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“Freedom from want, freedom from fear and the freedom of future generations to inherit a healthy natural environment – these are the interrelated building blocks of human, and therefore national security” - Former UN Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan

“Corruption undermines democracy and the rule of law. It leads to violations of human rights. It erodes public trust in government. It can even kill - for example, when corrupt officials allow medicines to be tampered with, or when they accept bribes that enable terrorist acts to take place. […] It has adverse effects on the delivery of basic social services. It has a particularly harmful impact on the poor. And it is a major obstacle to achieving the Millennium Development Goals” - U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon

Introduction

This volume shines a light on the relationship between corruption and human security; it similarly describes how they are key factors in promoting (or not) sustainable systemic development. Corruption has a deep impact on development and is often present in situations of human need. Yet, the systemic implications of corruption are not often encompassed in contemporary anti-corruption approaches and strategies. Likewise, human security is also often misunderstood in its systemic, sustainable and significance vis-à-vis development. Clearly, a comprehensive understanding of anti-corruption requires a new framework for analysis. And some work is being accomplished in this area. For example, Transparency International (TI) recently released its Global Corruption Barometer (2013), the largest survey ever undertaken tracking public opinion of corruption in over 107 countries.¹ In this regard, the perception of corruption documented in its annual “Corruption Perception Index (CPI)” has revealed how fragile states and transitional countries have been most affected by corruption. Furthermore,
while we generally associate corruption with illegal and immoral activities of public officials and private sector leaders, corruption is increasingly being viewed as a complex phenomenon that negatively affects various aspects of our global interactions, including development aid, humanitarian assistance and emergency response, as well as international judiciary and enforcement sectors, public procurement and security sectors.

What we now understand is that corruption has a direct negative impact on the social fabric, including in the provision of health and education, as well as in the protection of other basic human rights. It also has a detrimental impact on environmental factors and sectors, including energy, water, forestry, resources and land access. As a result of this growing awareness, the international community has responded to the plague of corruption with important achievements, including the UN Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC). However, notwithstanding these advances, additional national and cross-border anti-corruption measures must be established through aligned, appropriate and properly enforced laws. Indeed, increasing respect for the rule of law is at the core of most effective anti-corruption effective mechanisms. Yet, legal mechanisms, alone, are not enough; the international community must also help develop a more comprehensive and attentive analysis of the systemic elements of corruption, as well as more fully examine the extent to which corruption undermines human security and sustainable development.

Corruption of private businesses, public officials, and nongovernmental organizations is a major impediment to the administration of Official Development Assistance (ODA) in developing countries and other insecure contexts. More specifically, according to the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD)’s annual report, drafted by its Development Assistance Committee (DAC) through the International Network on Conflict and Fragility (INCAF), the issue of corruption is particularly alarming in post-conflict and fragile states. In fact, since the 1990s, the economic, social, and environmental vulnerability of states has been an ever-growing matter of concern on the emergency, development and security agenda. And yet, despite the numerous achievements in the reduction of worldwide poverty and other development issues – as highlighted in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) – on-going challenges to human security, sustainable development and anti-corruption continue to be an urgent priority in the Post-2015 development agenda. In short, vulnerable populations and fragile states continue to experience many levels of insecurity manifested through violence, poverty, inequality and vulnerability. Thus, defense, humanitarian and development interventions will continue to have a much higher risk of failure without the establishment of proper mechanisms for the prevention and prosecution of corruption activities. Unfortunately, corruption appears to be both an effect and a systemic reality, particularly difficult to eradicate in those contexts.

The present work addresses the need for more integrated sustainable approaches to human security, and does so through the lens of sustainability and anti-corruption. Indeed, corruption needs to be better analyzed in its relation to development and human security, especially in transitional and post-conflict societies. However, only sustainable, systemic and institutionally grounded solutions to both human security and anti-corruption will adequately address the complexity and diversity of today’s globalized societies. Therefore, the purpose of this and future publications exploring aspects of sustainable humans security is to highlight how systems thinking and pragmatic comprehensive solutions could represent more suitable development
methodologies. The analyses included in this volume attempt to explore some critical intersections and cases, while offering some practical insights and systemic solutions relevant to the implementation of good governance and responsible management practice.

The original call for papers emerged from the work of the World Engagement Institute (WEI) and its International Journal of Sustainable Human Security (IJSHS) as an attempt to provide critical, analytical and systemic practical reflection on these connections. Not pretending to be exhaustive of the many issues and examples, the selected articles offer some useful insights to better understand how corruption and human security affect each other. Some of the questions behind the creation of this Journal edition included: How do we move towards a more human security centered approach for anti-corruption? How can we consider anti-corruption analyses and solutions centered on the systemic, political, social and economic factors in addition to the moral responsibilities of individuals, organizations and institutions? What effective practices can be used as examples for establishing more feasible, sustainable and systemic solutions to promote anti-corruption? What examples are out there that can help us think about the connection between anti-corruption and human security from a sustainable and systemic standpoint? Our authors - who come from a diversity of disciplines, sectors and international experiences – have reflected upon these very questions.

A Time for Sustainable Solutions

It is not self-evident that the needed explorations of specific topics in the field of sustainable human security begin with anti-corruption. Yet, one is mindful that the non-maleficence fundamental precept in medical ethics derived from the maxim ‘first, do no harm’ is relevant to the analysis of the relation between corruption and human security. Therefore, when the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC) was launched in 2000, the vision was to include companies in a shared development agenda around nine principles, including respect of human rights, labor rights and environmental rights. Leaders of the represented private companies understood their shared responsibility to promote transparency and anti-corruption, as part of their support of the UN mission. Consequently, the UNGC added Principle 10 on anti-corruption stating: “Businesses should work against corruption in all its forms, including extortion and bribery.”

Today, the UNGC’s Transparency and Anti-corruption Section has been providing numerous resources to corporations and other private sectors. In addition to various collaborative initiatives with Transparency International (TI) and the OECD’s Business and Industry Advisory Committee (BIAC), UNGC provides a useful list of anti-corruption tools stemming from convention documents, as well as from resources related to due diligence, compliance, reporting, trainings and whistle-blowing. Realizing that anti-corruption requires value formation and appropriate education of future leaders, UNGC has been instrumental to the development of the Principles of Responsible Management Education (PRME), which attempts to create a principled framework and worldwide academic community sharing a strong commitment to responsible, sustainable, accountable and transparent management practices. Academic institutions, in their diverse organizational identities as private, public and nonprofit institutions, play a fundamental role in educating future leaders for a better world. Likewise, the inclusion of anti-corruption principles and the promotion of anti-corruption practices in
global businesses, international cooperation, capacity trainings and academic programming is a vital factor for a sustainable, inclusive, and positive future.

The international community is at yet another crucial stage in history, and developing a consensus toward a more comprehensive human development agenda is critical. The Post-2015 development agenda - while building on the lessons learned during the implementation of the MDGs – also needs to consider other powerful forces and emerging issues. The relation between anti-corruption, sustainable development and human security offers the necessary integrated framework for addressing the complex issues of our global societies.

In the last five years, the fragility of states and human insecurity has emerged through tumultuous events, such as the 2008 food, fuel and financial crises, the 2011 Arab Spring, and other threats (and opportunities) intertwined in new technologies, democratic movements, climate change, systemic poverty and forced migrations. A sustainable future requires the involvement and participation of the international community with its diverse stakeholders working toward an agreed agenda for sustainable and inclusive development. This integrated direction was clearly exemplified in the year 2000 with the international community’s commitment toward the implementation of the eight MDGs and it is now further specified and extended in the Post-2015 Agenda. The Outcome Document of the 2010 High Level Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly on the MDGs generated an important impetus toward a common agenda. The global Post-2015 development agenda has been fortified as an inclusive intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder process that has generated the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and integrated them into a more comprehensive agenda with goals regarding development, sustainability and security.

The Development of Sustainable Human Security

The notion of human security is quite recent. Although numerous documents have laid the fundamental relations between peace, security, development and the environment, it was the 1994 UNDP Human Development Report (HDR) that created and shaped the concept of human security. Ten years later, Kofi Annan’s 2005 report, entitled In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security an Human Rights for All, confirmed how the integrations of these fields were interlinked to other UN reforms. Unfortunately, numerous member states and scholars have failed to fully grasp the importance of modeling the international agenda and priorities toward human security. Twenty years after the HDR report, the notion of ‘sustainable human security’ appears to be a natural evolution and convergence of numerous achievements in the understanding and prioritization of human development, sustainable development and human rights. The recent inclusion of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) that emerged after the 2012 Rio+20 Conference with the continuation of the MDGs in the Post-2015 development agenda is a promising sign. The integrated notion of sustainable human security represents the next stage in global responsibility for building a peaceful, secure, prosperous, and sustainable future for all. It integrates concerns for peace, poverty, pollution and participation with a human-centered perspective.

The notion of sustainable human security emerges from at least thirty years of reflection in line with sustainable development, human rights based development, human security and human development. The 1983 Brundtland Report, Our Common Future, was a groundbreaking
achievement in defining the concept of sustainable development – “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” The World Commission on Environment and Development (also known as the Brundtland Commission for the leadership of Gro Harlem Brundtland, former Prime Minister of Norway) insisted on the importance of going beyond the traditional economic and physical understanding of development and poverty, and it provided a definition for including social, environmental and political aspects. It also insisted that ‘development’ is about improving our common situation; for both developed and developing countries.

This human-centered understanding of development reached a fuller understanding with the publication of the first Human Development Report (HDR) and the introduction of the 1990 Human Development Index (HDI). Under the leadership and vision of Pakistani economist Mahbub ul Haq and Indian Nobel Laureate Amartya Sen, the report placed people at the center of the development process and reassessed development not only on economic terms, but also on health and education. Poverty was contextualized not simply in economic terms, but as a quality of life matter. Therefore, rather than simply concentrating on capital wealth, development began being envisioned in terms of providing choice and freedom, with ‘people’ representing “the real wealth of a nation.”

The sustainable challenges to - and opportunities in - development were further defined during the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, together with the 2002 Rio+10 (or Johannesburg
Summit), and the 2012 Rio+20 Summit. Analysis of documents that emerged from these summits clearly underscores the importance of integrating economic factors in development (prosperity) with social (people), environmental (planet) and governance (political) elements. The Agenda 21 document that emerged from the first Earth Summit further highlighted the governmental and intergovernmental responsibilities necessary for executing sustainable development at local, national and international levels. Additionally, the Johannesburg Summit most certainly contributed to the integration of governance into the economic, social and environmental pillars of sustainability. It also reaffirmed the governance commitment toward the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and further advanced understanding of sustainable capacity development. Unfortunately, the event was eclipsed by the heavy political, security and military pressures emerging from the War-on Terror in the immediate Post 9/11 period. The Future We Want documents emerging from the Rio+20, as well as the merging of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with the MDGs in the Post-2015 development agenda, reaffirmed the need for a sustainable, human centered development approach. In spite of the many shortcomings and setbacks, the global understanding and international commitment to a better world have converged into a more integrated approach. Sustainable human security is a paradigm that encompasses most of these understandings and developments.

The Intersecting Dimensions of Sustainable Human Security

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who included ‘freedom from want’ and ‘freedom from fear’ in his celebrated 1941 State of the Union Speech, anticipated a broader understanding of human rights and what later came to be known as ‘human security’. Since then, our understanding of human security has been evolving, just as it has for human rights. It started with first-generation concepts of civil and political rights (e.g., right to life and political participation), morphed into a second-generation focus on economic, social and cultural rights (e.g., the right to subsistence), and emerged from the process as the so-called third-generation of solidarity rights (e.g., right to peace, right to clean environment). Since 1994, the notion of human security has expanded into four pillars and typologies of fear, sifting from an emphasis on nation-states to a human-centered perspective. For example, reflections emerging from the practices of human security in Japan have emphasized the ‘freedom from want’ aspect. Likewise, those emerging from Canada have emphasized ‘freedom from fear’. Meanwhile, Kofi Annan’s In Larger Freedom (2005) introduced yet another expansion of traditional notions of human security: freedom to live in dignity – just as the 2005 introduction of the notion of environmental security expanded the paradigm, thus evincing a fourth expansion of human security that incorporates sustainable institutional reforms of global environmental governance. We emphasize, however, that just as with the expanding notion of human rights, human security is indivisible. Thus, no state or program should stress one aspect of human security at the expense of others.

Although the literature on human security is significant, more work is needed to deepen our understanding of the integrated notion of sustainability with human security and the implications on sustainable development, human rights, labor rights, environmental rights, anti-corruption, climate change, and international law among others. This said, the following is a brief overview of the four expansions (or four pillars) of the current concept of ‘sustainable human security.’

1. **Freedom from Fear (Human Survival):** Human security is about human emergency. It starts with the protection of individuals and communities from natural and
Human-made disasters alongside other situations of violence and conflicts. However, this element of human survival cannot be dissociated from other forms of security, as violent threats are often strongly associated with poverty, lack of capacity, exploitation and inequity. Humanitarian emergency assistance, peace building, conflict prevention, management and resolution are part of the shared global responsibility to the foundation of human security. The difference with national security is that threats are perceived and evaluated not in relation to nation-states but to human beings and humanity. Personal security is integral to human security. Personal security is often interlinked with other forms of fear caused by community, political, national and public threats. The freedom from fear includes protecting people from physical violence, whether caused by governmental authorities, non-state actors, violent individuals, violent crime or other forms of abuse.

2. **Freedom from Want (Human Development):** Human security is about human development. It includes freedom from want often visible in extreme poverty, recurring poverty and systemic poverty. It is expressed by a subset of security fields well known in the development literature. These include economic security, food security, health security, educational security, and environmental securities. While ‘freedom from fear’ is foremost about human survival and emergency, the ‘freedom from want’ dimension of human security is foremost about human development and availability of opportunity. Economic security represents a system that guarantees a basic income for individuals and families through adequately remunerative work and ‘decent work’.

A public policy system designed around the notion of economic security would also provide a publicly financed safety net as a last resort for unemployment and other situations in which basic income from remunerative work is insufficient. Food security is another central dimension of human security. It implies that all people at all times have both physical and economic access to basic food. According to the United Nations, food insecurity is not caused by food availability in itself, but by other factors such as food price speculation, poor distribution, lack of purchasing power, and inadequate policies, or deliberate strategies in violent contexts. Health Security is also integral to human security. It is a major priority in the MDGs and it aims to guarantee a minimum protection from diseases and unhealthy lifestyles.

3. **Freedom from Shame (Human Dignity):** Human security is about human dignity. Beyond the emergency and development foundation expressed in the freedom from fear and freedom from want, the third dimension of human security has to do with the recognition of the fundamental human rights of every individual. Hence respect for the rule of law and the body of international law that guarantee and promote quality of life in all its aspects is at the core of this dimension. This includes elements of diversity respect and human fulfillment in line with racial, ethnic, cultural, gender, socio-economic and other types of diversity. The respect, protection and preservation of human (biocultural) diversity in its intertwined dimensions of biological, cultural and linguistic is critical to diversity of life and the preservation of human life.

4. **Freedom from Vulnerability (Human Sustainability):** Human security is about human sustainability. The environmental challenges of our society have a human
security perspective.\textsuperscript{15} From this perspective, human security is closely related to environmental challenges and environmental security. The focus is the protection of people from short and long-term natural disasters, especially through the reduction and mitigation of man-made threats in nature. These include access to clean water and resources in developing countries and climate threats due to pollution, global warming, and greenhouse gases that threat human survival in this planet. The objective and priorities of intervention are about diminishing human vulnerability while increasing resilience and building sustainable capacity.

An individual’s human rights and development revolve around the possession of these four fundamental freedoms. The sustainable human security movement incorporates the notion that every human being has the right to live in a secure environment, live with access to all necessary resources, and live with pride and dignity. The concept of ‘sustainability’ in regards to human security altogether focuses on the long-term solutions for the overarching aspects of human security, including the institutional, economic, social, and environmental aspects. Since human development is one of the most important issues in the world today, it is essential to have frameworks such as sustainable human security to create a foundation in which the fundamental freedom to human life can be fully exuberated and developed. The notion of human security is still in expansion and will surely be a central paradigm in peace, development and human rights in the years to come.\textsuperscript{16} Dr. Alfredo Sfeir-Younis, in his sustainable
development and human rights work at the World Bank has been instrumental to lay the foundations for the integrated notion of sustainable human security.\textsuperscript{17}

The sustainable human security framework offers essential guidelines for addressing the underlying causes of numerous levels of human insecurity. One of those insecurity levels rests in the social and political corruption plaguing many national governments today. Corruption, as further discussed below, systematically undermines the positive work being done through a sustainable human security framework.\textsuperscript{18} In order for these essential human freedoms to become reality, anti-corruption methods must interlock and strongly reinforce the sustainable human security framework. The connection between these two frameworks can positively benefit each other while holistically and most effectively addressing the most destabilizing acts of corruption today. It is with this mindset we further inspect the characteristics of corruption.

**Sustainable Human Security for Good Governance**

In 2003, the United Nations Commission on Human Security reaffirmed how the increasing complexities of economic, social, political and environmental insecurity requires a paradigm shift. Co-chaired by Sadako Ogata and Amartya Sen, the report entitled *Human Security Now*, insisted that such insecurities effectively demands an integrated approach.\textsuperscript{19} Human security was clearly recognized as the necessary integrated paradigm with interrelated frameworks in response to the challenges in today's world. It presented human security as protection of vital freedoms and as shared responsibility on “creating systems that give people the building blocks of survival, dignity and livelihood.”\textsuperscript{20} Therefore, human security was recognized in its dimensions of both ‘shielding’ people from acute threats and ‘empowering’ people to take charge of their own lives. The Commission report made clear policy recommendations in a number of interrelated areas of human security including “conflict and poverty, protecting people during violent conflict and in post-conflict situations, defending people who are forced to move, overcoming economic insecurities, guaranteeing the availability and affordability of essential health care, and ensuring the elimination of illiteracy and educational deprivation and of schools that promote intolerance.”\textsuperscript{21}

The achievement of human security in societies is interlinked to the establishment of good governance practices, based on long-term sustainable peace, reinforced by effective democratic institutions, rule of law, and inclusive economic opportunities. In post conflict and transitional societies a top priority should be the establishment of institutions that protect people, uphold the rule of law, and establish good governance systems for political, economic and social growth. Like emergency interventions should be linked to development plans, post-conflict governance capacity should be linked to sustainable institutional solutions. Unfortunately, peace settlements address governance as a short-term stability strategy rather than long-term sustainability solution. Hence, “holding elections and establishing a “legitimate democratic” regime become part of the exit strategy for international actors, rather than a realistic measure of good governance.”\textsuperscript{22} In other words, to avoid superficial, short-term solutions and pursuing long-term sustainable human security solutions the key is empowerment and capacity development. This would require a coordinated, multilayered, multi-sector and multidisciplinary approach centered on accompanying the development of ‘sustainable’ capacities of individuals, communities, organizations and institutions. Good governance is closely linked to the empowerment of people and communities. Without the effective presence of good governance
mechanisms, people cannot fully participate and unless people and communities are empowered to let their voices be heard or to participate in decision-making, good governance is not possible. Good governance is therefore interlinked to all the aspects of ‘freedoms’ and ‘fulfillments’ of human security. The Commission defines Human Security as protection of “the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfillment.” 23

“Human security means protecting fundamental freedoms—freedoms that are the essence of life. It means protecting people from critical (severe) and pervasive (widespread) threats and situations. It means using processes that build on people’s strengths and aspirations. It means creating political, social, environmental, economic, military and cultural systems that together give people the building blocks of survival, livelihood and dignity.” 24

Human security is inherently ‘prevention-focused’, that is, it addresses root causes and promotes structural (personal, community, organizational, institutional levels) and behavioral changes that can help prevent the crises from arising in the future. In this respect, human security is inherently ‘sustainable-oriented’ as it looks at creating the conditions that guarantee the systemic elements for protection and empowerment. While protection is a top-down process addressing norms, processes and institutions required protecting people from critical and pervasive threats; empowerment is a bottom-up approach and strategies that enable people to develop their ‘sustained’ capacities and resilience to difficult situations. The two dual mutually reinforcing pillars of protection and empowerment become a hybrid approach for implementing human security solutions. This approach “combines top-down norms, processes and institutions, including the establishment of the rule of law, good governance, accountability and social protective instruments with a bottom-up focus in which democratic processes support the important role of individuals and communities as actors in defining and implementing their essential freedoms.” 25

The international community has a responsibility to continue reflecting and implementing the notions and practices of human security. The UN 2005 World Summit recognized the importance of supporting a collective reflection on the opportunities that the integrated notion of human security to the ever increasing human threats from economic, social, political and environmental vulnerabilities. 26 The UN Security Council has also recognized the importance of this integrated approach and addressed the core concerns of the human security concept along sustainable development and good governance.

That peace, security and development are mutually reinforcing, and that a broad strategy is needed to address the root causes of armed conflict and political and social crises in a comprehensive manner, including by promoting sustainable development, poverty eradication, national reconciliation, good governance, democracy, gender equality, the rule of law and respect for and protection of human rights. 27

It is within these integrated views and hybrid approaches of human security that the relation with sustainable solutions and good governance emerges. Rather than simply equate ‘sustainability’ with the prevention and mitigation of environmental threats to human security (sustainable security) 28 the notion of ‘sustainable human security’ addresses the multiplicity of fears and complexity of human insecurities. It also re-centers the definition and its applications
into a good-governance approach based in protection, empowerment and capacity development. In this respect, dysfunctional government institutions that may tolerate, foster, or legitimize corruption practices undermine human security efforts at its core. It is the responsibility of all of us to foster a culture of transparency, accountability and rule of law for achieving an equitable, inclusive and prosperous future for all.

The implementation of top-down and bottom-up human security approaches should centers the establishment of mechanisms, institutions and policies for good governance, transparency, accountability and participatory processes supporting people in their essential freedoms. Bad governance exemplified in misguided exercise of authority, abuse of power, corruption and bribery prevent a society working towards the common good. Such practices erode public trust, stifle development, increase inequalities, accelerate the environmental destruction, and frustrate the pursuit of justice. Instead, the promotion of good governance practices based respect for the rule of law, democracy, political accountability, government flexibility and responsiveness to its citizens increase human security. Increasing good governance capacity is generally identified beneficial for socio-economic development. However, not much studied have been produced to explore the theoretical relations and practical implications of good governance with human security. Good governance, at the local, national and international levels is perhaps the single most important factor in promoting development and advancing the cause of peace. Yet, it also depends on implementing effective political reforms, transparent institutional development, establishing adequate anti-corruption mechanisms, and building capacity to effectively and implement the rule of law.

Anti-corruption Solutions for Sustainable Human Security

Corruption is a phenomenon undermining international development efforts and it ultimately undermines human security. Transparency International (TI) defines corruption as “the abuse of entrusted power for private gain” at three levels: petty (management level), grand (leadership level) and political (systemic level).

“Grand corruption consists of acts committed at a high level of government that distort policies or the central functioning of the state, enabling leaders to benefit at the expense of the public good. Petty corruption refers to everyday abuse of entrusted power by low- and mid-level public officials in their interactions with ordinary citizens, who often are trying to access basic goods or services in places like hospitals, schools, police departments and other agencies. Political corruption is a manipulation of policies, institutions and rules of procedure in the allocation of resources and financing by political decision makers, who abuse their position to sustain their power, status and wealth.”

Corruption, both in its grand and petty typologies, undermines humanitarian assistance, poverty alleviation, human development and human security. In emergencies, post conflict and transitional countries, corruption often takes the form of a systemic and endemic complex phenomenon linked to organized crime and correlated to weak institutions. Numerous studies have demonstrated how corruption contributed to the systemic vulnerability of people already affected by violence, disasters, poverty and inequality. The comprehensive and promising
concept of human security needs to be reexamined in light of manifestations of corruption in humanitarian emergencies, peace-building, post-conflict, human rights and corporate participation in development programs among others.

During the past decade corruption has ranked highly on the agenda of multinational development agencies, private firms, and policy-makers; it has become one of the most prominent managerial issues at the individual, organizational, national and international level. The recent increase in interest in corruption is related to a couple of factors, the most important being that corruption has become more prevalent in the global economy and that the fight against corruption is central to the struggle for human rights and thus for human security. Corruption is the private gains of individuals and groups with the consequence of undermining social gains and proper democratic, accountable and transparent processes for nation building. For too long the anti-corruption and human security movements have been working in parallel rather than tackling these problems together.

Corruption, which is generally associated with weaker states and less investment, has been a global problem for many years now, and even with the recent international move to combat this issue, there lacks a complete and distinct definition of the term. However, some scholars suggest corruption to be the “private gains of individuals and groups with the consequence of undermining social gains and proper democratic, accountable and transparent processes for nation building.” From this definition, we conclude that corruption, in a broad sense, is a process that undermines proper democratic initiatives. More specifically, “corruption is behavior which deviates from the formal duties of a public role because of private-regarding (personal, close family, private clique) pecuniary or status gains; or violates rules against the exercise of certain types of private-regarding influence. This includes such behavior as bribery, nepotism, and misappropriation.” The typical outcome of corruption undermines the good work being done by international nongovernmental organizations and other humanitarian efforts, reinforces insecurity, and completely dismantles the legitimacy of the state.

The next step in addressing this problem is to reexamine current human security initiatives, while keeping anti-corruption methods in mind. This option becomes a more comprehensive framework that effectively addresses human security issues and corruption. Anti-corruption scholars, as well, must fully understand the work of the human security framework and thus effectively integrate the two to produce a guideline to holistically and more effectively combat human security problems. We must explore the interlocking connections between human security and corruption in order to establish a sustainable human security model that will improve the issues of human survival (freedom from fear), human development (freedom from want), human dignity (freedom from shame), and human sustainability (freedom from vulnerability) at the national and international levels.

When confronting the issue of human survival and the freedom from fear pillar, the anti-corruption methods and the human security framework must interlock to create better opportunities for human development. For example, when addressing the human survival pillar, individual freedom from fear, the holistic approach needs to address issues of personal security (physical harm, pain, rejection, murder, crime) and political security (corrupt officials, unjust laws, inadequate judicial system) simultaneously. While addressing these issues independently may seem more practical, a tactic that will produce in depth outcomes is addressing these
problems together to create a sustainable impact that focuses on human survival from every angle. Other issues within the human survival pillar that must be addressed are community security, national security and public security.

In the human development pillar (freedom from want) the same tactic is necessary. Innovative leaders must address the underlying causes of security while addressing some seemingly unimportant aspects of human security. The sustainable human security framework combined with anti-corruption measures must simultaneously and with equal force address economic security, food security, and health security issues. Since these three development aspects heavily interlock with one another, they must be addressed simultaneously. In many situations, economic security depends on health and food security and vice versa. For example, in order for individuals to be able to work and sustain themselves they must be both physically and mentally capable. Furthermore, if people lack food or access to health care, they are unable to make an honest living to provide for themselves financially. If one of these issues in the human development pillar is not addressed to the fullest extent like other issues in the same pillar, the lack of effective development will most likely undermine the work being done to improve ones overall security.

With regard to the human dignity pillar that focuses on the human right to be free from shame, the same comprehensive, sustainable framework must be applied. Some of the primary security issues within this framework include human rights, rule of law, the state’s judicial system, democratic civil participation, and decent and wholesome work. While all of these issues are significant enough to address independently, that type of framework is no longer effective. Instead, the notion of combining human security initiatives to address both human rights and the judicial system is insisted. Furthermore, if an individual has human rights but has no substantial and honest judicial system, there is no point in having human rights if they cannot be used. On the other hand, if a state has a completely secure and functional judicial system meant to promote security for people, but the people do not possess other civil human rights the entire system becomes undermined and therefore ineffective in the long run. In order to stay away from initiatives that waste time, resources, and innovation we must create a sustainable framework that encompasses the entire wellbeing of an individual at all levels of development and from every angle of human security. ‘Sustainable’ solutions to the issue of corruption and human insecurity generally link back to creating and nurturing good governance initiatives. While good governance is a perfect solution, it is not an option for nations that lack institutional stability, social civility, and community security.38 The nations most affected by corruption are those that struggle with strong institutions and foundations. Other scholars believe that structural mechanisms that detect corruption, like Transparency International, will also assist in the effort to end corruption.39 These may seem like unreachable goals, but they are steps needed to be taken in order to have a sustainable impact on the lives of the poor and marginalized and to create a world of hope and security.

The Purposes and Focus of the Studies

The integrated dimensions of sustainable human security require a careful, inter-disciplinary and international analysis relevant to both the practices and theories of sustainability and human security. Such integrations are priorities for numerous inter-governmental and inter-organizational development initiatives, including those of the Post-2015 sustainable development
agenda. United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon, recently reaffirmed the centrality that anti-corruption and good governance should have in the Post-2015 development agenda, poverty eradication and the promotion of human rights.

“Corruption defies and undermines fundamental human rights. It exacerbates poverty. It deepens inequality by diverting money sorely needed for health care, education and other essential services in our societies. And it in fact undermines institutions and the beliefs in the systems that we have created for these institutions. It is a very dangerous phenomenon. It increases the costs of doing business. It distorts markets. It impedes economic growth. It is driven by and feeds criminal activity. It results in malfunctioning state institutions and weak governance. It is a barrier to achieving the Millennium Development Goals, and our work for a more equitable and prosperous world. That is why anti-corruption measures, transparency, the rule of law and good governance should be taken into account as we set global development priorities for the post-2015 period.”

Good governance capacity, rule of law institutional development, and sustainable human security are also inherent to the mission of international non-governmental organizations that, like the World Engagement Institute (WEI), are committed to the programs, priorities and methods for dialogue and collaboration across diverse stakeholders and perspectives. Indeed, addressing the complex relations of these dimensions of human security require both analytical capacity intercepted by practical knowledge. This volume and its fit with the mission of the International Journal of Sustainable Human Security provides the academic, analytical and practically relevant space for understanding and divulgate the dimensions of sustainability in human security. The relation between human security and corruption also requires a careful articulation of its diverse dimensions, manifestations and long term consequences on human beings, communities, sectors, countries and international relations. In spite of the good contributions of other journals addressing human security, sustainable development and human rights, there is a gap in the analysis of these fields in relation to one another and to specific human security subjects.

The contributions included in this volume provide theoretically relevant and practically useful solutions to the implementation of anti-corruption practices in the context of human security. Their multidisciplinary identities and diverse perspectives reflect the needs for understanding the complexity of these issues in a collaborative, multi-dimensional and multi-sectoral framework. They offer systemic analyses and critical studies on the relation of corruption and human security from American, European, Asian, African and Middle Eastern perspectives.

Charles E. Tucker’s Corruption and Human Security: Prepare for the Rainy Day or be Prepared to Drain the Swamp offers a detailed and critical analysis of the impact that development aid has on government corruption. Through numerous examples and well-documented scrutiny on the responsibility to build capacity and causal effect that aid has in perverting a country’s governance system. Floods of money through either natural resources or development aid - but without adequate capacity development - risk of converting localized petty corruption into institutionalized grand corruption. A type of corruption that is probably impossible to reverse through traditional anti-corruption campaigns. The cases examined of grand corruption institutionalism offer the reason for the suggested systemic (perhaps sustainable) solutions
beyond punitive measures and with an ex ante anti-corruption approach based regularization through amnesty programs and other programs for bringing the underground economy into the open.

Angela Dettori and Ernestina Giudici’s *Sustainability: Towards an Anti-corruption Strategy to Protect Human Rights in Multicultural Societies* explores the notion of sustainable human security in relation to the workforce environment and the success of businesses. Through a review of organizational central dimensions trust, equality, respect, and multiculturalism, the study offers some solutions on the various initiatives that sustainable enterprises can undertake to combat human insecurity. In this line, the work shows how sustainability reduces corruption by working to prevent human rights violations within the working environment.

Claudia Melis and Ernestina Giudici’s *Corruption and Human Security: A Further Point to be Added on Multinationals Companies’ Corporate Social Responsibility Agenda?* explores the relation of human security and corruption in connection with Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). They make an argument for how linking human security and corruption through the lens of CSR may improve our understanding about the possibilities for mitigating corruption. The examples and solutions provided are relevant to multinational companies practicing CSR and actively engaged in reducing corruption activities.

Paolo Canonico, Stefano Consiglio, Ernesto De Nito, and Gianluigi Mangia’s “*Garbage is Gold*: The Emerging Threat for Human Security” explores the consequences of corruption on human security, specifically on health conditions and the quality of life. Through an analysis of managerial corruption and the notion of human security, they present a case study related to the illegal trafficking of toxic waste from Northern Italy to the Campania region. The study is based on qualitative research and official judiciary sources.

Jae Eon Yu’s *The holistic educational approach for anti-corruption in human security: The case of Korean business education*, proposes a systems approach through a holistic business education centered on inclusiveness and co-operative human security. The study argues that unethical practices, including corruption practices, are best addressed through business education centered on ethical programs, participatory processes, and action learning aimed at increasing ethical sensitivity for human security. A systems approach is necessary for business ethics education as demonstrated in the cases of educational practices in Korean universities.

Kemi Ogunyemi’s *Human Security and Development: Anti-corruption Solutions* examines how human security is understood and how anti-corruption efforts could enhance it. Through short narratives of the human experience in Nigeria, the study explores the relationship between corruption and human security in the context of a developing country. Human security is considered in the context of human rights and development ethics. Local engagement and the consideration of narratives of people in specific situations constitute an invaluable resource for understanding and resolving the challenges of corruption and human security.

Dima Jamali, Alessandro Lanteri, and Amy Walburn’s *Corruption and Economic Security in the Arab Countries: The Role of Business Schools* provides a study of accountability and corruption and its positive or negative repercussions on human security in Arab societies. They suggest that business schools can actively fight corruption and promote economic security by showing how
corruption practices promote inefficient economic transactions and undermines economic security. They provide a convincing argument and practical solutions for business schools and what they can do to enhance human and economic security by reducing the occurrence and dependence on corruption in Arab states.
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Notes

9 The Government of Japan considers Freedom from Fear and Freedom from Want to be equal in developing Japan’s foreign policy. See http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/human_secu/
10 Canada has been a critical player in the efforts to ban landmines and has incorporated the "Freedom from Fear" agenda as a primary component in its own foreign policy. See also the works and contributions of the Vancouver, Canada’s Human Security Report Project (HSRP) at http://www.hsrgroup.org/
13 The International Labour Organization (ILO) has embraced the notion of ‘decent work.’ “Decent work sums up the aspirations of people in their working lives. It involves opportunities for work that is productive and delivers a fair income, security in the workplace and social protection for families, better prospects for personal development and social integration, freedom for people to express their concerns, organize and participate in the decisions that affect their lives and equality of opportunity and treatment for all women and men.” Read more at www.ilo.org/global/topics/decent-work
To further explore the human security dimensions of environmental challenges see the works of the International Human Dimensions Programme (IHDP) at http://www.ihdp.unu.edu and the United Nations University’s Institute for Environment and Human Security (UNU-EHS) at http://www.ehs.unu.edu/


Ibid.


Ibid, p. 4.

Ibid.


General Assembly resolution 60/1, paragraph 143. “We stress the right of people to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair. We recognize that all individuals, in particular the vulnerable people, are entitled to freedom from fear and freedom from want, with an equal opportunity to enjoy all their rights and fully develop their human potential. To this end, we commit ourselves to discussing and defining the notion of human security in the General Assembly.”

Security Council resolution 1625 (2005)


32 Ibid.
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