Human Security, Human Development and the Millennium Development Goals[1]

Bo Asplund and Romeo A. Reyes[2]

"Rasa aman dari ancaman bahaya seperti kelaparan, kekurangan gizi, penyakit dan tekanan" dan "perlindungan dari kekacauan tak terduga dan menyakitkan dalam kehidupaan sehari-hari adalah dua aspek utama konsep keamanan manusia dalam pandangan UNDP. Konsep keamanan manusia berbeda dan seharusnya tidak dicampur baur dengan konsep keamanan nasional, yang biasaya diartikan sebagai aman dari serangan luar dan aman dari upaya pemecahan keutuhan wilayah. Pembangunan manusia – yang terpusat pada manusia, inklusif, adil dan berkesinambungan – terkait dengan keamanan manusia karena alasan yang sederhana bahwa pembangunan manusia mengarah pada keamanan manusia. Pembangunan manusia karenanya adalah jalan menuju keamanan manusia. Jika demikian adanya, Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) dapat dijadikan peta penunjuk arah bagi negara-negara, termasuk Indonesia, dalam menempuh perjalanan menuju keamanan manusia. Pelbagai tujuan dalam MDGs tersebut berkisar dari upaya mengakhiri kemiskinan dan kelaparan, mewujudkan pendidikan dasar universal, memajukan persamaan jender, mengurangi angka kematian ibu dan anak, memerangi HIV/AIDS, memastikan kesinambungan lingkungan, hingga membentuk kemitraan global untuk pembangunan. Ada beberapa tahap yang dianggap penting bagi perjalanan Indonesia menuju keamanan masusia. Ini mencakup pemberlakuan Perjanjian Pembangunan Millennium Nasional untuk melaksanakan MDGs secara adil.

This brief article defines the concept of human security from a UNDP perspective, advances the notion that human development is the road to human security, and suggests how Indonesia could use the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as a road map to guide its journey towards human security.

---

[1] This article is to be published by the Centre for International Law Studies, Faculty of Law, University of Indonesia, in the Indonesian Journal of International Law.

[2] Resident Representative [and Programme Advisor], UNDP Indonesia, [respectively].

Human Security: UNDP Perspective

In UNDP's view there are two main aspects of human security. *The first is safety from chronic threats such as hunger, malnutrition, disease and repression. The second is protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns or routine of daily life.* [3]

As articulated in the 1994 Human Development Report, the concept of national security has been influenced mainly by the potential for conflict between states. Thus, the United Nations, and especially its Security Council, was established right after World War II essentially to prevent potential conflicts between states from escalating into violence and thereby make the world secure from war. The concept of national security was seen more in terms of security from external aggression and protection of territorial integrity.

Today, following the end of the Cold War and of the ideological divide that sustained it, the sense of insecurity for most people arises not so much from the threats of war or external aggression as from threats of human deprivation. Often, the origin of the threat is internal conflict rather than external aggression.

All over the world, people are more concerned now with security relating to their income, job, education, and health. And they feel threatened by drug abuse, crime, and more recently by domestic and international terrorism, along with social and political conflicts, which could abruptly turn into violence. What is even more disturbing is that many of the threats and insecurities, along with their root causes, are interlinked and form a vicious cycle. For instance, inequities in access to health, education, and livelihood and other economic opportunities are often the source of income and job insecurity, and thus root causes of social tension and conflict.

---

[3] Statement of the UNDP Representative at the Consultative Group for Indonesia (CGI) Mid-year Review Meeting, Jakarta, 12 June 2002.

Human security is distinct and should not be confused with the traditional concept of national security. Yet they are intertwined and mutually reinforcing for world peace, stability and prosperity. Their distinct and mutually reinforcing character can perhaps be elucidated by the ASEAN Community to be established following the ASEAN Summit in Bali. In accordance with Bali Concord II, the ASEAN Community shall be established, comprising of three pillars: (1) ASEAN Security Community - ASC, (2) ASEAN Economic Community - AEC, and (3) ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community - ASCC.

Emphasizing that ASC is not a defence pact or a military alliance, ASEAN leaders envision it as a mechanism "to promote peace and stability in the region...to counter terrorism...and ...to ensure that the Southeast Asian Region remains free of all weapons of mass destruction."[4] Clearly, this pillar of the ASEAN Community corresponds to the traditional notion of security that influenced the creation of the UN Security Council.

The two other pillars - AEC and ASCC - are envisioned to contribute more towards human security through human development. It is to be achieved through regional integration in a manner that equitably distributes its net economic benefits, and through cooperation in social development activities, including "prevention and control of infectious diseases, such as HIV/AIDS and SARS, and support to joint regional actions to increase access to affordable medicines."[5] It s aim is the security of the ASEAN Community against poverty and infectious diseases.

In a sense, ASC is to peace as AEC/ASCC is to human development. The two concepts of security – national and human - are intertwined and mutually reinforcing in the same way that peace and development are.

---

[4] Section A, Declaration of ASEAN Concord II signed in Bali by ASEAN Heads of Government on 07 October 2003.

[5] Section B and C, Declaration of ASEAN Concord II.

Human Development: The Road to Human Security

Human security is linked to human development for the simple reason that the latter leads to the former. Development that is people-centred, inclusive, equitable and sustainable would be critical for each and every Indonesian to feel secure about her/his income, job, and source of livelihood, and feel safe from threats of crime and social conflicts. For development to be inclusive and equitable, it must be pursued as a fundamental individual right for everyone and not as a privilege for a few who enjoy a disproportionate share of the fruits of economic growth.

There are a number of necessary and sufficient conditions for human development. To start with and as a minimum necessary condition, macroeconomic policies must be pro-growth rather than directed towards perpetual fiscal and Balance of Payments adjustment to maintain stability at home and in the international monetary system. After 5 years of economic adjustment since the financial and economic crisis of 1997-98, macro-economic policies in Indonesia reflected in the White Paper[6] are still concerned mainly with the financial sector rather than the real sector, and directed mainly towards maintaining financial stability rather than stimulating economic growth.

While the White Paper was originally dubbed as an "IMF Exit Strategy" in view of the decision to exit from the IMF Programme by end of 2003, macroeconomic policies reflected therein remain generally restrictive as they were in the IMF Programme. The minimum necessary condition therefore for the country to attain human development goals is hardly satisfied. Another necessary condition is that macroeconomic policies must be pro-poor so that the fruits of economic growth are distributed more equitably and accrue more to the poorer and marginalized segments of society. For instance, policies promoting SMEs in industry and agriculture where majority of low-income people derive their livelihood must

---

[6] Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs, Government of Indonesia, Economic Policy Package, Pre and Post-IMF, 2003

be adopted.[7] As a sufficient condition, a rights-based approach to development management must be pursued so that those who are marginalized by market forces are empowered to gain access to basic social services in health and education. This third condition is consistent with the inclusive character of human development.

Human Security and Good Governance

There is a strong link between human security and good governance. Indeed, if human security is to be realised through human development, all of the above necessary and sufficient conditions for human development must be met. And they could be met only if governance is effective and democratic, in the context of a well-functioning market economy.

Good governance could also contribute directly to human security through democratic political processes that peacefully reconcile diverse and often conflicting demands and needs of society. Conflict in demands and needs of various ethnic, religious and communal groups would be inherent in any society as big and as diverse as Indonesia. Without effective and democratic governance, this conflict could abruptly turn into threats and use of violence and thereby into "sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns or routine of daily life". Apart from democratic political processes, one other important factor to effectively manage conflict and prevent it from abruptly turning into a crisis of violence is the nature of governance in the security sector itself, including professionalism and civilian control of security forces. However, where the root causes of the conflict are economic and social inequities within and across regions and communities, human security could be realised in the long run only through human development.

---

[7] See "The Macroeconomics of Poverty Reduction in Indonesia", an independent study supported by UNDP through the Asia Pacific Programme on the Macroeconomics of Poverty Reduction, for detailed analysis of pro-poor policies.

MDGs: The Roadmap to Human Security

If human development is the road to human security, then the MDGs are the road map guiding countries in their journey. The MDGs derive from the Millennium Summit Declaration adopted by 189 UN Member States, including 147 Heads of State and Government, as follows:

1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
2. Achieve universal primary education
3. Promote gender equality and empower women
4. Reduce child mortality
5. Improve maternal health
6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
7. Ensure environmental sustainability
8. Develop a global partnership for development

The MDGs are different from previous goals set by the United Nations in the past development decades in many respects. *First*, except for Goal 8, they are translated into time-bound, quantitative, and internationally comparable targets. For instance, for Goal 1, the target is to halve by 2015 the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day.

Second, the MDGs are closely interdependent. For instance, Goal 1 - eradicating extreme poverty and hunger - is probably a necessary although not a sufficient condition for realizing Goals 2 through 7 relating to universal primary education, gender equality, health, and environmental sustainability. Similarly, without partnership and cooperation from the rich countries, which is what Goal 8 is about, the poor countries cannot achieve the seven other goals.

Third, the MDGs are not UN goals, although the UN has embarked on a global campaign to help realise them. They are goals of the countries that participated in the Millennium Summit in New York, which issued a Declaration calling for a fully inclusive, people-centred and rights-based approach to development. While governments that represented those countries in the Summit have

become accountable to their people for making that bold declaration and setting those ambitious goals and targets, all stakeholders should share the responsibility of realizing those goals: poor and rich countries alike, governments – central and local, parliaments – again central and local, non-government organizations, academia, the business sector, and the media. All of them must share the collective responsibility and participate in whatever way they can to realise the MDGs. Consistent with their main function, parliaments should do their share not only by holding governments accountable but also passing the necessary legislations, including budgetary appropriation, to realise the MDGs. The mass media can also play an important role by consistently reminding governments of their accountability. Politicians campaigning for election to parliament and other institutions of governance could even refer to the MDGs in presenting their campaign platform.

Fourth, with support from the UN, there is a concerted global effort to monitor progress, raise awareness, catalyse action, and provide the necessary research and intellectual foundation for policy reforms, capacity building and investment resource mobilization to meet all the goals. The UN has gone so far in its campaign as to appoint a Special Ambassador for the MDGs in the Asia Pacific Region who happens to be an Indonesian.

The MDG Global Deal

To help poor countries surmount structural obstacles and mobilise the huge amount of resources required to meet the MDGs, the 2003 Human Development Report advanced the notion of a global deal, whereby poor countries will mobilise domestic resources and exercise good governance for the realization of the MDGs, while rich countries will in turn increase aid and relieve onerous burdens of debt.

Unfortunately, the terms of this proposed global deal called *Millennium Development Compact* are somewhat unfair in terms of reciprocity, joint responsibility and mutual accountability. On the one hand, poor countries are held responsible and accountable for

achieving quantitative and time-bound targets for Goals 1 through 7. Rich countries, on the other hand, are responsible for Goal 8 whose targets are open ended and phrased as if they were to be realized on a best effort basis. Consider for instance the targets for eradication of hunger, reduction of child mortality and improvement of maternal health: halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger; reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate; reduce by three-quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio. Consider, on the other hand, the targets for Goal 8 relating to trade and debt: develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system; deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries... in order to make debt sustainable in the long term.

If this global deal were to be compared to a bilateral trade agreement, it would be like one country binding itself to reducing tariffs on a set of specific commodities to 0-5 % by end of, say 2015, and the other pledging to exert its best efforts to reduce tariffs in the future! If it were to be compared to an arms reduction treaty, one would be fully susceptible to verification and the other not at all. This lack of mutual accountability and susceptibility to measurement and monitoring has prompted HDR 2003 to call on rich countries to also set quantitative and time-bound targets for aid, trade, and debt relief. Heeding that call would remove doubt on the seriousness with which rich countries are addressing the global partnership embodied in Goal 8.[8]

MDGs: Is Indonesia on track?

What has been the record of Indonesia so far and what are the prospects that it would realize the MDG targets by 2015? Based on the 2003 Global Human Development Report (HDR), Indonesia generally made good progress towards realising the MDGs based on

---

[8] For further details on Goal 8 targets and an assessment of the prospects for realising them, see Romeo A. Reyes, "Millennium Development Compact: What it means for Indonesia", Jakarta Post, 22 and 23 July 2003.

key indicators such as GDP per capita, gender equality, child mortality and access to water and sanitation. It partly confirmed the projection made by the first Indonesia HDR published in 2001 that based on 1993-1999 trends Indonesia would attain the MDG targets on poverty reduction, gender equality, child mortality and maternal mortality before 2015. Based on the two reports, Indonesia appears to be generally on track at the national level.

The challenge for Indonesia is at the sub-national level, where pockets of poverty and other human deprivation are yet to be fully recognized and addressed. Based on the analysis of trends in poverty incidence and other indicators at the provincial level, many provinces are found not on track and will likely reach the MDG targets way beyond 2015.

With reference to poverty reduction, the projection is that it would be reached by 2008 at the national level. A number of provinces are on track to attain the targets by 2015, with Yogyakarta projected to attain it even earlier in 2004, East Java, Jambi and East Kalimantan in 2006, and central Sulawesi in 2008. However, the majority (17) will not attain it by 2015. For North Sumatra, Aceh and West Nusa Tenggara, it will be attained only in the next century, unless the 1993-1999 trend is drastically altered. With respect to the other goals, a number of provinces will similarly be left behind and will not realize the goals by 2015.[9]

It may be worth noting that provinces suffering from internal conflict seem generally to be lagging behind in terms realizing the MDGs, suggesting that conflict prevention and recovery are critical for these provinces to catch up with others. Peace and development go hand in hand.

---

[9] BAPPENAS, BPS. UNDP, Indonesia Human Development Report 2001, "Towards a New Consensus", October 2001.

Critical steps in the journey towards human security in Indonesia

What would be the critical steps towards human security in Indonesia?

As a first step, the Government is already preparing an MDG report to help determine more precisely whether the country is on track towards realizing the targets. The report will analyse whether and to what extent the MDG targets are on track at the provincial level, and possibly at the district level for some indicators.

A second step is the estimation of the financial cost of realizing the MDG targets at the provincial and district levels, given the progress tracked and analysed in the MDG report. This activity is already ongoing and the results will be the subject of the second National Human Development Report.

The third step could be the negotiation and adoption of a social compact between the capital city and the regions as well as between the regions for realizing the goals in an equitable way. Necessarily, that compact should take due account of uneven progress thus far and of the uneven capacity in generating and absorbing resources for development. Given the information from the MDGR on the relative progress of each province as of to date and the information from the second Indonesia HDR on what and how much it would take to realise the MDGs in the medium term and in the long term, the two reports could be used as a critical input for building a national consensus and forging a *National Millennium Development Compact.*

Unlike the global one between the poor and rich, the national compact should be between the centre and the regions as well as among the regions, taking full account of the decentralisation policy and the special regional autonomy laws for certain provinces that have been adopted in the context of the Unitary State of Indonesia. The compact could specify the targets for each of the seven goals for each province, with a corresponding resource framework and how the resources are to be raised. Any compact based on national consensus will obviously need a lot of work and consultation with

all stakeholders, but especially if it is to serve as a guide for more equitable development, across provinces and districts. There are many policy issues that need to be addressed. For instance, should existing trends towards attaining the MDGs be altered in the interest of equity through policies, programmes and allocation of public funds and if so, to what extent? In particular, should leading provinces (e.g. East Java in poverty reduction) that are on track to realize the MDGs much earlier subsidise the lagging provinces? Should leading provinces be allowed to set MDG + targets? To what extent can resources be channelled to lagging regions for reasons of equity taking account of absorptive capacity? There are many more but these are some of the issues that would need to be resolved in forging the compact.

When the MDG targets have been agreed upon through a national compact, the necessary final step would be to set them explicitly as targets of national and sub-national poverty reduction strategies, and to mainstream the formulation and implementation of those strategies into national and regional development management. The aim is to ensure that the MDG targets and resource requirements guide decision-making on development policies and allocation of public funds.

It is a long journey, a good part of the road is still unpaved, and the milestones are yet to be clearly established for many provinces. With a national compact in place and the rich countries making good on their pledges in Monterrey and Doha, that destination can be reached by 2015.