

THE ROAD TO INSECURITY: HOW ECONOMIC GROWTH ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT IS MAKING THE WORLD MORE INSECURE

MOHAMMAD AZAHARUDDIN ANSARI¹

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, K N P G College, Bhadohi, U.P. INDIA

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to examine the complex relationship between development and security and to identify some, if not all, of the major harms brought about by the indiscriminate pursuit of economic growth. Conventionally, development has been defined and understood in terms of economic growth. Obsession with this understanding of development has begotten several threats and challenges, like environmental degradation, sea level rise, global warming, deforestation, acute centralization of wealth, etc., that are posing existential threats to the security and wellbeing of people. Thus, economic growth-oriented development has resulted in completely antagonistic consequences in terms of people and our planet. A fundamental contradiction seems to have arisen between development and security. This paper contends that if development is understood in terms of the broad concept of human development, development and security would no longer remain contradictory; on the contrary, they would become mutually interdependent and complementary. Human security cannot exist without human development, and human development cannot be imagined without human security.

KEYWORDS: *Economic growth, development, security, inequality.*

INTRODUCTION

Although the pursuit of security and development can be traced back to ancient times, its relevance in the twenty-first century is unparalleled. In conventional understanding, economic growth oriented development has been accepted as a reliable mean through which the goal of prosperity and security can be realized. It was precisely for this reason that throughout the twentieth century, development and developmental policies constituted the backbone of governance and policymaking. Leaders everywhere, regardless of their political inclinations and affiliations, are seen declaring their desire to have their economies included in the list of the world's fastest-growing economies. Never before has economic growth dominated the economic agenda (Balakrishnan 2024).

Security and development are fascinating concepts that are worthwhile to realize. Even though these concepts are widely discussed in the domains of academia and policymaking, there are still a lot of ambiguities surrounding them. Historically, growth in a number of macroeconomic indicators—such as employment, GDP, investment, and gross national income—has been used to define development. To put it another way, economic growth and development have been defined as synonymous and for that reason economic development has been equated with economic growth. This generalization's central tenet was that human welfare and

prosperity are inextricably linked to faster economic growth. The road to security and prosperity is widely believed to pass through economic growth.

The concept of development with this narrow scope has been mainly the subject of the discipline of economics. According to the classical economists, if any state manages surplus wealth production, it will definitely benefit every section of society. In academics, this theory of classical economics is known as "trickle-down theory." There are several interpretations, theories, and approaches prevailing regarding economic growth-oriented development that can be categorized into two grand schools of thought. The first is Western-individualist, and the second is Asian-Communitarian school. It is interesting to note that in this case, both schools agree on the end even though they disagree on the means.

In this context, both schools agree that achieving a higher rate of growth in macro-indicators of economy is the ultimate goal. However, in order to achieve this goal, the Western-individualist school advocates for a free market economy, open society as well as the civil and political freedom of individuals; conversely, the Asian-communitarian school holds that limiting or suspending an individual's liberty is acceptable in order to pave the way for achieving rapid economic growth. The first Prime Minister of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew, was a major proponent of the Asian-communitarian

school, also known as the Lee thesis (Sen 2001, 148). The Asian-communitarian school contends that the majority of third-world nations continue to struggle with extreme poverty, underdevelopment, and backwardness, while the West has already reached the Rostow's last stage of economic growth. If this is the case, various socio-economic and cultural rights (collective rights) may take precedence over the political and civil rights (individual rights) that the West stands for.

In the discourse of growth-oriented, narrow concept of development, the central place is assigned to the economy, GDP, foreign investment, national income, employment, etc. It is important to note that while these growth-related factors are important, they are insufficient on their own. Furthermore, as this paper aims to demonstrate, the obsession with these narrow economic indicators exclusively generates almost contrary reality. The obsession with achieving a faster rate of economic growth has led to numerous threats and challenges to human existence on a global scale. The blind pursuit of skyrocketing economic growth has brought humanity to a juncture where it is becoming difficult to distinguish between development and destruction. Has economic growth-oriented development made us more secure, or has it become a source of insecurity not only for human beings but also for the whole planet? Answering this question necessitates a review of the narrow concept of development and the inherent contradiction in it. Following are some detrimental outcomes of pursuing the economic growth oriented development.

CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH IN FEW HANDS

One of the most severe negative effects of growth-oriented development is the unprecedented concentration of wealth in a small number of hands. Without a doubt, the phenomenon of wealth inequality is not new. What is new is the ever-widening gap between the haves and the have-nots—a handiwork of the process of liberalization and privatization. Beyond the conventional North-South divide, wealth inequality has now become a global phenomenon. Wealth inequality can be of two types; the first is *horizontal inequality*, and the other is *vertical inequality*. Economic growth-oriented development, accompanied by liberalization and privatization, has worsened both types of inequalities. A study published in 2024 by Oxfam International amazingly demystifies that the richest 1 percent have more wealth than the bottom 95 percent of the world's population put together (Oxfam International 2024). Concentration of wealth is now a universal phenomenon. To understand this phenomenon, let us look at India as an example.

The aforementioned statistics are sufficient to illustrate the reality of an ever-expanding wealth inequality between the rich and the poor. Unquestionably, growth-oriented development has brought humanity unmatched material advancement, but this comes at a price. Massive wealth

inequality brought about by unrestricted neo-liberal capitalism and growth-oriented development has various negative effects on human security and well-being as well as society as a whole. Wealth, possession, and the opportunity to participate in wealth creation are among those values that are allocated authoritatively by the state. It basically concerns with who gets what, when, and how that puts these issues of possession under the rubric of politics. Rights and accommodations in any political system are contingent upon political legitimacy; therefore, competition between and among the different groups of society will inevitably emerge in an effort to get their values prioritized in the allocation process.

Table 1:

Share of national wealth own by Indians- 2023

Top 0.1% richest owns	29% of National Wealth
Top 01% richest owns	39.5% of National Wealth
Top 10% richest owns	64.6% of National Wealth
Middle 40% owns	29% of National Wealth
Bottom 50% owns	6.5% of National Wealth

Source: (Bharti, Chancel, Piketty and Somanchi 2024)

As such, extreme wealth disparity undermines the social fabric and cohesiveness of any society. Wealth inequality generated by neoliberal economic policies makes the situation worse in societies like India that are already divided on the caste, religion, ethnicity, and region lines. It fosters mistrust and conflict between and among the different social classes and groups, which eventually results in a loss of faith in the government, ethnic and political violence, and a crisis of political legitimacy. Inequality that exists horizontally as well as vertically in any particular country has the potential to pose a grave threat to the unity and territorial integrity of the country. These threats to territorial unity and integrity may be in the form of violent ethnic movements, insurgencies, separatism, terrorism, or even secessionism. The cases of Sri Lanka, Balochistan in Pakistan, Manipur in India, and what was formerly known as East Pakistan (now Bangladesh) all lend credence to this theory.

All forms of inequality originate from economic inequality. Inequality of entitlements breeds inequality of opportunities. In this context, the declaration of different sorts of constitutional rights proves to be in vain, as only well-off individuals or classes of society are able to consume numerous socio-political rights. For an empty stomach, bread is more important than a hollow declaration of rights. Due to this inequality of opportunities, a sizable portion of society is deprived, which in turn leads to the exclusion of these groups from mainstream society and politics. This phenomenon makes society, economy, and polity more exclusive. This socio-political exclusion paves the way for a vicious cycle of

underdevelopment, poverty, and conflict, particularly in multiethnic societies (Stewart 2008). As we have discussed, these problems of poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, health, and socio-political marginalization not only hinder the operation of any economy but also limit the choices available to individuals.

Apart from various socio-political ramifications, there is also an economic implication of wealth inequality for the economy of any country. Massive economic disparity exacerbates the condition of poverty. It is a well-established fact that the economy faces a shortage of skilled labor when health, education, and skill development are not adequately provided. Lack of efficient and productive labour force definitely hinders a country's economic development in the long term. Massive and institutionalized inequality, especially inequality of opportunity, creates an environment that is conducive to the growth of many evils, including crime, unsustainable exploitation of resources, corruption, and nepotism.

UNPRECEDENTED ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION AND CLIMATE CHANGE

The execution of traditional notion of development is rightly blamed for the unprecedented level of pollution that is currently seriously endangering humankind's future. The traditional paradigm of development places great emphasis on GDP growth and national income growth, which is why rapid industrialization is seen as instrumental. The process of rapid industrialization has polluted the planet unprecedentedly. Global warming, desertification of land, sea level rise, deforestation and biodiversity loss are a few of the consequences of rapid industrialization in the name of development that themselves endanger human security and existence on a global scale. The problem of climate change is one of the most complex challenges to humanity in the 21st century. Both the causes and the consequences of climate change are global. These issues cannot be attributed to any one nation or group of nations. In the same way, no country or group of countries can be immune to the disastrous effects of the aforementioned challenges. In this sense, these climatic issues are global in nature and scope, thus underscoring the need for collaborative efforts to tackle them.

Economic growth oriented development is buttressed on maximum production and consumption. It has led to reckless consumption, unsustainable exploitation of natural resources, massive industrialisation and urbanisation, and unmanageable waste generation. Economic growth is voracious. Cities with millions of high-consumption residents act like huge vacuum cleaners, sucking in resources and then blowing out huge volumes of wastes that must be buried, dumped into the oceans, or vented into the atmosphere (Hamilton 2003, 184). Apart from other things, unchecked emissions of greenhouse gases are contributing to the rising global average temperature

of the earth, leading to sea level rise, increased frequency of extreme weather events, and ecosystem disruptions. All these changes have various crucial ramifications on the sustainability of life on earth.

Numerous recent studies conducted across a range of academic fields have highlighted the intricate connection between climate change and socio-political instability (Scheffran et al. 2024). Recent studies have shown that socio-political instability, ethnic conflicts, violence, and other issues may be worsened by climate change, especially in developing nations (UNFCCC 2022). An agriculture-based economy can be used as a concrete illustration of this theory. The agricultural sector employs the vast majority of people in underdeveloped and developing nations; their very existence depends on the kindness of the weather. The unpredictability of weather patterns and climate change forces large numbers of agricultural workers to migrate to urban areas in search of new employment opportunities, resulting in a fundamental shift in the demographic makeup of the affected area or city. Even though a shift in the demographic composition on its own might not result in issues, it undoubtedly creates an environment that is favorable for aggressive and violent politics. Mass displacement caused by climate change and rapid industrialization is notorious for breeding demagogues (Bhoomiputras) who indulge in identity politics, at times by fanning hatred, polarisation and violence in society (Chua, Amy 2004).

ECONOMIC GROWTH AS AN END WHILE NATURE AND HUMANS AS MEANS

Rapid economic growth is perceived by the economic growth-oriented development paradigm as the panacea for eliminating socio-economic backwardness in all nations, regardless of their ideological leanings. Interestingly, despite being antagonistic to each other, economic growth is worshipped by both capitalist and socialist countries. During the Cold War, both camps unanimously agreed on the desirability of economic growth, despite the ideological divide. On that, all agreed. What they disagreed about was which system of economic organisation—socialism or capitalism— could generate more growth (Hamilton 2003, 06). Even today, every state has an obsession with GDP and economic growth, and they invest resources and strategies to make their economies one of the fastest-growing in the world. A high rate of economic growth is fetishised in a way that it becomes an end in itself (Hickel 2020). In contrast, people, nature, and natural resources are seen as a means to an end: economic growth. Neoliberal capitalism's attitude to nature is driven by the belief that the environment is valuable to humans because physical resources provide economic value. The value of nature is measured by its value in the market. Since it is widely believed that the quality of human life is directly proportional to the volume of production in an economy, therefore unrestrained economic

expansion and exploitation of the environment are justified. Clearly, this belief radically separates humans from the natural world and subordinates the latter to the former (Hamilton 2003, 192). In this paradigm, nature is considered mere a means to gratify the insatiable voracity of humans. Such a viewpoint denies the mutualism that exists between humans and nature. In this sense, the history of capitalism can also be seen as the history of men's efforts to conquer nature.

Humans, in addition to nature, are seen as means to an end. Therefore, controlling, regulating, and even forcibly displacing masses can be justified in order to achieve the goal of economic growth. This perspective of development validates the Asian values thesis, which authoritarian regimes often use to defend their oppressive regimes. Following the Second World War, a number of prominent Western scholars, including Milton Friedman and F.A. Hayek, proposed a close connection between the free market, economic growth, and democracy. These scholars contend that only in an open society and democracy can there be rapid economic development through the robust free market mechanism. However, some nations that have been far from democratic and open—such as China, Chile, the erstwhile South Asian Tigers—South Korea, Singapore, Taiwan, and Hong Kong—as well as some Gulf nations—have managed to achieve a comparatively higher rate of economic growth, making this generalization untenable. Furthermore, proponents of the so-called Asian Values thesis assert that when it comes to economic growth, Asian culture—which places a strong emphasis on community and discipline—is far more effective than Western individualist culture.

This phenomenon raises a basic moral question: if democracy and human rights are not respected, can higher economic growth still be called development? Apart from the aforementioned nations, democratic nations also occasionally resort to forced mass relocation and the acquisition of fertile land to attract foreign direct investment and spur economic growth. It raises a substantial as well as political question: is it development? or if it is development, whose development is it? Treating economic growth as an end in itself paves necessarily the way where people are treated as just a means to achieve it. Assigning people a lower priority in terms of priorities encourages governments to carry out atrocities, executions, and human rights violations in the name of development.

Defining development narrowly as economic growth or rocketing the key macro indicators of economy has its own limitations that we have discussed already under the above-mentioned titles. In its narrow sense, the concept of development can not be a guarantee of human security and welfare. When we consider only economic factors as a measure of human security and progress, we are, in fact, ignoring other important facets of life that are vital to human freedom, security, and well-being. As we have already examined,

attempts to define development too narrowly inadvertently give rise to structures and factors that endanger human welfare. Therefore, considering development in the conventional sense, security and development seem to have an antagonistic relationship. Put differently, development and security seem to go against each other.

IS THIS EXACTLY WHAT WE WANT?

The goal of economic growth is achieved through the weapon of the market. It is widely believed that increased consumer spending spurs market-led economic growth. Sustained economic growth needs sustained demands from the consumer side. The market is well equipped with first creating the false needs and then gratifying those false needs. In other words, economic growth is demand-driven growth. Therefore, every effort is made to stimulate and maintain the demand in the economy. To spur and sustain economic growth, market fosters a different kind of ideology that is called consumerism. In the age of the information revolution, the internet, mass media, and social media are the formidable weapons of the market through which culture and the ideology of consumerism are injected into the minds of people. By keeping the intensity and magnitude of consumerism in view, some scholars have called this phenomenon hyper-consumerism.

Hyper-consumerism can be defined as the practice of consuming goods and services beyond what is necessary. Consuming excessive goods and services than what is our actual need can be due to presumed social status, shame marketing or socio-cultural pressure. Unprecedented penetration of internet, mass media, social media, shopping malls, credit cards, etc. has transformed consumerism into hyper-consumerism. Products are used not only to satisfy needs; rather, consumption of products is considered a status symbol as well. Hyper-consumerism has now become a formidable force that is shaping our lives and lifestyle through the robust apparatus of advertisement and marketing (Orozco 2024). Hyper consumerism is both the cause and consequence of demand-driven economic growth. It is a lifeline for economic growth.

In the age of hyper-consumerism, there are no human beings but consumers. The ultimate goal of a human-being turned consumer is to consume more and more products/ services and to derive pleasure from them. And this ultimate goal can only be purchased through money. An American industrialist Armand Hammer rightly boasted “money is my first, last, and only love.” The never-ending pursuit of money and gratification of needs have inflicted huge losses on our planet and environment. The culture of consumerism is responsible for pollution, resource depletion, excessive waste generation and numerous harmful consequences. In addition to its catastrophic effects on the environment and the planet,

consumerism has detrimental effects on individual well-being too. In the context of a materialist view of life, happiness turns out to be a mirage. It is harmful to both our physical environment and inner wellbeing. There is evidence to suggest that prioritizing the acquisition of material goods and money may even be associated with lower levels of personal well-being (Isham A, Verfuether C, Armstrong A, Elf P, Gatersleben B, Jackson T. 2022, 05). People who strongly value the pursuit of wealth and possessions report lower psychological well-being than those who are less concerned with such aims (Kasser 2002, 05). The more materialistic values are at the center of our lives, the more our quality of life is diminished. (Kasser 2002, 14) Hyper-consumerism has a strong connection with rising crime, moral bankruptcy, anxiety, depression, discontent, and poor relationships. Rather than making people secure and happy, neoliberalism driven hyper-consumerism is making people more insecure and unhappy (Hayward, Keith and Oliver Smith 2023, 550).

From the above discussion, we may conclude that economic growth has given birth to numerous by-products that are threatening humanity. In other words, what is being applauded as growth and development proves to be disastrous for both human beings and the planet. In the economic growth-oriented development paradigm, there is no axiomatic relationship between development and security. On the contrary, both development and security seem at odds with each other in this paradigm. In this context, it is paramount to rethink our choices, strategies, and goals.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEVELOPMENT AND SECURITY

We have seen how development and security appear to be mutually exclusive realities within the growth-oriented development paradigm. In this paradigm, there is a zero-sum game-like relationship between the two concepts. This contradiction can be eliminated if we look at both development and security with a fresh perspective. A brief overview of the new perspective will be pertinent to discuss. Similar to the traditional concept of development, the traditional concept of security can also be said to be a macro concept. During the entire period of the Cold War, in the discipline of political science and international relations, the concept of security was used predominantly to refer to the security and survival of macro referent entity like state/military/nation. In the traditional sense, security has been considered synonymous with state/national security or military security. Following the end of the Cold War, a number of pressing non-military threats surfaced that constituted a serious threat to the security of the citizens living in the state that was completely secured from external military aggression. This phenomenon exposed the insufficiency of the traditional concept of security in addressing these novel threats and challenges.

In response to completely changed realities, the concept of security expanded both vertically and horizontally, much like the concept of development. Consequently, invention of a new concept of security, the concept of human security was crystallized. It was in the UNDP Human Development Report of 1994 that the concept of human security was first thoroughly discussed. In addition to the change in the referent object of security, a wide variety of threats to people's security are now acknowledged. Furthermore, according to this new security framework, social exclusion, diseases, poverty, crime, human rights abuses, environmental degradation, etc. are all considered as threats to human security. The range of threats to the "human" automatically expands when we center security discourse on the 'humans.' Since, in the discourse of human security, security refers to the security of people rather than the security of a state /nation, it would be a worthwhile endeavor to analyze the relationship between development and security.

The central thrust of this paper is to illustrate how pursuing economic growth oriented development recklessly is making this planet more insecure and unsafe place. For this purpose, the relationship between development and security would be examined. The nature of the relationship between development and security rests on the level of analysis and policymaking. Level of analysis and policy making may range from macro (national income, employment, foreign investment, etc.) to micro (individual-centric). As we have already discussed, if development and security are defined by taking the macro level parameters into consideration, there is no axiomatically cordial relationship between them. Contrarily, what is celebrated as development in reality proves to be disastrous both for individuals and the whole planet. However, ontologically, security and development are not mutually exclusive; rather, they are mutually dependent and complementary. However, this can only be realized if we accept the "human" as a fundamental unit for analysis as well as policymaking purposes. Stated differently, we need to define both security and development by putting the "human" at the centre rather than any vague macro entity or indicator. Development and security will inevitably be incompatible realities if we strive for development at the expense of people and nature.

Since, in the 21st century, the scope of threats to human security is so broad that the realization of human development without addressing the issues of human security seems like a pipe dream. Issues of poverty, hate crime, terrorism, human rights abuses, environmental degradation, climate change, illiteracy, and diseases threaten both human security and human development. From one perspective, these issues pose a grave threat to the security of people, while, from another perspective, since these issues limit the horizons of human choices, they are obstacles to human development too.

In addition, the issue of sustainability holds a prominent position in the paradigm of human development. Stated differently, human development as a concept necessitates the sustainability of the environment and those fruits of development that are considered vital to human development. And it is obvious that sustainability can not be ensured without the inclusion and participation of each and every section of society. If not, achievement of development will always suffer from a legitimacy crisis. Since the question of sustainability in the paradigm of human development concerns the future, it can not be ensured without addressing human security concerns.

Defining and mapping both development and security at the macro level always proves to be vulnerable to manipulation by the political rhetoric. For example, It is a very common political manoeuvre that is used by rulers around the globe that skyrocketing data regarding GDP, FDI, per capita income, etc. are boasted as the development of citizens of the country; however, these statistics-based claims are often essentially rhetorical and misleading. These statistics hide more than they reveal. It is not impossible to secure high rank or position in terms of GDP growth rate, per capita income, FDI, ease of doing business, etc. by making vulnerable people more vulnerable and deprived people more deprived. In a similar vein, apparently a state may appear secured and protected from external invasion or attack, and this condition of being secured from external threat may be applauded as national security. This kind of national security too does not tell how secure our citizens are in their daily lives from myriad of non-military threats. Placing "human" rather than any macro entity at center has the potential to represent the real picture, and it would also help us to redress the real threats to development and security. Most importantly, establishing "human" at the center of discussion and policy formulation makes the concepts of development and security mutually intertwined and overlapped. When viewed in this light, they are complementary rather than antagonistic. A threat to human security is also a threat to human development and vice versa.

FROM ECONOMIC GROWTH-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT TO HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

The fundamental contradiction between development and security disillusioned a section of the academia that led to the birth of a novel concept of development: the concept of human development. Pakistani economist Mahbub-ul-Haq and Indian economist Amartya Sen are considered its principal proponents. The first Human Development Report (1990), a yearly publication of UNDP, provided a detailed discussion of the concept of human development. The report prepared under the leadership of Mahbub-ul-Haq, begins with the opening declaration that "*people are the real wealth of a nation*" (United Nations Development Programme 1990, 09). The concept of human development, in contrast to the traditional concept of

development, is people-centric, wherein people are regarded as an end in themselves. Nonetheless, this new paradigm does not discard the importance of economic growth; rather, it views economic growth just as a means of achieving the end of human development and wellbeing. What is novel in the concept of human development is its treatment of people as focal referent object of development.

Poverty, illiteracy, diseases, social injustice, violation of basic human rights, etc. restrict the sphere of human choices and freedom. Human development is therefore centered on creating conducive environment and enhancing human capabilities so that individuals can exercise more freedom, autonomy, and choices (Sen 2001, 14). Building and enhancing human capabilities to overcome the above-mentioned restrictions requires mechanism of affirmative actions legitimated by the state. However, it is important to note that the concept of economic development and human development should not be understood in binary opposition. The concept of human development never discards the importance of the indicators of economic growth or development, i.e., high per capita income, national income, GDP, employment, etc., but it goes beyond these parameters and does not rely solely on these means. The concept of human development, as contrary to the conventional concept of development, can be supported by the following arguments.

Growth in economic metrics like GDP, GNP, FDI, consumption and employment unquestionably plays a critical role in human freedom and development. However, in addition to economic considerations, other factors such as a just and accommodative society, a democratic and participatory political system, a participatory economy, sustainable environment and so forth, also play a very crucial role in determining human development and security. Economic growth does not necessarily and automatically translate into human development and well-being. A country can perform well in the sphere of human development even with a relatively low level of income. On the other hand, it is quite possible that a state's human development indicators are below par even though its income is comparatively high. Challenges and cures to human development are beyond the narrow scope of economic growth. It is not possible to eradicate discrimination on the basis of caste, class, language, religion, gender, and to redress exploitation, marginalization, human rights violations, etc. by just growing the size of an economy. As such, economic growth can never be an assurance of human development. Since the very referent object of development has been replaced, measures to achieve it must be replaced concurrently. Thus, it is desirable to move from development that is based on macro indicators to development that is people-centric. Although the significance of the concept of human development has been widely acknowledged in scholarly discourse, the conventional

growth-oriented view of development still predominates in the field of policy formulation.

CONCLUSION

In the name of development, we have caused irreparable damage to nature. Economic growth has conventionally been equated with development in this enterprise; however, we have seen that economic growth has resulted in anthropogenic disasters. The importance of economic growth in the context of human development can not be denied, but economic growth should not be unfettered or unchecked. Rather, economic growth must meet the criterion of not harming people and our environment. Health, wellbeing, and sustainability of human beings and nature should be placed as veto against developmental processes. Economic growth or development should be concurrent with the security and sustainability of people and our planet. It should not be mutually exclusive.

We need to understand and admit the symbiotic relationship between human beings and our planet. Human beings are inevitably harmed when economic growth is achieved at the expense of the environment. Therefore, we should not look at or define development in such statistical terms that are secured at the cost of both our planet and human beings. We are breathing in an era in which a lot of uncertainties are terrifying human lives all around the world. An integrated world coupled with simultaneous processes of integration and fragmentation has given birth to such challenges to human existence that need extraordinary measures to fix them. Other than the "human," no other referent object, such as a nation, state, or economy, should be regarded as an end in and of itself in such an unstable environment. This appeal extends to the concepts of development and security as well. Combating ever-growing challenges to the well-being of people requires a holistic approach with the help of which issues can be contextualized, defined, and addressed. In the last analysis, we can state that a shift from macro to micro (economic growth to human development) may be a solution to end the fundamental contradiction between development and security, allowing development to give people in their lives security rather than insecurity.

REFERENCES

- Bharti, Nikhil K., L. Chancel, Thomas Piketty and A. Somanchi. 2024. "Income and Wealth Inequality in India, 1922-2023: The Rise of the Billionaire Raj." Working Paper 2024/09, World Inequality Lab, Paris School of Economics, Paris.
- Chua, Amy. 2004. *World on Fire: How Exporting Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Hatred*. United Kingdom: Random House.
- Clack, Timothy, Ziya M., Louise S. 2024. *Climate Change, Conflict and (In) Security: Hot War*. United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis.
- Hamilton, Clive. 2003. *Growth Fetish*. Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Hayward, Keith and Oliver Smith. 2023. "Crime and Consumer Culture." In *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, edited by Alison Liebling, Lesley McAra and Shadd Maruna. Oxford University Press.
- Hickel, Jason. 2020. *Less is More: How Degrowth will Save the World*. Random House.
- Isham A, Verfuert C, Armstrong A, Elf P, Gatersleben B. and Jackson T. 2022. "The Problematic Role of Materialistic Values in the Pursuit of Sustainable Well-Being." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2022 19 (6): 3673. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19063673>
- Kasser, Tim. 2002. *The High Price of Materialism*. London: The MIT Press.
- Orozco, leslie. 2024. "Opinion: Hyperconsumerism Costs more than You Think" *The Shorthorn*, April 02, 2024. https://www.theshorthorn.com/opinion/columnists/opinion-hyperconsumerism-costs-more-than-you-think/article_9dec1580-ead2-11ee-8f59-efa710339753.html
- Oxfam International. 2024. "The World's Richest 1% Own More Than 95% of the World Population." *Oxfam Sverige*. September 23, 2024. <https://oxfam.se/en/nyheter/varldens-rikaste-1-agermer-an-95-av-varldsbefolkningen/>
- Pulapre, Balakrishnan. 2024. "Growth mania can be injurious to society" *The Hindu*, January 30, 2024. <https://www.thehindu.com/opinion/lead/growth-mania-can-be-injurious-to-society/article67790032.ece>
- Scheffran, J., Michael Brzoska, H.G. Brauch, P. M. Link and J. Schilling. 2012. *Climate Change, Human Security and Violent Conflict: Challenges for Societal Stability*. Germany: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Sen, Amartya. 2001. *Development as Freedom*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Stewart, Frances. 2008. *Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict: Understanding Group Violence in Multiethnic Societies*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

ANSARI : THE ROAD TO INSECURITY...

United Nations Development Programme. 1990. *Human Development Report*. New York: Oxford University Press.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. 2022. "Conflict and Climate." July 12, 2022. <https://unfccc.int/news/conflict-and-climate>