, according to the Home Ministry, poses a significant threat to the people of India. Compared to other countries, India faces a wide range of terror groups. Terrorism found in India includes Islamic terrorism, separatist terrorism, and left-wing terrorism. India is one of the countries most impacted by terrorism.[30] In 2019, India suffered terrorist attacks in the state of Jammu and Kashmir, the northeastern Indian states, and parts of central India. The Government of India continued to apply sustained pressure to detect, disrupt, and degrade terrorist activities within its borders. Prime Minister of India and other senior Indian leaders made numerous statements to condemn domestic terrorist attacks and bring to justice the perpetrators of terrorism, in cooperation with the United States and other like-minded countries. The United States and India increased CT cooperation in 2019. In

---

27 Ibid.
28 UNICEF. Clean drinking water. https://www.unicef.org/india/what-we-do/clean-drinking-water
29 Umbreen Javaid. Compulsive Peacebuilding in South Asia: Analysis of Pakistan-India Relations. In South Asia in Perspective, Lahore: Center for South Asian Studies , University of the Punjab, 2013, 12-14.
30 Terrorism in India. Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Terrorism_in_India

March, the United States and India held the annual Counterterrorism Joint Working Group in Washington, DC, meeting concurrently with the second US-India Designations Dialogue. Both countries announced their intent to prevent terrorists from obtaining access to weapons of mass destruction and underscored their respective commitments to the implementation of UNSCR 2396. In December, the United States hosted the 2+2 Ministerial Dialogue, in which the ministers called for concerted action against all terrorist networks, including AQ, ISIS/Daesh, LeT, JeM, HQN, Hizb-ul Mujahideen and TTP.[31]

While there are three elements of terrorism that the Pakistan is concerned about: (1) the Al-Qaeda factor, (2) What India is calling cross-border terrorism and Pakistan is calling the freedom struggle in Kashmir, (3) The Sectarian (Sunni v. Shia) extremism and terrorism in Pakistan.[32] The War on Terrorism has turned out to be the most critical clash of the 21st century and it is Pakistan that has suffered the most in this war. Pakistan's role in this war has caused multi-dimensional exterior security coercion for the country. It has been the greatest victim in this entire war in terms of irrecoverable loss of human capital more than 45,000 in number. Pakistan, as compared to the other actors in Afghanistan, has also taken serious beatings.[33] By making Pakistan a front line state, such a game is being played that Pakistan is American friend and foe at the same time. After 9/11, Pakistan has become the theater of a blind war. It is becoming difficult to assess with every passing day that who is against whom.[34]

Religious Radicalization in India and Pakistan

Religious radicalization and its violent eruption have been developing along two levels in Pakistan: the domestic level and the international level. Pakistan's leadership, both military and civilian, has done its best to prevent social and political chaos and its major goals have little to do with development in structures of civil society, rather it has been applying all its energies for reigning in bothersome ethnic groups. Separation from East Pakistan, tensions and wars with India and outstanding issue of Kashmir between India and Pakistan have contributed to the emergence of an unstable regional environment. Similarly, the Afghan war has had a strong impact on internal security, having been strictly connected with growing Islamic militancy, drug trafficking and smuggling. However scenario is India is completely different India has witnessed sudden surge in religious radicalization at the hands of state itself after the Hindu majority government - BJP - came into power in the year of 2014, since then religious minorities including Muslims and Christians have been worst victim of religious radicalization. The outrage over the beef consumption by the Muslim in India resulted in mob lynching of dozens of people in different states of India despite the fact that India is the largest beef exporter in the world, exporting buffalo meat worth US$4 billion a year[35] India's beef exports rise under Modi Government despite Hindu vigilante campaign at home as such Indian democracy has stooped to double faced view.

31 Country Reports on Terrorism 2019: India. Bureau of Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State. https://www.state.gov/reports/country-reports-on-terrorism-2019/india/

32 Steve Coll. Between India and Pakistan, A Changing Role for the U.S. Washington Post, 26-May-2002.

33 Muhammad Saleem Mazhar, Samee Ozair Khan, Naheed Goraya. Post-2014 Afghanistan. Journal of South Asian Studies, Lahore: University of the Punjab, Lahore, 2013, 28(1), 67-82.

34 Dr. Naheed Shabir Goraya. Global War against Terrorism: A Security Threat to Pakistan. In South Asia in Perspective, ed. Dr. Umbreen Javaid, Lahore: CSAS, University of the Punjab, 2013, 86.

35 Sanya Dhingra. India's beef exports rise under Modi govt despite Hindu vigilante campaign at home. The Print, 26-March-2019. https://theprint.in/economy/indias-beef-exports-rise-under-modi-govt-despite-hindu-vigilante-campaign-at-home/210164/

The religious radicalization didn't stopped over the staple food of the Indian poor minorities only it extended its hands over to the Right to Choice dress code of women by creating Hijab controversy as the result hundred Muslim girls has have been compelled to pursue their basic education.[36]

Political Instability

The concept of comprehensive security led to a broader and more holistic approach. It was recognized that security is affected not only by the military balance of power, but also by instability resulting from mutual clash, communal strength, poverty, joblessness, planned criminality, terrorism and conservational deprivation, as well as by mass population movement. Human security thus came to be seen as requiring the establishment of both security from such continuing fears as starvation, illness and protection from abrupt turbulence in daily routine life. On the point it is worth to mention that India is dropping on every essential index globally be it Poverty, Starvation and Sanitation. India has faced several uprisings because of lack of these basic human needs. The centralization of power in India in few hands of Hindu oriented ruling party has resulted in many undemocratic and unjust decisions, important to mention will be Farmer Laws. Farmer Laws brought instability in whole country and shaken the foundations of the central government of India though government play hide and seek for almost a year till 700 farmers died in the protest and thousands got injured.[37] Political instability have caused because of many other acts of the government like "AgniVeer, Exam Scam".

Currently, Pakistan is facing various kinds of security as well as terrorist threats from several Taliban groups. In the tribal parts of Pakistan, many terrorist groups are active and trying to weaken Pakistan with acts of terrorism. Pakistan also has many issues with respect to its sovereignty and survival in this situation. So, there are different types of internal and external players who want to play a very negative role in the survival, trade and economy of Pakistan.[38] There are different types of political, religious and ethnic organizations, which have been growing by utilizing Information Technology (IT) tools effectively for creating political chaos and instability for the last fifteen years. There have been ethno-linguistic movements in all the provinces, as well as sectarian and tribal conflicts in many areas, resulting in the convergence of multiple typologies and a widespread Islamic radicalization. The reasons for this situation are multi-dimensional and represent a complex phenomenon, to be considered as a part of a unmanageable process of socio-cultural change creating tension and social crisis.

Human Security and the Role of Media

The role of media has domestic, regional and global implications for human security. However, domestic and regional role of media is more relevant to human security issues in the context of India and Pakistan. India's ranking in the 2022 World Press Freedom Index has fallen to 150 out of 180 countries, according to the latest report released by the global media watchdog, Reporters without Borders (RSF).[39]

---

[36] Divya Arya. Karnataka hijab controversy is polarising its classrooms. BBC, 16-February-2022. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-60384681

[37] Did over 700 farmers die during anti-farm bill protests at Delhi borders? A detailed analysis of the data reveals the truth. OpIndia, 13-January-2022. https://www.opindia.com/2022/01/a-detailed-analysis-of-the-data-of-deaths-of-farmers-reveals-the-truth/

[38] Muhammad Jahangir Tamimi. India's Foreign Policy towards South Asia and Pakistan. In South Asia in Perspective, ed. Dr. Umbreen Javaid, Lahore: CSAS, University of the Punjab, 2013, 34.

[39] G. Sampath. India's position on the World Press Freedom Index. The Hindu, 5-May-2022. https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/indias-position-on-the-world-press-freedom-index/article65382354.ece

Several Indian media outlets have become a global joke for publishing fake news claiming "Pakistan is invading Afghanistan this week," while experts from American think tanks said that what these media have done sounds pretty ridiculous but it is not the first time this happens. Actually, Indian media has a long story of creating fake news which have been refuted repeatedly. The mainstream Indian channels have upgraded itself to Self-entertaining which is evident from the act of the starter of making fake news is India's right-wing channel Republic TV, which on quoted exclusive footage from Hasti TV, an Afghan TV channel in the UK, saying that Pakistani air force attacked Panjshir valley in Afghanistan. However, fact check website Boom soon found that the footage aired by Indian media is from the video game Arma-3.[40] Indian mainstream always wages virtual wars, "We want revenge, not condemnation. It is time for blood, the enemy's blood", thundered Arnab Goswami, a famously aggressive news anchor.[41]

Pakistan has a plural culture at the domestic level, across several religious sects. Radio and TV stations broadcast many programs based on religion and culture. The lack of debate on religious issues and certain cultural taboos forces people to rely on the given interpretations of religious issues unquestioningly. The ill-informed and conservative religious teachers are totally free to misuse the loud speakers of mosques to propagate their extremist viewpoints on world affairs, without any checks and balances. Resultantly, the population encounters manipulated news and fundamentalist ideas, which cause flawed perceptions, unrealistic expectations, sensationalism, fanaticism, and sectarianism.[42] In this way, media at the domestic level contributes to the factors which have been posing threat to human security in Pakistan since its inception.

Apart from the domestic factors, external developments at the regional level, such as events in Iran, Afghanistan and China could also be key concerns for human security in Pakistan.[43] Overall, at the regional level, the India-Pakistan traditional rivalry against each other poses a greater threat to the human security of the both countries, owing to nuclear capability of India and Pakistan.

(B) Regional Factors

At the regional level, the pursuit of domination by one state over its neighbors is a recipe for insecurity and instability. The prevailing asymmetry with regard to both strategic objectives and the relationship between military forces of the largest country in South Asia, i.e. India and its smaller neighbors is a structural factor for instability and has been exacerbated by Delhi's desire to dominate. In such a way Pakistan security feels fragile at the hands of the more accelerated position of India. Certainly, attempts at domination can be destabilizing and thus highly dangerous in terms of human security provision, particularly for Indian and Pakistan given their history of wars waged so far. The Indian rivalry factor has also been important in aggravating conflicts generally in the region and particularly in Pakistan, thereby posing serious challenges to human security. Indian interference plays a negative role in

[40] Ridiculous fake news by Indian media might be created under govt support: observer. Global Times, 9-September-2021. https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202109/1233773.shtml

[41] Vaishnavi Chandrashekhar. India's Media Is War-Crazy. Foreign Policy, 1-March-2019. https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/03/01/indias-media-is-war-crazy/

[42] Yoginder Sikand. Pakistan, Islam and Indian Media Stereotypes. CounterCurrents.org, 21-January-2006. https://www.countercurrents.org/ipk-sikand210106.htm

[43] Michael Krepon, Alex Stolar. Outlook for Regional Security in South Asia. Pakistan Horizon, 2007, 60(3), 73-82.

aggravating domestic conflicts in some areas of Pakistan like Baluchistan as claimed by the Pakistan administration similarly the deliberate interference of Pakistan in Indian side of Kashmir also weaken the security parameters.

Pakistan and India have engaged themselves in a number of conflict management talks, negotiations and agreements but all of them proved to be futile in the end. Agreements and summits like the Tashkent Agreement in 1965, the Shimla Accord in 1972, the Lahore Declaration in 1998, the Agra Summit in 2001 and Composite Dialogue that began in 2004 proved to be major steps initially but in the end they could not produced desired result. This has added to the resentment between these neighboring states. Furthermore, both sides tried to resolve their conflicts through other channels like Track II diplomacy and were engaged in extensive talks with the help of retired diplomats, former military men, business groups and other social entities, but like previous efforts, they remained unable to extract a successful or major positive result. Pakistan and India as the two most important states of the South Asian region need to manage and resolve their conflicts.[44] The internal terrorism menace, a significant challenge by itself, as well as external involvement by both the countries have complicated the task, which has been compounded by years of neglect and errors of omission and perhaps commission.

Kashmir Dispute

Kashmir dispute has been a burning issue over the last sixty-eight years, waiting to be resolved. Under the UN resolution of 1948, on 1-January-1949, a ceasefire agreement was signed between Pakistan and India through the mediation of United Nations and it was decided that Kashmir issue will be resolved according to the wishes of the Kashmiri people through a plebiscite, but it was never conducted by India. Henceforth, the issue remains an unresolved and biggest conflict because both states have diverging positions and claims over the Kashmir.[45] The outstanding Kashmir conflict has proven threat to the human security as these two neighboring states have fought three conventional wars in the backdrop of Kashmir dispute which had damaged not only human lives at large but stunted the growth of socio-political and economic development compatible to human security. Due to ongoing conflict of Kashmir conflict more than 4,600 security personnel, 13,500 civilians.[46]

Siachen Conflict

Siachin conflict is a by-product of the Kashmir dispute. The conflict began in 1984 when Indian forces occupied the glacier. For its part, Pakistan asserts that Siachen is an essential part of Gilgit-Baltistan, administered by Islamabad. "Pakistan fears that India will use the passes over the glacier to invade and occupy more territory in Baltistan. Indian occupation of Siachen Glacier also represents a threat to Karakoram Highway, the major road linking Pakistan to China through the Khunjerab Pass."[47]

In CPEC scenario, such fears have worsened. Pakistan also argues that its troops on Siachen are trying to prevent further Indian aggression in the region. The Indian condition for de-escalation in the Saltoro

---

[44] Umbreen Javaid. Conflict Management Between India and Pakistan: Challenges and Failures. Journal of South Asian Studies, Lahore: University of the Punjab, 2016, 31(1), 253-254.

[45] Victoria Schofield. Kashmir in Conflict: India, Pakistan and the Unending War. London: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd, 2003, 15.

[46] Insurgency in Jammu and Kashmir. Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Insurgency_in_Jammu_and_Kashmir

[47] Omer Farooq Zain. Siachen Glacier Conflict: Discordant in Pakistan-India Reconciliation. Pakistan Horizon, April-2006, 59(2), 73-82. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41394127

range has been for Pakistan to agree to a demarcation of the posts which is not acceptable for Pakistan. In a joint statement of defence secretaries of India and Pakistan after talks in June 1989 agreed on redeployment of forces and future positions on the grounds under the Simla Agreement. India however, backtracked. Again, bilateral talks were held in New Dehli in November 1992, but could not produce meaningful outcome. A hope of settlement emerged when Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh visited Siachen in 2005 and showed a gesture towards resolving the conflict with Pakistan by turning Siachen into a 'mountain of peace'. However, it did not happen due to resistance from the Indian Army. Meanwhile, conflict has claimed 2,700 human lives on both side not due to combat but avalanches, exposure and altitude sickness caused by the thin, oxygen-depleted air at Siachen. The conflict continues to pose challenge to human security in both countries.

Kargil Conflict

The Kargil crisis in 1999 also reflected Pakistan and India's conflict over Kashmir. The conflict brought out the serious threat of nuclear war as both states had tested their nuclear bombs a short time before this conflict. James Woolsey, a former head of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), termed the Kashmir issue as a flashpoint that had the probable prospects for future use of weapons of mass destruction including nuclear weapons.[48] The conflict ended with intervention by the international community, in particular, the United States convinced Pakistan and India to come to the negotiating table to discuss and resolve disputed issues including the Kashmir problem.[49] The conflict claimed more 1,200 human lives on both sides.

The Way Forward: Ensuring Human Security

Human security operates more as a unifying, 'umbrella' concept and encompasses threats to social and economic security as well as to physical security.[50] Therefore, both human security and human responsibility go side by side while focusing on human security measures at the bilateral, regional and global levels. Pakistan and India must resolve conflicts at the bilateral level. At the regional level, Afghanistan along with India and Pakistan must play a role to curtail terrorism so that threat to human security from the western border of Pakistan may be reduced. Further, India must play a role in Afghanistan's stability with Pakistan's cooperation but not the role in Pakistan's destruction through supporting anti-Pakistan terrorist groups. Also at the regional level, the key players China and USA, must understand the human security dimension in South Asia and try to bring the South Asian nations together for regional development and comprehensive security through trade and investment.

---

[48] Rashid Ahmad Siddiqi. Deterrence Stability in Nuclear South Asia-A Study of Post 1998 India-Pakistan Conflict and US Role. PhD Thesis, New Zealand: University of Aukland, 2011, 72-119.

[49] Muhammad Jahangir Tamimi. India's Foreign Policy towards South Asia and Pakistan. In South Asia in Perspective, Lahore: CSAS, University of the Punjab, 2013, 21.

[50] General Assembly Thematic Debate on Human Security. UNGA, 22-May-2008.
https://www.un.org/en/ga/president/62/pdf/calendar/20080522-humansecurity.pdf
Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 16 September 2005. Fulfilling the commitment of the World Summit Outcome document, UN Doc. A/RES/60/1, 'to discussing and defining the notion of human security in the General Assembly', New York: UNGA, para. 143.
https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_60_1.pdf

5. EU Regional Strategy in South Asia: Moving beyond the Role of a Trade Partner

South Asia is quickly emerging as a pivotal region of the world. It boasts rapid economic growth, is a conduit through the Indian Ocean to a large share of the world's trade, has states in various stages of transition to democracy and faces a number of developmental and security challenges. And of course, it is home to rising powers such as India.

While the United States and EU member states such as Britain, France and Germany have recognized the potential of the region in economic and security issues, the EU is hardly visible as a strategic actor in South Asia. In spite of longstanding partnerships with many South Asian states, the EU is viewed mostly as a trading bloc and not as a political or security actor in the region, despite spending a large amount of aid funds in various sectoral allocations. The EU certainly has an image problem in South Asia, and yet the region's importance has not been duly recognized in recent discussions on the EU's global strategy and the EU's approach to important partners such as India is outdated, lacking of innovative policy responses.

South Asia is an important region on the global stage. It is characterized by massive economic growth rates and emerging markets. At the same time, it is the centre of global security concerns, from securing the oceans to combating terrorism. Interestingly, while the US and China have been increasing their engagement with the region, it continues to be a blind spot for the EU.

The EU's partnerships in the region are based on an old development and technical assistance model, which tends to ignore the strategic significance of the region and changing political realities. This demonstrates an urgent need to revive and reset the EU's partnerships with South Asian states and with the SAARC. To increase its impact as an actor in the region, the EU needs to focus on areas where it is recognized as a policy leader and where there is demand from the South Asian side to learn from the EU's historical and technical experience. At the same time, there is a need to recalibrate EU strategy to take into account threats and challenges that it shares with the South Asian region.

In the case of India, the EU needs to distinguish its strategic partnership with the country from India's bilateral relationships with EU member states, in order to avoid being crowded out by the latter. To do so, the EU needs to reset its partnership with India and sharpen the focus of the Joint Action Plan. Cooperation in climate change and renewable energy, maritime security, and capacity building and technology transfers could be a good starting point, as India already recognises the EU as a leading actor in these areas.

The EU also needs to recognise that pushing the goal of integration in South Asia is not the most effective strategy – instead, building SAARC capacities on instruments such as cross-boundary resource sharing, for which there is political will, might prove more effective and eventually lead to greater regional integration. Finally, as a security actor, the EU needs to do much more in countries like Pakistan and promote democratic consolidation in other South Asian states. Here, sectoral cooperation has to give way to a far more holistic push for democratic institutions to make EU aid more effective and to translate its trade presence into political influence.

Conclusion

As the world changes, many scholars, analysts and policy makers agree that while governments need to confront external threats, creating sustainable domestic environments is an imperative policy priority. In the post-Cold War period, several conflicts, including the nuclear tests of 1998 and the post-9/11 war on terror, have made South Asia a focused region and continue to make India and Pakistan vital states, where both India and Pakistan has a pivotal role to play in the region. In this context, human security should remain a top priority for both these two countries.

The Indo-Pak security complex has been posing new challenges for the human security in the region since nuclearization of both states, because the Kashmir dispute has often been described as a potential nuclear flash point across the region. This risk to human security can only be mitigated within the framework of cooperative security. India and Pakistan need to focus their attention on how to bring about this transformation. They must unambiguously commit themselves to seek a negotiated settlement of the Kashmir dispute. If the Kashmir issue had been resolved peacefully during 2004-06, there would have been no further bloodshed, no political interference and no ethnic disturbances. Only peaceful, practicable, equitable, democratic and honorable actions can bring a durable solution of the Kashmir issue and this shall ensure a peaceful and prosperous future for the entire world in general and for South Asia in particular.

It is the need of the hour that India and Pakistan make progress in economic and trade relations. Both states need to realize that at present it is in the interest of not only the two states but also their huge populations to have improved relations, which will absolutely be advantageous to both Pakistan and India. It is a pity that the South Asian region lags behind in regional trade as compared to other regions and the development and progress of South Asia is directly linked with peace in this region. It is the only solution for peace and stability in South Asia.