

GLOBAL POVERTY AND HUMAN SECURITY: A VASUDHAIVA KUṬUMBAKAṀ PERSPECTIVE

Jipson Joseph and Achyutananda Mishra*

Abstract: Poverty has been a persistent issue throughout human history, affecting societies worldwide. In the major industrialized nations, social welfare policies served as the primary approach to poverty alleviation until the late 20th century. In 1994, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) introduced a human-centred sustainable development model, emphasizing human security as a means to eradicate poverty and other forms of insecurity. Despite these efforts, data from the World Bank and other international organizations indicate that a significant portion of the global population remains impoverished, highlighting the ongoing need for development and inclusivity. The ancient Indian concept of *vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam*, which promotes open-mindedness, interconnectedness, brotherhood, and fairness, offers a universal vision rooted in a family model. Interpreted in a contemporary context, *vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* presents a global perspective that resonates with the principles of human security. Integrating this concept with the human security framework holds the potential to address global poverty and promote the universality of human rights. This article seeks to reconstruct the human security paradigm through the perspective of *vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* in order to eradicate poverty and promote global well-being.

* Jipson Joseph is a research scholar of Law at CHRIST University, Bangalore. His research interests are in Constitutional Law, Human Rights, Global Poverty, Human Security, and Ethics. Email: jipson.joseph@res.christuniversity.in

* Dr. Achyutananda Mishra is a Professor at the School of Law, CHRIST University, Bangalore. His areas of research interest are Constitutional Law, Human Rights, Globalization, Legal Theory and Democracy. Email: achyuta.mishra@christuniversity.in

Keywords: Poverty Eradication, Universality, Inclusiveness, Cosmopolitanism, Sustainable Human Development, Openness, *vasudhaiva kutumbakam*, Vulnerabilities, Welfarism.

1. Introduction

Poverty alleviation has been on the agenda since the Industrial Revolution. The last decade of the 19th century witnessed many social security schemes introduced by the Bismarck government, which the other countries followed in the 20th century (Kenworthy 1119). Poverty alleviation as a policy surfaced in the US during the Great Depression leading to Roosevelt's initiative of the New Deal policy (Kennedy 251-254). His 'four freedoms' speech devised the strategy for poverty alleviation (Roosevelt 58). The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) advanced the socio-economic and cultural interests of individual(s) and communities as human rights of marginalised people. Nevertheless, international law heavily emphasised on security from a national border perspective, partly, due to the Cold War context. Such emphasis has resulted in human miseries like famine, poverty, migration, etc., across the globe.

To address such a grim global situation, the UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) came up with the idea of human security as an alternative approach which advances sustainable human development addressing various insecurities in people's daily life (HDR 1994, iii). Human security is a people-centred method revolving around the principle of universalism that values the life claims of all (HDR 1994, 13). "Pro-people, pro-nature, pro-jobs, and pro-women" policy design is advised to develop human capabilities assuming the sanctity of life (HDR 1994, iii). In furtherance of this, pro-poor programmes like declaration of three consecutive decades of poverty eradication, prioritization of poverty alleviation in MDGs and poverty eradication in SDGs, year-wise calculation of Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), etc., were designed. However, poverty,

which is a denial of standard life that contains nutritious food, health-care, education, and basic rights (Ravallion 168) continues to be a cause of concern for the global society.

Many scholars contend that scarcity of natural resources is not the real cause of poverty but policy failures and poor governance (Rawls 64). The *World Inequality Report 2022* reveals that the richest 1% of the world population owned 38%, whereas the poorest 50% owned just 2% of global increment in wealth between 1995-2021 (3). The *Poverty and Shared Prosperity Report 2022* states that 719 million people experience extreme poverty (3). The World Bank’s presentation of 2023 in nine charts affirms that around 690.76 million people are extremely poor. These statistics expose the global nature of the most adverse vulnerability, which is also called “the problem of problems” (Lewis 21).

To address the concerns of human security and sanctity of life, the age-old global vision of *vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam*, rooted in Indian spiritual tradition and culture, offers a ray of hope for the world with a substantial prospect. It affirms a universal familial vision of interrelatedness extending to the whole living and non-living beings. *Vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* has, thus, a cosmopolitan outlook in its scope and approach which can also be found in other religious and secular traditions. Its universal vision of solidarity echoing oneness of humankind is the only answer for the present-day problems (ITC no. 1).

2. Philosophy of *Vasudhaiva Kuṭumbakam*

Vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam (*Maha Upaniṣad* (6:71-72)) is an all-inclusive concept affirming peaceful harmony, inclusive love, and in-depth communion. The ancient Indian sages presented it as an ideal framework to enhance one’s vision of life with unitarian, humanitarian, and egalitarian principles towards the universe and its creatures. Openness without boundaries is its essence, inviting people to move forward from egoism to altruism. Advocating detachment from material possessions and prejudice, it advances cosmopolitan vision. Partiality and segregation are substituted with universality (Singh, “Some Thoughts,” 105).

Indian spiritual and philosophical vision of oneness and openness is extended beyond its borders. The ancient sages affirmed openness and inclusiveness, albeit having a limited understanding of the width of the world (Babu 34).

Vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam envisions universality and brotherhood. Generally, humans limit their vision of family to a closed circle. Maximum delimitation is presumed to give maximum happiness and oneness. But *vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* enlarges the scope of family (Kar 43). Human shared identity locator is extended to the whole world. This process is not easy. Union with universal consciousness is mandatory for an individual to be enriched with wider perspective of life (Singh, "Some Thoughts," 105). It transforms intolerant and xenophobic attitudes to universal brotherhood. Belongingness and responsibility are its characteristics encouraging to consider the world as an extended family (Kar 43). However, it is not a mandate of uniformity, but rather, an inclusive philosophy of diversity (Gupta 21). Peripheral world witnesses to plurality but when going deep into universal consciousness there is nothing but oneness (Parecattil 13). Unity/oneness is the nature of the world and *vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* insists to celebrate unity beneath diversity. Every individual is invited to behold others as unique members of the family rather than selfishly delimiting the familial space (Gupta 24).

2.1. Theological Approach: *Imago Dei*

Most religions propagate individual self as part of universal self. The Sacred Scripture (applicable to both Jews and Christians) says that humans are created in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:27). Human person is thus called *Imago Dei*. Severian of Gabala argues that it refers to 'oneness of all humans' because they are created in the 'image' not 'images' of God (55-56). On the one side, there is God, the ultimate oneness and on the other side, there are human persons who are different from one another in external appearance. *Imago Dei* is the universal attribute that connects all human beings with the ultimate reality and with one another.

Union with the universal consciousness should happen in interpersonal relations because the fellow-human being is its image (Häring 140). Humans are interconnected on account of their *Imago Dei*. It is the source of their equality and indivisibility. Quran also upholds oneness of the ultimate pure Being, Allah, (37:4-5; Aminrazavi 98) by affirming *la ilaha Illalah* (there is no reality other than the One Reality) as the nucleus of Islam (3:18). Differentiating transcendental and imminent aspects of Allah (Aminrazavi 100), Quran states that there is no match for Allah in the transcendental sphere (62:11), but in the imminent zone wherever one turns there is Allah’s face as all are His manifestations (2:115). Individuals are manifestations of the Universal Reality. Prophet Muhammad did not differentiate Muslims from non-Muslims because of their ‘common humanity.’ Islam thus demands to accept and respect the other without any prejudice (Khanam 460-461).

Hinduism revolves around two core elements: *Brahman* (cosmic principle) and *Ātman* (individual self). *Upaniṣads* advocated monism against Vedic polytheism upholding fundamental unity of the world regulated by *dharma* (Radhakrishnan 434-437). *Ātman* seems to be different in all living beings, but in reality, it connects all into one (*Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 6.10; *Kaṭa Upaniṣad* 2.2.9). *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* identifies *Ātman* with *Brahman* (4.4.5) and makes the deepest *Advaita* statement, *Aham brahmāsmi* (1.4.10). Negating duality, *Upaniṣads* affirm oneness of the ultimate reality and the created world. All are one with the ultimate reality and with one another because of *Ātman* (Woodhouse 119). Explaining this unitarian principle, Swami Vivekananda enlarged the horizon of brotherhood in his 1893 Chicago speech. Buddhism does not discuss *causa prima* but explains everything in tune with interconnectedness (Bodhi 533-550). Jainism holds that all animate and inanimate beings have souls, which undergo rebirths until *moksha* is achieved. Successive births underline the interconnectedness of souls (Arya 81). Though both Buddhist and Jain traditions are not theistic, they propound interconnectedness of all creatures.

Most religious traditions, so far analyzed, affirm that the principles of universal reality and individual self are juxtaposed. All of them prioritize the interrelation of all beings. Realizing this positivity and religious wisdom, open-minded people may perceive either Universal Self or interrelatedness among each other upholding universal brotherhood over egoistic interests (Mathur 394). Inclusiveness is the nature of *moksha* reverberating tolerance and transparency in relations. Although the context is religious, it establishes not religious but spiritual order wherein all individuals are interconnected (Rao 201-202). No spiritual ideal promotes divisive mentality, whereas some exclusivists differentiate between insiders and outsiders (Nandhikkara 368). Human-centred approach requires the spiritual vision of oneness and interrelatedness rather than the segregating elements.

2.2. Secular Approach

Parallel to the spiritual universal design, a secular approach emerged in the west mainly inspired by the natural law philosophy and cosmopolitan worldview.

2.2.1. Natural Law Philosophy

The paradox between *Divine Command Theory* and *Euthyphro dilemma* was well answered by natural law philosophy (Dimmock and Fisher 66). Ancient Greek and Roman thinkers advocated universality of human reason and freedom of will, paving an ideal setting for natural law. Romans considered it befitting to expand their boundaries for launching a universal community (von Leyden 24-25). It then led to the expansion of Catholic theological horizons, the origin of international law with legal systems' natural justice underpinnings resonating same universal moral truths, and the inalienability perspective of human rights with the contributions of Thomas Aquinas (McCormick 592-596), Hugo Grotius (Coyle 593-604) and John Locke (von Leyden 25-35) respectively. Though Kantianism, historicism, and positivism have criticized it as shallow Scholastic thought, it propagated an inclusive universal order (Haakonssen and Seidler 378). Coyle

argues that it can be the context of universal ethics (591) as it calls for collaboration of all people of good will (ITC nos. 9-10).

Evolution of natural law philosophy ratifies its universality. One of its earliest references could be traced back to Sophocles' play, *Antigone*, in which the central character describes the eternal “unwritten and immutable laws” (450-460). Though Aristotle did not use the term natural law, many interpreters argue that his *Rhetoric* laid its theoretical foundation (Duke 13-23). Stoicism, then, transformed it into a universal moral norm affirming the importance of living one's life according to nature (Seneca VIII, 1). People are advised to live according to the dictates of their human nature endowed with reason. Cicero, in this line, explained it as the epitome of reason inserted in nature that gives appropriate guidance to one's actions (I, VI, 18). The Scholastic period convincingly shaped natural law philosophy especially with the contributions of Aquinas. His perception revolved around the idea of three precepts. Among them, the primary precepts are absolute and universal, which he based on the contribution of Ulpian, who said, *quod natura omnia animalia docuit*. While explaining its nuances, Aquinas stated that human nature teaches certain things to all humans and these ‘things taught by the respective human nature’ are self-evident, universal, and inalienable (I.II.Q.94). Human nature, common to all, is its source. It is inbuilt in them. Supremacy and universality of ‘human nature’ is professed echoing internal-depth rather than external points of reference. Mandates of external reference systems are not superior to the dictates of inherent nature. Accordingly, every person is a dignified part ‘inseverable from the rest’ (Holmes 44). Humans are endowed with reason capable of perceiving self-evident and universally applicable values making them interconnected. Principle of universality should thus be comprehended as an international norm as it does not confine to any particular culture (Bull 171).

2.2.2. Cosmopolitan Approach

More or less simultaneously, another universal perspective,

cosmopolitanism, originated in ancient Greece itself especially with the contributions of Diogenes (ca. 404-323 BCE) and the Stoics (ca. 300-30 BCE) urging people not to confine themselves to their 'polis' but to broaden their vision to the whole world (Bombongan 242). They held that reason makes all people fellow-citizens irrespective of national boundaries demanding respect towards humanity (Nussbaum, "Kant," 7). More than a philosophy, it is a "way of being in the world" (Warf 419), a human practice, or a moral approach wherein one's existence is identified with the world rather than the nation-state. Kant (1724-1804 CE) and other philosophers expanded cosmopolitanism but it received a setback with the overemphasis of nationalism (Sluga and Horne 370). The philosophies of Peter Singer, Martha Nussbaum, Amartya Sen, Daniele Archibugi, David Held, etc., revived this worldview in the second half of the 20th century.

Contemporary cosmopolitanism is used with many adjectives like moral, political, cultural, legal, civic, and global justice (Taraborrelli 1). Pin-Fat points to the lack of universal consensus on the meaning of cosmopolitanism (83). Various philosophers and writers like Kant (moral cosmopolitanism), Kelsen and Sweet (legal cosmopolitanism), Archibugi and Held (political cosmopolitanism), and Beck, Cohen, and Habermas (new cosmopolitanism) perceive it differently (Pin-Fat 83-85; Rolf 3). Philosophers focus their attention towards moral cosmopolitanism, legal practitioners and scholars towards legal cosmopolitanism, political scientists towards political cosmopolitanism, and sociologists and anthropologists towards new cosmopolitanism (Pin-Fat 85). But all of them converge on its three core elements: human-centric, universality, and generality (Bombongan 243). Pin-Fat thus defines cosmopolitanism as "any position in which human beings are the 'ultimate unit of moral concern' (individualism), are so equally (universality) and where their moral status extends beyond arbitrary factors such as national boundaries (generality)" (86). Contemporary cosmopolitanism is far superior to its previous versions as it not only extended one's perspective beyond the territorial identity

but also shifted its focus to person. However, it cannot be equated with Hobbesian ‘radical individualism’ (Pennock 11) because it promotes universality based on “empathy and compassion” (Warf 419).

Rights have high value in cosmopolitanism. Kant claimed that the violations of rights in any part of the earth will have its impact on other parts, and proposed universality of rights for perpetual peace (“Toward a Perpetual Peace,” 84-85). He advanced universalism of human dignity, respect, and peace (Nussbaum, “Kant,” 3). But the Kantian version was ideally different from the Stoics and the contemporary understanding. He comprehended it in tune with ‘universal hospitality’ (Canto-Sperber 270). Referring to Tagore’s character Nikhil in *The Home and the World*, Nussbaum emphasizes universality of rights and reason over patriotism stating that our primary allegiance should be towards the human community in general (“Patriotism,” 3-14).

Cosmopolitan perspective of social justice endorsing the interests of all should be its design (Pogge, “Cosmopolitanism,” 312). Shared world identity, human rights protective global organization, democracy that values the opinions of all etc., are essential for a rights-promoting world (Canto-Sperber 271-273). Territorial boundary is not a hurdle where universal vision guides one’s attitude towards others and their claims. Imagination has a unique place in cosmopolitanism. It not merely explains ‘what is in the world’ but explores ‘what is possible in the world’ (Bombongan 244). Cosmopolitan imagination does not exclude the other but includes all with openness. Cosmopolitans are ambassadors of global interconnectedness. They show interest in engaging with the various needs of others, imagining an active and positive interrelation. It is a process of bridging with the other (Bombongan 246). It suggests ‘global justice design’ to promote equitable opportunities irrespective of national or ethnic identities so that no one will be denied their essentials (Caney 113-115).

2.2.3. Human Rights

Rights existed in one form or another for centuries. Humans are

“rights-possessing-creatures” enforcing their claims on others (Kleinig and Evans 560). All modern champions of human rights ranging from Hohfeld to Dworkin attribute prime attention to claims (Pennock 13). Discussions of human rights mainly focused on its origin, whether natural or legal. Many argue that human rights owe its origin to natural law philosophy (Dufour 292) as it assigns enforcing capacity of the claims to human nature. Accordingly, they were called natural rights. In the post-Medieval period, it grew up together with natural law philosophy (Dufour 300-301). But Pennock argues that both natural law and natural rights are different, albeit the “close blood relationship;” while the first emphasizes duties, the second stands for rights. He credits William of Ockham (ca. 1287-1347) for the shift from law to rights. At the same time, he states that “natural law implied natural rights” (1-2). Affirming the significance of natural rights, Locke exhorted not to surrender the rights to life, liberty, and property in social contract (Donnelly 391). The Magna Carta (1215), Bill of Rights (1689), Declaration of Independence by thirteen American colonies (1776), and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizens (1789) were definitive steps in the growth of natural rights (Aikman 23-24). They were also the real force behind the 18-19th centuries’ fight against political absolutism. However, the advocates of utilitarianism, positivism, and idealism criticized natural rights claiming that they are unreal and imaginary (Weston 258-262).

The period after World War II witnessed universal acceptance of human rights. Divisive ideas are propounded and practised by the narrow-minded, whereas the open-minded celebrate diversity with *vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* principle inviting people to uphold the unity slogan (Parecattil 12). This call was explicit in the UN Charter (1945), which upheld peaceful coexistence of all as good neighbours. While *vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* insists to enlarge familial space, the UN Charter demands to expand neighbourhood zone. While the former insists on family relations, the latter calls for friendly relations (UN Charter Art. 1). But the UDHR favours family framework resonating *vasudhaiva*

kuṭumbakam vision. Its preamble affirms the inalienable rights of all without any exclusion criterion. Though they are moral rights, UDHR demands the states to legally recognize them for universal respect and observance (Pennock 7). Various international conventions and covenants and the modern constitutions of almost all the countries incorporated and safeguarded them professing their universality and inviolability (Weston 271-281). The *Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action* (1993) finally declared the universality, indivisibility, interdependency, and interrelatedness of all human rights (no. 5).

Human rights and human development are interdependent as both of them try to secure basic freedoms (Hamm 1006). Until the last decade of the 20th century human rights and human development were following parallel paths. Philosophers and activists concentrated on human rights whereas economists and policy-makers stood for human development. But the contemporary thinkers advocate their harmonization as they together constitute true human wellbeing (HDR 2000, 1-2). In the past, development was equated with economic growth only, but today, it is perceived more as sustainability covering all aspects of human life (HDR 1992, 2). Many international platforms like the World Conference of Human Rights (1993), World Conference on Women (1995) and the World Summit for Social Development (1995) situated development policies in the ambit of human rights (Hamm 1007). Rights-based development “sets the achievement of human rights as an objective of development. It uses thinking about human rights as the scaffolding of development policy” (ODI 1). Human rights are both the foundation and objective of development. Both human rights and development are so intimately connected as they together promote a universal family space where people are able to enjoy their basic rights and developmental aspirations.

3. Idea of Human Security

Human security is the latest development in global governance and policy-making. Compared to the earlier version of security

where it was negatively understood as the absence of military threat, the human security paradigm positively aims at “reducing vulnerabilities” (Busumtwi-Sam 258). Kaldor credits the idea of human security to the ‘Helsinki Accords’ of 1975, especially to its ‘third basket’ (445). But in the contemporary human-centred perspective, it was the contribution of the UNDP (HDR 1994, 1). It is an umbrella term consisting of economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community, and political securities (HDR 1994, 24-25). State security is equated with citizens’ security (Howard-Hassmann 90) by shifting attention to human concerns within the nations rather than the issues between nations (HDR 1994, 1). Global security concerns were thereby shifted to human vulnerabilities. ‘Downside risks’ in any part of the world are deemed to have worldwide repercussions. ‘Freedom from fear’ and ‘freedom from want’ perspectives are linked to include social, economic, and cultural rights together with civil and political rights (Kaldor 445-46). To be precise, it is a policy design that stipulates secure conditions in both national and international levels for human wellbeing.

Human security is broader compared to human rights and human development. Human rights are universal. Universality “demands universal conditions under which human rights can be realized” (Hamm 1008). History of human rights’ violations attests to insecure conditions that jeopardize its actualization (Fahy 25-37). Human security calls for secure conditions so that people should be able to realize their rights. It transforms declaration into actualization. Whereas Howard-Hassmann criticizes it as nothing short of re-labelling of human rights (99-101). But both are different. Human rights explain individual’s claims against others and the state, whereas human security unfolds secure conditions for realizing the life claims (Kaldor 445-446). Critically analyzing resource-based, preference-based, and right-based approaches Nussbaum argues that they were not ultimately advantageous to people (“Capabilities,” 127-129). Whereas, human security prescribes people-centred policy guidelines by ensuring secure “material and institutional

environment” (Nussbaum, “Capabilities,” 132) that facilitate welfarism. Sustainable human development is the blueprint for a secure ambience. Overall development of the person is the real concern, not mere economic growth. It requires good policies and institutional framework (Busumtwi-Sam 267). Human security is thus a triangular approach consisting of security, human rights, and sustainable development. Global order, in view of human security, is the secure condition moulded by good policies oriented towards sustainable development and protection of rights.

4. Poverty: A Global Phenomenon

Multiple definitions of poverty show lack of conceptual clarity. Attempts have been made to quantify and qualify poverty, which also lack consensus. Many westerners equate poverty with hunger, failing to consider it from other angles (Banerjee and Duflo, *Poor Economics*, 27-28). Incompetence to afford basic essentials for a minimum standard life in the place and time where one lives can be termed poverty (Shafir 131). For example, Adam Smith said that lacking linen shirts was a symbol of poverty in England (715-716), but still now, it is a luxury in many parts of the world. The World Bank often defines poverty in income-based calculus, whereas UNDP explains it in the context of social welfare or barriers of making choices and decisions for a tolerable life (Lemanski 4; HDR 1997, 2). Amartya Sen understands it as the deprivation of capabilities (positive freedoms) that individuals require to function properly (*Inequality*, 41). Welfarism considers it as the dearth in attaining a critical level of economic welfare (Ravallion 169). Pogge calls it “ongoing harm” (“World Poverty,” 1). All these definitions, somehow, point to economic and social disparity. Financial deficiency denies dignified and standard life to the poor. Economic disparity leads to social disparity and vice versa.

Statistics show that majority of the world's poor is split between fragile/low-income countries (LICs) and lower-middle-income countries (LMICs) (Page and Pande 174). Fragile countries

lack stable administration, whereas LICs and LMICs lack proper policies and effective administration. Administrative failures impose poverty and compel the poor to try other available options causing many problems like migration, crimes, human trafficking, etc. Poverty-rate is increasing in the developed countries as well (HDR 2016, 30). Poverty is neither personal nor local nor national; it respects no borders. It is a global phenomenon due to fast-growing interconnectedness (HDR 1994, 2). Poverty is not inheritance but faulty policies and intolerance force poverty into inheritance.

4.1. Global Poverty: Issues and Challenges

The most famous income-based calculation is problematic to understand the real depth of poverty. The World Bank draws a thin-line of calculation and applies worldwide without systematically assessing different circumstances of the countries. This metric relies on the individual's purchasing power (Banerjee and Duflo, "Economic Lives," 141-143). The World Bank studies the national poverty-line of 15 poorest countries and on its basis fixes international poverty-line (Lucci et al. 301). The *Poverty and Shared Prosperity Report 2022* redrew the poverty-line and fixed US\$2.15 in LICs, US\$3.65 in LMICs, and US\$6.85 in upper-middle-income countries (3). Reliability of income-based calculation is doubtful (Ravallion 175-179). It may be helpful to exhibit poverty reduction in official data, though not so in reality. By the end of the 20th century various international bodies started to calculate poverty-line in multidimensional perspective (Lucci et al. 303-304). The UNDP and OPHI came up with the MPI calculation in three indicators: health, education, and living standards. Lucci et al., argue that these indicators cannot be equally applied in rural and urban areas (303-305). But it seems to be a better model as it provides a "more holistic view of lived poverty" (HDR 2020, 11). Policy-makers can utilize it for a universal approach towards poverty eradication. But they must not hide under the "veil of ignorance" (Rawls 45). Any welfare government can eradicate poverty as it is not just a resources-crisis but an economic disaster

caused by policy failures (Sen, *Poverty*, 162).

Poor people are often challenged by their daily financial demands. Spontaneous thinking about their disordered financial capacity and unfulfilled basic needs leads to a poverty mindset compelling them to manage urgent needs neglecting other essentials (Shafir 132). In many parts of the world, children are sent for work, health emergencies are met with unqualified practitioners, nutritious food and quality education are denied or sacrificed, and many other adverse things happen due to the scar of poverty (Banerjee and Duflo, “Economic Lives,” 148-161). Their choice is not plausible as it does not come from within. They are victims of unfair distribution of resources. Yet, they are considered incompetent and idle, lacking commitment and clear orientation of life. Some people perceive poverty as a self-inflicted condition and failure (Shildrick et al. 169), and so, they maltreat poor people considering them as a burden to economic growth and societal well-being. This ignominious behaviour of some people distances them from the mainstream of the society (Shafir 133).

Global, regional, and national initiatives are manifold with respect to poverty eradication in tune with the UN 2030 agenda of sustainable future. But the resistance and corruption of the politicians and officials demotivate the strategies and policies of poverty eradication agenda. The globe has plenty of resources but not properly distributed to satisfy the needs of all. Misappropriation and diversion of funds, which are quite normal in the LICs and LMICs, relegate effective measures of poverty eradication (Banerjee et al. 78-79). Politicians need to deliberate on the people’s interests rather than their party interests. Many of the government plans and policies are advantageous only to the rich causing enormous increase in rich-poor disparity (Banerjee and Duflo, *Poor Economics*, 396). Corrupt administrative system neglects the interests of the poor. Many social security policies do not reach the poor because of the corrupt system (Page and Pande 188).

International bodies like World Bank, WTO, and IMF

prescribe policy guidelines to the LICs and LMICs in the form of Washington Consensus and other trade agreements to impose policy rules of the developed over the developing countries (Williamson 1475). They claim to promote economic growth, political stability, and poverty eradication of the developing countries, but in reality, mostly favours the interests of the developed countries, and their TNCs, and MNCs. Stiglitz criticizes this approach, unveiling its drawbacks to the poor countries. Besides giving the example of the Argentine economic crisis, he points to the examples of some Asian and other countries that made developments in the last decades, and state that they evolved their own suitable policies (230). Imposing western developed policy design on the developing countries may not be favourable. Policies need to be framed considering the requirements of a particular space and time. Unsuitable policies cause severe threats to human security.

4.2. Global Poverty and Human Security

Cosmopolitan thinkers addressed world poverty from different angles. Singer's utilitarian-cosmopolitanism relies on the charitable contributions of the rich to give maximum benefit to the poor. Differentiating between luxuries and necessities he argues that the rich should contribute to the poor whatever they plan to spend on luxuries ("Singer Solution," 61-63). He demands positive duty (moral imperative) in the form of charity. Pogge asks for responsible intervention of the rich countries to eradicate poverty. Highlighting negative duty, he shifts the responsibility for global poverty to the affluent ("Cosmopolitanism," 317-319). Poverty could have been eradicated decades ago but we did not try (Pogge, "World Poverty," 1). All are somehow responsible and it demands interpersonal and cross-border cooperation (Pogge, *World Poverty*, 215) advocating "not to harm" principle (Pogge, "World Poverty," 5). Nussbaum states that a person's internal choice cannot always produce desired effect, it requires secure conditions as well. Governments and international institutions thus have to strengthen human capabilities for eradicating

poverty (“Capabilities,” 131-132). Human security paradigm enlarges cosmopolitan vision by launching human-centred poverty eradication agenda. It is more practical compared to cosmopolitanism.

Poverty is not inevitable. The world has all the resources to eradicate poverty. Many developing countries have already certified the potentials to eliminate absolute poverty. Suffering in silence is not its remedy, but good governance and appropriate policies (HDR 1997, iii). Enabling and empowering the poor to build up essential assets is a prerequisite. Basic human rights, facilities for education, health-care, sanitation and safe drinking water, social safety plannings, pro-poor economic growth, pro-poor policies, and international cooperation are to be ensured (HDR 1997, 6-12). True human development entails equitable distribution (HDR 1998, 1-4), respectful listening to the voice of poor in global and national policy-making process (HDR 1999, 11), and policy reforms that prudently channelize public funds for uplifting the poor (HDR 2000, 9). All these aim at increasing the income-level of the poor (HDR 2020, 6). In sum, human security suggests sustainable human development model of national and global policy-cooperation for poverty eradication.

4.3. Global Poverty, Global Responsibility and *Vasudhaiva Kuṭumbakam*

Global poverty is antithetic to *vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam*'s core ideas – familial feeling, sense of belongingness, openness, all-inclusiveness, and universal brotherhood. Both human security and the 2030 agenda revolve around universality of life claims (HDR 2016, 4) and demand a global perspective for poverty eradication. Darwinian “survival of the fittest” has been the slogan for many centuries. *Vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* advocates ‘survival of all’ pointing to the empowerment of basic capabilities that “refer to the freedom to make choices necessary for survival” (HDR 2019, 32). Once the basic capabilities are met, they should be helped to move towards enhanced capabilities because most of them are on the brink of going down the poverty-line as their

security is not fully realised. Even some relatively stable families may fail to go beyond the poverty-line due to personal, familial, and professional shocks or natural calamities (HDR 2019, 70). *Vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* framework call upon global positive responsibility together with Pogge's negative duty to actively support them. The world has shown its positivity many times like, during tsunamis, earthquakes, covid-19, etc. International, national, and local institutions and agencies must verify that this support-system directly reaches the poor, needy, and marginalised. This new perspective promotes open-minded and coordinated positivity towards insecure people. Secure conditions are imperative to realise and enhance their capabilities. In 2015, the Chinese President Xi Jinping urged the world to work together for building "a community of shared future for mankind." The proposed slogan, "we are a community," appealed to formulate a clear understanding of justice, specific model of unity, respectful cooperation, equal coexistence, and coordinated development (Guo 45). Universal familial vision towards the earth is far superior to clustered community vision. Considering the entire globe as a family shall not be a bane but a boon in helping to achieve the cause of humanity and eradicate poverty.

Rawlsian 'law of peoples' seems to be in terms with *vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam*'s universal vision. For Rawls, the law of peoples "is a family of political concepts along with principles of right, justice and the common good that specify the content of a liberal conception of justice worked up to extend to and apply to international law" (43). Rawls argues for a family of political concepts and norms, whereas *vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* demands familial vision towards the whole earth. Though Rawlsian constructivist justice cannot be equated with *vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam*'s universal spiritual vision, both of them propagate justice, rights, and common good. Unfair application of justice, disrespect towards human rights, and deviated policies are the root causes of poverty. *Vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* perspective, which also includes Rawlsian idea of justice, is an appropriate setting for international institutions to promote a vision of oneness and

openness for confronting insecurities like global poverty.

Pogge argues that “we are *harming* the global poor if and insofar as we collaborate in imposing an *unjust* global institutional order upon them” (“World Poverty,” 5). Governments of affluent countries and many of their citizens are responsible for unjust global institutional order. The world is governed by a duality, ‘ours’ and ‘others.’ Affluent countries and international institutions consider the issues of LICs and LMICs belonging to ‘others.’ Their egoistic interests are imposed over the other-world interests. This dichotomy can be resolved through *vasudhaiva kutumbakam* perspective, which puts forward universal familial vision. Poverty eradication agenda must assess the wellbeing of all because no institutional order is just if it fails to assure a minimum human rights standard (“Severe Poverty,” 55-56).

People often show interest to help those who are in vicinity or whose stories personally touch them. Distance is a barrier in many instances (Singer, “Famine,” 239). Confronted by the stories of poor persons like Rokia, many are interested to be generous but when poverty is shown as a threat affecting millions of people in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, the same persons fail to show responsibility (Banerjee and Duflo, *Poor Economics*, 2-4). Open-mindedness promoted by the human security approach helps to subdue this dilemma providing multidimensional cooperation with universal perspective (Hamm 1007). Global policy framework can coordinate global responsibility initiatives. Siding with Justin Lin’s “new structuralist approach” Stiglitz demands the governments to take the lead in the planning of the economy considering the needs of people (232-233) with the support of the international community (Page and Pande 173).

Economic growth is the platform for LICs to overcome poverty. Social welfare policies, subsidies, etc., are helpful for sustainable growth (Page and Pande 174-176). But critics argue that they create a “safety-net” trapping the poor and damaging their initiatives (Kenworthy 1119). When the state adopts “legal charity” principle towards the needs of the poor, it makes them idle (de Tocqueville 15). Proper planning and execution of pro-

poor policies are the best means. The poor in LMICs entail effective direct redistribution of resources (Page and Pande 176). But excessive redistribution is not a long-term solution as it will reduce economic growth (Kenworthy 1120). *Vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* perspective insists on proper policy formulation particularly focused on infrastructure development, employment creation, and equitable distribution.

5. Conclusion

Globalization has deepened the magnitude of poverty. National initiatives alone will not suffice for its eradication. Human security approach is a suitable framework for poverty eradication but it needs a universal familial perspective for better functioning. *Vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* is the best available theoretical foundation for its inclusivity as it covers both cosmopolitan and natural law perspectives. Other-world attitude towards the poor can better be mitigated by this perspective that ultimately leads to poverty eradication. For many developing countries, poverty is a scar of their colonial past. Global order entails positive responsibility from former colonial powers in the form of support to the poor countries. It is not charity but justice. Rawlsian “justice as fairness” should be its *modus operandi* (Rawls 36). Vested political interests are contradictory to the universal familial vision revolving around justice.

Human security coupled with the idea of *vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* has a higher potential to promote growth and development, and thereby to eradicate poverty. Indian spiritual vision of oneness of all creatures demands to situate human-centric paradigm in the universal perspective of positivity and inclusiveness, which assures the human security of the present and future generations. Without any separation of space and time, humans are interconnected with one another, with other creatures, with the ecosystem, and with the universal order; working with a spirit of *vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam* will, with all possibilities, lead to the achievement of human security and eradication of poverty across the globe.

References

- Aikman, Colin. “The Evolution of International Human Rights.” *New Zealand International Review* 24.2 (1999): 23-27.
- Aminrazavi, Mehdi. “God, Creation and the Image of the Human Person in Islam.” In *The Concept of God, the Origin of the World and the Image of the Human in the World Religions: A Discourse of the World Religions*, vol. 1. Ed. Peter Koslowski. Dordrecht: Springer, 2001, 95-111.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. Tr. Fathers of the English Dominican Province. New York: Benzinger Brothers, 1947-1948.
- Arya, Samarendra Narayan. “Soul in Jain Philosophy and Development of Indian Society in the Sixth Century.” *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress* 76 (2015): 81-85.
- Babu, B. Ramesh. “National Security to Human Security.” *World Affairs* 20.1 (2016): 30-41.
- Banerjee, Abhijit V., and Esther Duflo. “The Economic Lives of the Poor.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 21.1 (2007): 141-167.
- Banerjee, Abhijit V., and Esther Duflo. *Poor Economics: Rethinking Poverty & the Ways to End it*. Gragon: Penguin Random House, 2011.
- Banerjee, Abhijit V., et al. “From Proof of Concept to Scalable Policies: Challenges and Solutions, with an Application.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 31.4 (2017): 73-102.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu. *The Connected Discourse of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Samyutta Nikaya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2000.
- Bombongan, Jr., Dominador. “Cosmopolitanism, Global Ethic, and Interreligious Dialogue.” *Journal of Dharma* 33. 3 (2008): 241-258.
- Bull, Hedley. “Natural Law and International Relations.” *British Journal of International Studies* 5.2 (1979): 171-181.
- Busumtwi-Sam, James. “Development and Human Security: Whose Security, and from What?” *International Journal* 57.2 (2002): 253-272.
- Caney, Simon. “Cosmopolitan Justice and Equalizing

- Opportunities." *Metaphilosophy* 32. 1/2 (2001): 113-134.
- Canto-Sperber, Monique. "The Normative Foundations of Cosmopolitanism." *Proceedings of Aristotelian Society* 106 (2006): 267-283.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De legibus*. Tr. William James Niall Rudd. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1987.
- Coyle, Sean. "Natural Law in Aquinas and Grotius – An Ethics for Our Times?" *New Blackfriars* 97.1071 (2016): 591-609.
- De Tocqueville, Alexis. "Memoir on Pauperism." In *Memoirs on Pauperism and Other Writings: Poverty, Public Welfare and Inequality*. Ed. Christine Dunn Henderson. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2021, 1-28.
- Deussen, Paul. *Sixty Upaniṣads of the Veda*. 2 vols. Tr. V. M. Bedekar and G.B. Palsule. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2010.
- Dimmock, Mark, and Andrew Fisher. "Aquinas's Natural Law Theory." *Ethics for A-Level*. Open Book Publishers, 2017, 65-77.
- Donnelly, Jack. "Human Rights as Natural Rights." *Human Rights Quarterly* 4.3 (1982): 391-405.
- Dufour, Alfred. "Natural Law and Natural Rights." *Journal of Modern History* 54.2 (1982): 292-302.
- Duke, George. "Aristotle and Natural Law." *The Review of Politics* 82.1 (2020): 1-23.
- Fahy, Sandra. *Dying for Rights: Putting North Korea's Human Rights Abuse on the Record*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2019.
- Guo, Jing. "The Idea of a Human Community of Shared Destiny." *Journal of Dharma* 46.1 (2021): 43-60.
- Gupta, Arvind. "Reimagining Multilateralism: The Ethos and Philosophy of *Vasudhaiva Kuṭumbakam*." *National Security* 4.1 (2021): 20-24.
- Haakonssen, Knud, and Michael J. Seidler. "Natural Law: Law, Rights and Duties." In *A Companion to Intellectual History*. Eds. Richard Whatmore and Brian Young. West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 2016, 377-401.
- Hamm, Brigitte I. "A Human Rights Approach to Development."

- Human Rights Quarterly*, 23.4 (2001): 1005-1031.
- Howard-Hassmann, Rhoda E. “Human Security: Undermining Human Rights?” *Human Rights Quarterly* 34.1 (2012): 88-112.
- Kaldor, Mary. “Human Security.” *Society and Economy* 33.3 (2011): 441-448.
- Kant, Immanuel. “Toward a Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch.” In *Toward Perpetual Peace and Other Writings on Politics, Peace, and History*. Ed. Pauline Kleingeld. Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2006, 67-109.
- Kar, Arun Kumar. “The Concept of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* (The World is a Family): Insights from the *Mahopaniṣad*.” *National Journal of Hindi & Sanskrit Research* 49.1 (2023): 42-45.
- Kennedy, David M. “What the New Deal Did.” *Political Science Quarterly* 124.2 (2009): 251-268.
- Kenworthy, Lane. “Do Social-Welfare Policies Reduce Poverty? A Cross-National Assessment.” *Social Forces*, 77.3 (1999): 1119-1139.
- Khanam, Farida. “Islam in a Pluralist Society.” *Journal of Dharma* 43.4 (2018): 457-474.
- Kleinig, John, and Nicholas G. Evans. “Human Flourishing.” *Human Dignity and Human Rights* 32.5 (2013): 539-564.
- Lemanski, Charlotte. “Poverty: Multiple Perspectives and Strategies” *Geography* 101.1 (2016): 4-10.
- Lewis, Oscar. “The Culture of Poverty.” *Scientific American* 215.4 (1966): 19-25.
- Lucci, Paula, Tanvi Bhatkal, and Amina Khan. “Are We Underestimating Urban Poverty?” *World Development* 103 (2018): 297-310.
- McCormick, W. “The Role of the Natural Law in Politics according to Thomas Aquinas.” *History of Political Thought* 39.4 (2018): 591-605.
- Nandhikkara, Jose. “Religious Other towards Harmony of Life.” *Journal of Dharma* 43.4 (2018): 367-372.
- Nussbaum, Marta. “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism.” *Boston Review* 19 (1994): 3-16.
- Nussbaum, Marta. “Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism.” *Journal of*

- Political Philosophy* 5.1 (1997): 1-25.
- Nussbaum, Marta. "Capabilities and Social Justice." *International Studies Review* 4.2 (2002): 123-135.
- Overseas Development Institute (ODI), "What can we do with a Rights-based Approach to Development." *Briefing Paper* 3 (1999): 1-4, (03 January 2024).
- Page, Lucy, and Rohini Pande. "Ending Global Poverty: Why Money isn't enough?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 32.4 (2018): 173-200.
- Parecattil, Jojo. *Darśanavīṭ: A Theology of Inclusive Home in Saint Chavara*. Bangalore: Dharmaram Publications, 2020.
- Pennock, J. Roland. "Rights, Natural Rights, and Human Rights – A General View." *Nomos* 23 (1981): 1-28.
- Pin-Fat, Véronique. "Cosmopolitanism Without Foundations." In *Politics and Cosmopolitanism in a Global Age*. Eds. Sonika Gupta and Sudarsan Padmanabhan. London: Routledge, 2015, 83-102.
- Pogge, Thomas. *World Poverty and Human Rights*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002.
- Pogge, Thomas. "World Poverty and Human Rights." *Ethics & International Affairs* 19.1 (2005a): 1-7.
- Pogge, Thomas. "Severe Poverty as a Violation of Negative Duties." *Ethics & International Affairs* 19.1 (2005b): 55-83.
- Pogge, Thomas. "Cosmopolitanism." In *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*. Eds. R. E. Goodin, P. Pettit and T. W. M. Pogge. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007, 312-331.
- Radhakrishnan, S. "The Vedanta Philosophy and the Doctrine of Maya." *International Journal of Ethics* 24.4 (1914): 431-451.
- Rao, Rahul. "The Elusiveness of Non-Western Cosmopolitanism." In *Politics and Cosmopolitanism in a Global Age*. Eds. Sonika G and Sudarsan P. London: Routledge, 2015, 193-215.
- Ravallion, Martin. "On Measuring Global Poverty." *Annual Review of Economics* 12 (2020): 167-188.
- Rawls, John. "The Law of Peoples." *Critical Inquiry* 20.1 (1993): 36-68.
- Rolf, Jan Niklas. "Both/And or Neither/Nor? On the Prospect of
- Journal of Dharma* 49, 2 (April-June 2024)

- “New Cosmopolitanism” to Serve as a Middle Ground between Cosmopolitanism and Nationalism.” *Global Studies Quarterly* 2 (2022), 1-10.
- Roosevelt, Franklin D. “The Four Freedoms.” *World Affairs* 110.1 (1947): 58.
- Sen, Amartya. *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Sen, Amartya. *Inequality Re-examined*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. “*De vita beata*.” In *Brill’s Companion to Seneca: Philosopher and Dramatist*. Eds. Gregor Damschen and Andreas Heil. Leiden: Brill, 2014, 141-146.
- Severian of Gabala. “Homilies on Creation and Fall.” In *Ancient Christian Texts: Commentaries on Genesis 1-3*. Ed. Michael Glerup. Illinois: IVP, 2010, 23-93.
- Shafir, Eldar. “Decisions in Poverty Contexts.” *Current Opinion in Psychology* 18 (2017): 131-136.
- Shildrick, T., R. MacDonald, C. Webster, and K. Garthwaite. *Poverty and Insecurity: Life in Low-Pay and No-Pay Britain*. Bristol: Policy Press, 2012.
- Singer, Peter. “Famine, Affluence, and Morality.” *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 1.3 (1972): 229-243.
- Singer, Peter. “The Singer Solution to World Poverty.” *The New York Times Magazine*. 05 September 1999, 60-63.
- Singh, Karan. “The Growing Relevance of Vedanta.” *India International Centre Quarterly* 40.1 (2013): 16-24.
- Sluga, Glenda, and Julia Horne. “Cosmopolitanism: Its Past and Practices.” *Journal of World History* 21.3 (2010): 369-373.
- Smith, Adam. *The Wealth of Nations*. New York: Random House, 1937.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. “Rethinking Development Economics.” *The World Bank Research Observer* 26.2 (2011): 230-236.
- Taraborrelli, Angela. *Contemporary Cosmopolitanism*. London: Bloomsbury, 2011.
- UNDP. *Human Development Report (HDR) 1992*.
<https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report->

1992.

[https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-1994.](https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-1994)

[https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-1995.](https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-1995)

[https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-1996.](https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-1996)

[https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-1997.](https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-1997)

[https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-1998.](https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-1998)

[https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-1999.](https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-1999)

[https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2000.](https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2000)

[https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2006.](https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2006)

[https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2011.](https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2011)

[https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2016.](https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2016)

[https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2019.](https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2019)

[https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2020.](https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2020)

Von Leyden, W. "John Locke and Natural Law." *Philosophy* 31.116 (1956): 23-35.

Warf, Barney. "Cosmopolitanism." In *International Encyclopaedia of Human Geography*. Ed. Audrey K. Elsevier, 2020, 419-422.

Weston, Burns H. "Human Rights." *Human Rights Quarterly* 6.3 (1984): 257-283.

Williamson, John. "The Washington Consensus and beyond." *Economic and Political Weekly* 38.15 (2003): 1475-1481.

Woodhouse, Mark B. "Consciousness and Brahman-Atman." *The Monist* 61.1 (1978): 109-124.