Violence and Human Development: A Perspective from Amartya Sen

*Gerry Flores ARAMBALA**

Abstract

Political violence is a broad term that is often identified with acts of violence perpetuated by individuals or the state with the lone purpose of achieving political goals. Political violence may come in two modes, either as political terrorism or counter terrorism. The former is determined as the aggressive manipulation of an individual's judgments by threats and intimidations to achieve political change. The latter presupposes the preventive measures the government is doing in fighting against all forms of terrorism, which inevitably lead to war. This paper is intended to examine how both of these forms of political violence affect the development of an individual, following Amartya Sen's capability approach. This paper will argue, in the end, that the best way of solving arm conflicts is democratic dialogue. This paper, following Sen, adheres to the idea that any attempt of solving violence by resorting to war is futile. War in all its form is destructive to the claim of individual development. The government that readily engages into war without having to consider first any democratic dialogues in solving arm conflicts is not fulfilling its task of protecting and prioritizing the development of the people. In war there is no individual development.

Key words: *Capability Approach, Counter Terrorism, Human Development, Political violence, Sen, Terrorism, War*

Şiddet ve İnsani Kalkınma: Amartya Sen'in Fikirleri Üzerinden Bir Bakış[1]

Öz

Siyasi şiddet, siyasi amaçlara ulaşmak amacıyla bireyler veya devlet tarafından uygulanan şiddet olarak tanımlanan geniş bir kavramdır. Siyasi şiddet, siyasi terörizm veya terörle mücadele olarak iki şekilde ortaya çıkabilir. İlki, bireylerin siyasi kararlarının değişime uğraması için tehdit ve göz korkutma ile agresif manipülasyonu anlamına gelir. İkincisi ise, hükümetin terörün her çeşidiyle mücadele etmek için başvurduğu ve/fakat kaçınılmaz biçimde savaşa yol açan önleyici tedbirleri içeriyor.
Bu makale, tanımlanan siyasi şiddet biçimlerinin her ikisini de Amartya Sen'in "Yetenek yaklaşımnı" (Capability approac) kullanarak incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırmanın sonucunda silahlı çatışmaları çözmenin en iyi yolunun demokratik dialog olduğu ileri sürülmektedir. Bu makale, şiddeti çözmek için nihayetinde savaşa başvurmasnın faydasız olduğu görüşünü savunuyor. Savaşın her biçimi bireysel kalkınma çabaları üzerinde tahripkâr bir etki yaratır. Bu nedenle demokratik diyaloğu ilk çözüm olarak dikkate almayıp silahlı bir çatışmaya giren hükümetler, halkın korunması ve kalkındırılması hakkındaki öncelikli görevlerini yerine getirmiyorlar demektir. Savaşta bireysel gelişimden söz edilemez.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Amartya Sen, Anti terör, İnsani Kalkınma, Sava, Siyasal Şiddet, Yetenek Yaklaşımı.*

---

* Philosophy Department, La Salle University-Ozamis, gerry.arambala@lsu.edu.ph
[1] Turkish translation of the Abstract has been added by editorial team of the Journal

1. Introduction

On May 23, 2017 the entire country was terrorized when the news about Marawi city being under siege by ISIS inspired-group broke out. "Marawi, the capital of Mindanao's Lanao del Sur province and whose mostly Muslim 200,000 population make the city the biggest Islamic community"[2], was instantly transformed into a war zone as the government troops fought to recapture the city from the "Maute terrorists who were then about 700 in number with the inclusion of some Abu Sayyaf members."[3] The ferocious fight –which lasted for six months and which reduced the city into a pile of rubble and dust– claimed almost 1000 lives and caused the diaspora of more than 200, 000 inhabitants.[4] The war was further intensified as the government forces opted to bomb the entire city in the hope of hastening the eradication of the terrorists group. The persistent bombing has not only cut short the lives of the enemies of the state but it likewise caused the total destruction of the entire city. More than 50,000 families are made homeless because of the government's attempt to hasten the liberation of the city from the Maute group.[5] And on October 16, 2017, President Rodrigo Duterte announced the liberation of the city from the Maute-ISIS group following the death of their leaders. The war is finally over and the city is again free. But despite of this joyous fact, there hides another terror that every inhabitant of the city must face. Such terror is no longer caused by any terrorist group, but is induced rather by the aftermath of the war. It is not hidden from us how devastating the war in Marawi was. It did not just destroy the enemies but it likewise destroyed the entire city and together with it the hope of the people of Marawi.

Terrorism is absolute evil. It deprives innocent civilians of the good life they envisioned to possess. Terrorists, in this regard, are aimed to cause absolute terror and instill fear in the minds of the people. They raise their personal concerns and selfish-interests to the government by intimidation and violence. Terrorists direct their attention on harassing and

---

[2] Joseph Hincks,"The Battle for Marawi City," [Article online], Time.com/marawi-philippines-isis/, Accessed on: October 18, 2017.

[3] Ryan Rosauro, "Marawi Siege Turning into a War of Attention," [Article online], http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/913119/marawi-siege-turning-into-a-war-of-attrition#1xzz4vSAg7Ghw, Accessed on: October 18, 2017.

[4] Associated Press, "The Fight for Marawi and a Painful Window on War," [Article Online], https://www.voanews.com/a/marawi-philippines-painful-war/3895615.html, Accessed on: October 18,2017.

[5] Nawal, Allan, Divina Suson, Jeoffrey Maitem, "Evacuees Can't Go Home yet even if Marawi Conflcts Ends." [Article online]. http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/937539/evacuees-cant-go-home-yet-even-if-marawi-conflict-ends#ixzz4vSVjyTEd. Accessed on: October 18, 2017.

killing civilians to achieve their goal of a radical political change. This vulgarity on the part of the terrorists often leads to war. The government, in preventing the proliferation of acts of terrorism, engages into war against terrorists. Counter-terrorism is the expedient way of solving the problem of terrorism. It is intended ultimately to destroy and to stop terrorism in general. Its main project is to eliminate all terrorists and to protect the innocent civilians who may become possible targets of terrorist attacks. Moreover, with the use of advance weaponries in the war against terrorists, counter-terrorist measures are made precise and effective in exterminating the enemies. But it is also from the use of these advance military technologies that the counter- terrorist measures are, more often than not, causing larger destructions and far more deaths than the terrorists themselves.

This paper is not intended to discuss and evaluate the moral valuing of both proponents of war. Rather, what this paper argues is that in either case the individual development is compromised. This is so because both instances of political violence are destructive to the project of human development. War, in all its forms, is in contradiction to human development. It denies the individual subject of the opportunity to be capacitated to project for the life he values living. In a place that is constantly ravaged by wars, the welfare of the civilians is always jeopardized. War ultimately denies the individual of his substantive freedom. It forces the human person to live in a dehumanizing state of existence of absolute fear and poverty. Development, as the extension of the individual capabilities or freedoms, is devalued in times of war. This is so because in a war afflicted area all opportunities for development are closed. Development as the expansion of individual liberty is devalued in a community whose state of peace and order is always threatened by the presence of war and terrorism.

2.Terrorism and War

The debate on the justifiability of either case of political violence must not ultimately be identified on the basis of our conventional understanding of terrorism and war. It is rather unpersuasive to argue that terrorism is unjustifiable for it deliberately targets innocent civilians in pursuing its goals of effecting radical political changes. While war against terrorism is justified for it ultimately seeks to protect the people from being terrorized. Although it is true that all acts of terror are condemnable and that counter terrorism, which leads to war, is in some sense good for its intention is to protect the population from terrorism. But if we are to compare the deaths and the extent of the damage that these two instances of

political violence caused to the populace, we will realize that "the actions of states opposing terrorist groups have frequently killed far more civilians than have terrorists."[6] This is not to say that the former is justified while the later is in contrary not. What is being presupposed is that our conventional understanding of the differences between both instances of political violence is limiting. In order to properly engage into the debate one must begin with the necessity of comparing the number of deaths and the actual extent of the damage that is caused in either instance of violence. The comparison should not lead us to determine which is far more justifiable between them; rather it must push us to realize that violence is detrimental to the development of the people. Violence should not be perceived as the sole alternative to solving political conflicts and disputes.

The necessity of reexamining our notion of terrorism springs from the fact that it cannot be determined under a specific definition. Defining terrorism is a notoriously difficult task due to its multiplicity of forms. "There are different kinds of terrorism as there are of war."[7] To define terrorism as simply the deliberate killing of innocent civilians is insufficient to determine the nature of such phenomenon. The description tends to disqualify the moral equivalence of the atrocities that anti-terrorist acts proliferate in the process of obliterating terrorist groups. The conventional definition of terrorism as "the random killing of innocent people, in the hope of creating passive fear"[8] is necessarily limiting. It tends simply to limit terrorism as an act that is proper to non government individuals whose interest simply is to terrorize the people, with the aim of causing political change. Micheal Walzer sees this as problematic, for even states are capable of causing terror. The bombings of Heroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 that have caused the deaths of thousands of innocent civilians and terrorized the entire nation, surely, as Walzer argues, were an act of terrorism.[9] Although it is true that by nature terrorism posits a "continual threat to individuals' sense of safety and well-being"[10], for it holds hostage the innocent civilians who are part of the government which they are opposing. Walzer asserts "It is the extension of violence or the threat of violence from individual to groups that is the special feature of terrorism."[11] But to simply limit such

---

[6] Viginia Held, "Terrorism and War", *The Journal of Ethics* 8, no 1 (2004), p.61.
[7] Viginia Held, "Terrorism and War", p.61.
[8] Micheal Walzer, "Terrorism and Just War", *Philosophia* 34, no 1 (2006), 3.
[9] Micheal Walzer, Terrorism and Just War, 3.
[10] Judith A. Richman, Lea Cloninger, Kathleen M. Rospenda, "Terrorism and Mental Health outcomes: Broadening the Stress Paradigm", *American Journal of Public Health* 98, no 2 (2008), p.113.
[11] Micheal Walzer, "Terrorism and Just War", 7.

capacity of terrorizing innocent civilians to non-state individuals is unpersuasive. Surely, terrorism is political violence and so too the state's counter terrorist measures is a form of political violence. The Marawi siege was one of the many instances of terrorism. It was an act of deliberate devaluation of the people of Marawi with the lone intention of forcing the government to yield to the Mautes' demands for political change. So too was the bombing of some cities in Germany during the early 1940s by the allied forces. Although the intention maybe of only killing the German soldiers who were sympathetic to Hitler and the deaths of thousands of innocent civilians were perceived to be the collateral damage of war. But the fact of the matter remains, that there were civilians who were killed and were terrorized by the act. Certainly I would say that such act was in fact an act of terrorism. War as acted by the state takes in some sense the same violence embraced by terrorists in pursuing their goals of political change. The differences merely lie on the execution of their intended goals. Terrorists tend to deliberately attack civilians while counter terrorist acts tend to not deliberately kill civilians. Micheal Walzer explicates:

> The terrorists hold that there is no such thing as 'collateral' or … secondary damage. All damage for them is primary, and they want to do as much damage as they can: The more deaths, the more fear. So anti-terrorists have to distinguish themselves by insisting on the category of collateral damage, and by doing as little of it as they can.[12]

Counter- terrorism justifies its violence with the presupposition that the deaths and the extent of the damage it caused in the process of fighting against terrorists were non-deliberate that is they were not intentionally willed but are sheer collateral damages of war. The government, in this regard, is justified in waging war against terrorists even if it would entail the deaths of innocent civilians. Walzer greatly disagrees with this position. For it is neither persuasive nor ethically sound to claim that the primary act of obliterating the enemies is willed while the secondary act of harming innocent civilians in the process is unintended. There should be, he argues, two intentions. The first is the immediate annihilation of the terrorists and the second is to protect the innocent civilians during the war.[13] In view of this, the government must take absolute care to avoid harming the people and to make sure that only minimal damage is caused. But what transpires is often the contrary for more often than not, counter-terrorist acts are far more destructive and careless in pursuing its cause of annihilating the enemies.

---

[12] Micheal Walzer, "Terrorism and Just War", 7.
[13] Micheal Walzer, "Terrorism and Just War", 7.

It is enough to reflect upon the destruction of Marawi city, after the government forces opted to bomb the entire city in wanting to eliminate the Maute group, to understand how anti-terrorist acts can compromise the safety and welfare of civilians in a war zone. Counter-terrorism is therefore a form of political violence. The killing and the terror it caused to civilians is likely to be the same as the killing and the terror that terrorists effect to their victims. A government that uses violence to suppress those non-government actors' demands for political change by way of unjustified violence is guilty of the same terroristic tendency. "And sometimes they are more at fault because alternative course of action were more open to them."[14] This is so because, "terrorism that kills civilians to oppose a government policies does not distinguish between those who support and those who oppose the government. But neither does counter-terrorism that kills civilians distinguish between those who support and those who do not support terrorist groups."[15]

I do not intend to argue that terrorism is justifiable, for it cannot be justified, nor do I claim that counter-terrorism is an absolute evil. What is simply being presupposed is in either case casualties are imminent. Innocent civilians are often the victims of war. In war, the civilians are devalued and are striped off of their welfare and wellbeing. There is nothing good that can be deduced from violence. Violence should be taken as the last resort if all possible options are taken but to no avail. The government must take the initiative to engage into a democratic dialogue, being the one who is in power to do so, with the "non-state actors". This is so because "democracy is more effective than counter-terrorism."[16] In a truly democratic society war is never an option; grounded by the fundamental principles of equality and liberty, the state would see to it that each individual's call for development is listened to in a public deliberation of political projects and development. And it is precisely this lack of democratic discourse that, more often and than not, have forced these non-state agents to rebel against the present structural injustices. In Mindanao for instance, its long history of wars and terrorism is attributed to the sad history of lumad oppressions that were proliferated by the country's powerful oligarchs who looted the region of its resources and thrown out the lumads from their ancestral domains.

---

[14] Viginia Held, "Terrorism and War", 71.
[15] Viginia Held, "Terrorism and War", 67.
[16] Viginia Held, "Terrorism and War", 69.

3. Capabilities and Human Development

Amartya Sen, in wanting to reformulate the notion of development, proposed his capability approach theory as a philosophical and ethical framework where everyone can begin to discuss what truly development is about. He rejected the conventional notion of development that centers on welfare economics. Development, as expressed in wellbeing utility, is reduced to sheer satisfaction of preferences realized in the sheer acquisition and consumption of resources. Although Sen does not absolutely deny the instrumental value of commodities for the wellbeing of the person, but what he is against with is its tendency to reduce the human being as a means for development, rather than an end in-himself. In welfare economics development is ultimately identified with the sum total of the economic growth of a country as determined by its GNP and the GDP. For welfare economics therefore the main objective of development is economic growth and man being simply an instrument for its realization is reduced to a sheer means. Man in this sense is dehumanized. The main objective therefore of the capability approach is to elevate man from his commodification in giving him his lost dignity in the process of economic development. The capability approach takes its primary presuppositions from an Aristotelian and Marxist assertion of man being rational and economical. For Sen, man is by nature rational. Man is capacitated to freely choose the life he finds reasonable to live. Likewise, since man is an economic being his development must spring from him being freed from the commodification factors of welfare economics. The capability approach is intended simply to making development truly human. This is realized by Sen with his insistence on the necessity of freedom as the proper space for development. Putting freedom as the primary element for wellbeing directs us to the end that constitutes development rather than to some means. Sen expresses the point thus:

> If freedom is what development advances, then there is a major argument for concentrating on that overarching objective, rather than on some particular means, or some specially chosen list of instruments. Viewing development in terms of expanding substantive freedoms directs attention to the ends that make development important, rather than merely to some of the means that, inter alia, play a prominent part in the process.[17]

The insistence on the necessity of seeing development as the expansion of individual substantive freedom is coming from the very project of humanizing development. The capability approach conceives freedom as the essential element for man to truly develop.

---

[17] Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 3.

Development in this regard is identified with the capability of man to freely choose the state of existence he finds reasonable to live and to do things he finds reasonable to do. It centers not on the things he possesses and will posses, but on what he can be and do without him being constraint and coerced by external factors foreign to him being rational and free. Severine Deneulin further explicates that: "By situating the evaluative space of quality of life in the capability space, that is, in what individuals are able to be or do, Sen's capability approach implies that individuals are to be considered as the very subjects of development."[18] Development for Sen is not value neutral as simply being an instrument for human flourishment –the way welfare economics would portray development –but rather it is value laden, for it presupposes the primary development of the individual person's freedom. Furthermore Sen argues:

> Development requires the removal of major sources of unfreedom: poverty as well as tyranny, poor economic opportunities as well as systematic social deprivation, neglect of public facilities as well as intolerance or overactivity of repressive states.[19]

What Sen is conveying is that in order for a real development to happen, one's substantive freedom must first be developed. This is so because the non-development of the individual's substantive freedom would eventually lead to capability deficit or poverty. Poverty for instance is seen not simply as the lack of income nor of the absence of job. It is rather seen as a complex pathology that encloses all other aspects of human existence, such as personal heterogeneities, social, environmental and political aspects that may have contributed to the individual's capability deficit. Poverty in this regard is caused absolutely by the lack of development of the individual's substantive freedom. David Crocker simplifies the point of Sen in saying that: "Development ultimately aims at improving the kinds of lives human beings are living."[20] Such is made possible by the expansion of the individual's capabilities to do and to be in order to attain certain functionings or actual doings and beings which he finds valuable.[21] Human development therefore is determined by the individual's capacity to attain certain functionings which he finds reasonable to possess. That is, of

---

[18] Severine Deneulin, Beyond Individual freedom and agency: Structures of Living Together in the Capability Approach, In. *The Capability Approach: Concepts, Measures and Application*. Ed. S Alkire; F Comim; M Qizilbash. pp. 105-124 (Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2008), 106.

[19] Amartya, Sen, Development as Freedom, 4.

[20] David Crocker, "The Foundations of Sen and Nussbaum's Development Ethic". *Political Theory* 20, no 4 (1992), 586.

[21] Frances Stewart, Capabilities and Human Development: Beyond the Individual –the critical role of social institutions and social competencies United Nations Development Programme Human Development Report Office (2013), 3.

whether the person is really free to choose for the kind of existence and the sort of actions to take in pursuing the good life. "Evaluating the wellbeing of a person may include assessing their wellbeing achievement and their wellbeing freedom, which concerns their actual freedom to live well and be well; their freedom to enjoy various possible states of wellbeing associated with different ways of functionings."[22] The evaluative necessity of freedom in the determination of development rests in the presupposition that freedom is not just the primary end of development but it is likewise its principal means.[23] That is developing individual substantive freedom allows for an authentic human development to transpire. It is when the individual is truly free that one can project for the life the person deems reasonable to live. A poor farmer living in his old dilapidated house sick and hungry is well protected by his negative freedom, on account that no one would try to ransack his house and rob him of his properties, but with his state of capability deficit his negative freedom maybe of less importance, if not totally insignificant. What he needs at the present moment is to be freed from the constraints of avoidable morbidity, had it had been the state policies protected and upheld his basic entitlement to positive health. The realization of the substantive freedom of the individual is always linked with the state's instrumental function of protecting and furthering the claims of development. Democracy for this matter will come as the proper state structure, with its fundamental principles of equality and liberty, that will upheld the development of positive individual freedom with its political schemes directed towards such goal.

4. Democracy and Political Violence

By placing special emphasis on the necessity of individual freedom, seen as the evaluative measure for the determination of development, Sen's capability approach presupposes that human beings are the primary ends of development. Sen explicates that: "Development is to be assessed in terms of whether the freedoms that individuals have are enhanced and development is to be achieved through the free agency of individuals."[24] The capability approach, though insisting on the necessity of individual freedom being a vital aspect for human flourishing, does not disqualify the vital role that any society or institutional arrangements play in the realization of human development. Despite of Sen's emphatic insistence on the vitality of individual freedom –being both the end and the means of

---

[22] Jefrey Spring, Rights and Well-Being in Amartya Sen's Value Theory. *J Value Inquiry* 45, (2011), 4.
[23] Amartya Sen, Development as Freedom, 10.
[24] Amartya Sen, Development as Freedom, 4.

development– the capability approach does not isolate the individual from the social milieu he belongs. That is, "Sen's capability approach does not separate the thoughts, choices and the actions of individual human beings from the society in which they live, since individuals are quintessentially social creatures."[25] What this means is the freedom and agency that everyone enjoys are determined by the social structures that an individual subject is part of. His modes of choosing and acting are always determined by the collective consciousness that is prevalent to the social milieu he finds himself in. That is the individual subject may have freedom to act in accordance to what he thinks good and reasonable for him, but his "choices are heavily influenced by norms and institutions (market as well as social)."[26] This is so because: "Individual freedoms are inescapably linked to the existence of social arrangements, and our opportunities and prospects depend crucially on what institutions exist and how they function."[27]

Development for Sen is quintessentially a social enterprise. That is, although the capability approach centers its notion of development on the substantive freedom of the individual subjects –being the lone criterion for measuring development– but its fulfillment rests in the kind of social institution that will help realize its goals. And the type of government that is fit to serve this purpose of realizing the goals of human development is, for Sen, a democratic social arrangement. Democracy is the best if not the only institution that truly allows the development of the individual subject's substantive freedom. In a functioning democracy everyone is recognized as having political and civil rights which serve as the fulcrum for development. Sen explicates the importance of political and civil rights in the pursuit of development by insisting on the instrumental role that these entitlements are directed to. He asserts that:

> In that context, we have to look at the connection between political and civil rights, on the one hand, and the prevention of major economic disasters, on the other. Political and civil rights give people the opportunity to draw attention forcefully to general needs and to demand appropriate public action. The response of a government to the acute suffering of its people often depends on the pressure that is put on it. The exercise of political rights (such as voting, criticizing, protesting, and the like) can make a real difference to the political incentives that operate on a government.[28]

---

[25] Severine Deneulin, Beyond Individual Freedom and Agency, 106.
[26] Frances Stewart, Capabilities and Human Development, 6.
[27] Amartya, Sen, Development as Freedom, 142.
[28] Amartya Sen, "Democracy as Universal Value", *Journal of Democracy* 10, no 3 (1999),6.

Democratic freedom, which is basically expressed with the individual subject's exercise of his political rights, is quintessentially vital for the development of the person. Democratic freedom basically allows the individual to insist for his right to development. That is, it allows the individual person to insist for his right over some political incentives (such as: to live a life that is good, to be healthy, to be educated, to be allowed to partake into political engagements, to appear in public without being shamed, and the like) that are proper to him being part of a democratic institution. So that in essence, political rights do serve a positive role in the development of the person in general. The proliferation of the individual political rights is possible only if one is part of a democratic political arrangement. This is so because for Sen, it is only in a democracy that everyone's rights and freedom are protected. The reason for this is democracy values "first, the intrinsic importance of political participation and freedom in human life; second, the instrumental importance of political incentives in keeping governments responsible and accountable; and third, the constructive role of democracy in the formation of values and in the understanding of needs, rights, and duties."[29] Democracy, in this regard, is directed upon realizing individual freedom by allowing the individual subject to exercise his freedom to insist for development to actively take part in any institutional arrangements that he deems relevant to him being free and rational. In a real democracy, everyone is capacitated to freely choose the life they find reasonable to live. More so, in a real democracy war and conflict do not exist. This is so because as Sen explicates:

> The practice of democracy gives citizens an opportunity to learn from one another, and helps society to form its values and priorities. Even the idea of "needs" including the understanding of "economic needs," requires public discussion and exchange on information, views, and analyses. In this sense, democracy has a constructive importance, in addition to its intrinsic value for the lives of the citizens and its instrumental importance in political decisions.[30]

In a war infested area the protective role of democracy diminishes to its minimum of simply becoming a night watcher. The instrumental value of democracy rests in its keeping and recognizing each and everyone's political rights to development. It enriches the individual by recognizing the intrinsic value of his political freedom, which is for Sen, part of his freedom in general. Moreover, it further allows the individual to insist on expressing his needs and is guaranteed of all political attention. Lastly is allows the opportunity for a social and

---

[29] Amartya Sen, "Democracy as Universal Value", 8.
[30] Amartya Sen, "Democracy as Universal Value", 8.

political discourse on matters that the individual deems necessary and relevant for his wellbeing.[31] All these functions of democracy are intended towards the development of the individual members of the state. And it is the moral obligation of a democratic government to sustain and keep such instrumental role. But what transpires the moment a state is engaged in war, as discussed in the first section of this paper, is the contrary. The protective role of democracy loses its instrumental value in the time of war. For instead of allowing the individual to flourish by recognizing his intrinsic value, it rather reduces the individual subjects (innocent civilians) in the war zone as sheer objects of war that is as casualties of war. The protection of the civil and political rights of civilians in war is no longer the priority of the government. The civilians are reduced to sheer expendables of casualties of war.

Wars do not exist in a truly democratic society. This is so because in a truly functioning democracy, everyone's needs and concerns are heard. The work of a truly democratic society as Sen argues is to prevent major economic disasters and to secure social security with the intention of directing all its institutional schemes towards realizing development. Terrorism is a complex phenomenon that cannot simply be reduced to religious struggle, rather it is linked with some other aspects of human existence that were not listened to in the past and which escalated into a political rage for revenge. Violence should be the last alternative to take in resolving political conflicts. There is no human development in war because there is only the devaluation of man. Although development is identified with the individual's capacity to choose certain functionings, thus making it entirely subjective. But that does not mean that the society and hence the state in general has no part in realizing the project of development. The availability of certain functionings can affect the expansion of our freedom. Opportunities, as economic wellbeing and functionings, must be present in order for individuals to develop. In a state of political violence there are no such things as opportunities. The scarcity of food and other basic commodities is what is prevalent in a state that is at war. Development in this regard is impossible. Moreover, development which is athe expansion of the individual's capacity to be and do cannot be realized if there is meager, if not absolutely lacking, amount of economic wellbeing. In war, the human person is no longer the end nor the primary means of development, he has now become an object of war, devalued and whose political rights are disrespected.

---

[31] Amartya Sen, "Democracy as Universal Value", 8.

5. Conclusion

The reexamination of our conventional understanding of terrorism –as not just presupposing the intentional harming of the innocent civilians, but likewise the unintended harm caused by the state in its fight against terrorism– has brought us to a vital realization that in as much as both instances of political violence are destructive; they tend to compromise the project of human development in general. The necessity of having an institutional arrangement that is directed towards the proliferation of human development springs from the nature of development as quintessentially social. For Sen, institutions play a vital role in the promotion and proliferation of individual development. An institutional arrangement is functional if it caters the needs of the people most especially the poor. Furthermore, because our ways of doing and choosing are essentially determined by the social milieu we belong, we are constantly affected by the social structures of the society we come from. In order to safeguard our project of development we need an institution that allows us to freely engage in the process of formulating political arrangements that are intended solely in protecting our interests. Democracy is the institution that is fitted for the job. Its main objective is to protect the people and to lead everyone to their development. But what transpires when the same state engages in war is the absolute contradictory. The people whom it is suppose to protect are devaluated and striped off of their political rights and their intrinsic value. They become sheer casualties of war which the government is justified in killing. In a truly functioning democracy wars do not exist. Political conflicts are resolve not through war but though rational discourse, where upon everyone is given the chance to partake in the political processes that is relevant to them.

References

Associated Press. The Fight for Marawi and a Painful Window on War. [Article Online], https://www.voanews.com/a/marawi-philippines-painful-war/3895615.html. (Accessed on: October 18.10.2017).

Crocker, David. The Foundations of Sen and Nussbaum's Development Ethic. *Political Theory* 20, no 4 (1992): 584-612.

Deneulin, Severine. Beyond Individual freedom and agency: structures of living together in the capability approach to development. University of Bath Online Publication Store: Cambridge University Press. (2008):105-124.

Held, Viginia. "Terrorism and War", *The Journal of Ethics* 8, no 1 (2004) 8: 59-75.

Hincks, Joseph. "The Battle for Marawi City," [Article online], Time.com/marawi-philippines-isis/, Accessed on: October 18, 2017.

Nawal, Allan, Divina Suson, Jeoffrey Maitem. "Evacuees Can't Go Home yet even if Marawi Conflcts Ends." [Article online]. http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/937539/evacuees-cant-go-home-yet-even-if-marawi-conflict-ends#ixzz4vSVjyTEd. Accessed on: October 18, 2017.

Judith A. Richman, Lea Cloninger, Kathleen M. Rospenda. "Terrorism and Mental Health outcomes: Broadening the Stress Paradigm", *American Journal of Public Health* 98, no 2 (2008): 323-329.

Rosauro, Ryan D. "Marawi Siege Turning into a War of Attrition,"[Article online], http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/913119/marawi-siege-turning-into-a-war-of attrition#ixzz4vSAg7Ghw, (Accessed on: October 18.10. 2017).

Sen, Amartya. Development as Freedom. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Sen, Amartya. "Democracy as Universal Value", *Journal of Democracy* 10, no 3 (1999): 3-17.

Spring, Jefrey. Rights and Well-Being in Amartya Sen's Value Theory. J Value Inquiry (2011 45, pp. 13-26.

Stewart, Frances. Capabilities and Human Development: Beyond the Individual –the critical role of social institutions and social competencies United Nations Development Programme Human Development Report Office (2013).

Walzer, MIcheal. "Terrorism and Just War", *Philosophia* 34, no 1 (2006): 3-12.