



Evolution of Thinking and Research on Human and Personal Security 1994-2013

Des Gasper and Oscar A. Gómez

Des Gasper is Professor of Human Development, Development Ethics and Public Policy at the International Institute of Social Studies, The Hague. Recent publications include *Migration, Gender and Social Justice: Perspectives on human insecurity*, co-edited with T. D. Truong et al., and published by Springer, and “Approaching Development Projects from a Human Development and Capability Perspective,” co-authored with A. Apsan Frediani and A. Boni for the *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities* (15(1), 1–12).

Oscar A. Gómez is a researcher based in Japan, currently serving as Deputy Secretary General of the Japan Association for Human Security Studies. His work deals with the theory and practice of human security, emphasizing the environment, health and disasters, with related fieldwork in Colombia, Japan and the Philippines. He has also been involved in several United Nations projects on human security operationalization and diffusion in Latin America. He is now working on human security perceptions in East Asia and the convergence of humanitarian and developmental agendas.

ABSTRACT

Human security analysis considers the intersection of deprivation and vulnerability, and is an essential part, or partner, of human development thinking, giving special attention to risks and forces of disruption and destruction. This paper highlights six strands or styles in such work since 1994: violent conflict, and its prevention and resolution; crime and 'citizen security'; psychological insecurity; environmental change; comprehensive identification and comparison of all major threats; and study of selected priority threats in a particular time and place. The main attention in the paper goes to the first, second and fifth of these topics. The 1994 Human Development Report's list of seven categories of frequently threatened values was not intended to promote consideration of each in isolation, for threats interconnect, their relative importance changes, and comparisons are required. The flexibility required runs counter to vested interests and established patterns of inclusion/exclusion; security is too often equated to familiar means instead of related to the changing agenda of threats. In each context, the paper advises regular alternation of broad-horizon studies to identify priority areas and their linkages, with narrower horizon studies that explore in depth the threats and alternatives within pre-selected priority fields.

Summary

Human security analysis is an essential part, or partner, of human development thinking. If we see human development analysis as including attention to basic needs, and to threats, disruptions and fluctuations, as it should and typically does, then human security analysis is a wing or dimension within it. If human development analysis is seen only as about creation and expansion of valuable capabilities, then human security analysis adds special attention to counterpart concerns: vulnerabilities, risks, and forces of disruption and destruction.

The human security concept covers both deprivation and vulnerability. These two aspects largely correspond to, respectively, human security analysis' 'equity dimension' (a focus on persons and how they live and can live, and a focus on fulfilment of basic needs and rights) and its 'connectivity dimension' (its study of how people live within a total context constituted by numerous interconnecting systems, and of the threats and opportunities that can arise from factors in various parts of this life environment, and from their intersection and interactions). It does not study threats, vulnerability and fluctuations per se, for it is not concerned with the risks of, say, speculators in financial markets. Instead, it distinctively studies deprivation with special attention to vulnerability. The multidimensional poverty analysis that is prominent in much human development research takes up the concerns in the equity dimension: basic needs and people-centredness. Human

security research examines in addition the other features: the nature and operation of threats in interconnected systems.

A focus on the realities of people's lives demands a comprehensive perspective that captures the 'connectivity dimension'. The intersections of diverse aspects involve not merely the addition of separate effects but major interactions, as highlighted for example in research on human dimensions of environmental change. Differences in the combinations of factors bring about major differences in what happens in the lives of different people, between families and between persons. The 'downside risks' that these conjunctures can bring for vulnerable people include spirals of disadvantage, damage, disability and ultimately even premature death.

The 1994 Human Development Report's listing of seven leading categories of frequently threatened values—economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, political security and community security—was not intended to entrench a silo-approach in which the categories are considered each in isolation (UNDP 1994). The seven-fold list had the unstated rationale that its categories often linked to existing policy portfolios and ministry or department titles, which helps to explain the list's durability despite its lack of exact conceptual basis. Within the list, those categories, like food security, that fit existing policy portfolios have often not become leading, self-standing foci for in-depth work that uses a human security language and framework, even though much of the work in those areas, for example, on livelihoods, can be readily accommodated and sometimes enriched within a human security framework.

A large exception to this pattern concerns environmental change, where a major human security literature has emerged despite the existence already of a standard policy portfolio, for we are not mainly concerned about the environment in isolation but because of its impacts on how people live. This stream of work is in many ways the most comprehensive line of human security research, giving attention to all seven categories above and more besides.

The theme of vulnerability is part of a richer picture of the human being than only capability and reasoned choice. Issues of security, insecurity and threats link to fear, emotions and partly subjective perception. Emotions are central parts of human personality, agency, motivation and experience. Compared to the term 'vulnerability', the term 'insecurity' may help in better bringing out the essential subjective dimensions.

This paper highlights six major strands in work since 1994 that have explicitly used a human security framework, focused, respectively, on: violent conflict and its prevention and resolution; crime and 'citizen' security; psychological insecurity; environmental change; comprehensive identification and comparison of all major threats; and case-specific identification of priority threats in a particular

time and place. Significant work in other fields, such as migration, refugee studies, and minorities studies, exists, but is not highlighted here.

One major stream of research using human security ideas in relation to the ‘personal security’ category addresses situations of ongoing, feared or recent armed conflict, especially in Africa and Asia. Human security thinking has served to frame peace efforts that go beyond military victory. Its emphasis on understanding the root causes of conflict, with due context-specific attention, adds value. Human security research has highlighted also how levels of violence in general have been decreasing worldwide, how armed conflict is mutating into a more complex, low-intensity phenomenon in a limited set of hotspots, and how state security systems accordingly could and should be transformed.

The ‘citizen security’ stream of work has been about threats to citizens in everyday life from physical violence and crimes against property, largely with reference to local rule-of-law institutions in Latin America and the Caribbean. (The 2011 *World Development Report* adopts the term ‘citizen security’ but tries to introduce a deviant definition in terms of physical violence only.) Reflecting more than a decade of experience and evolution in Latin America, the ‘citizen security’ notion has helped to inspire transformation from a research and policy agenda focused on violence and conflict to one of institutional consolidation dealing with an expanding agenda of types of crime and social pathology that affect ordinary people. The approach shows the potential gains of sometimes changing the scale of analysis, from the nation to the city and sometimes the supranational region. The change of level allows getting closer to people, to the reality of threats, and to existing local protection and empowerment practices. But, for highly interconnected, mobile 21st century societies, ‘citizenship’ might become a restrictive central category, unless forms of ‘citizenship’ beyond local nationality are recognized.

The theme of psychological insecurity—or more broadly, attention to perceptions and emotions of security and insecurity—can and should be combined with every type of sectoral focus. Biases and over- and under-estimations are endemic. At the same time, perception studies capture public opinion on institutional performance and may help identify biases in official statistics. They also help to include the voices of the excluded and all affected populations, and to better grasp the complexity of situations, and how insecurity and agency interact in daily life. Citizen security surveys, for example, have provided insights into: local cohesion or lack of cohesion, ‘security dilemmas’ at the individual level, the sacrifices people make in response to feelings of insecurity, and the scapegoating of some populations. Reports frequently show that successful initiatives are not followed by reduced fear, and that responses adopted in the face of exaggerated or misplaced fears can be worse than the actual threat.

A broad treatment of threats and potential responses is essential: Threats interconnect, their relative importance changes over time, and comparisons are required between different ways of responding to a given threat and the returns from responding. Contingency in the circumstances, and variation in the combination and impacts of threats, together disqualify an a priori hierarchy of threat importance. Any threat can become the most critical, depending on the circumstances. Comprehensive or comparative human security analyses allow mapping of both the occurrence and the perception of a wider pool of threats, so that traditional personal security issues can be understood in their deserved dimensions and not disproportionately.

The required flexibility of analysis and response runs counter to processes of institutional ossification, vested interests, and established and institutionalized patterns of inclusion/exclusion. These support a persisting emphasis on the familiar means of security, over the ends of human freedoms and well-being. Security as a concept keeps being associated with certain specific means—the military, the police, etc., in their conventional avatars—instead of with the changing agenda of threats. In the case of threat-based organizational silos, an exit strategy may not exist once the targeted threat ceases to be an important danger.

Narrow views of threats and means for realizing human security reflect also a too limited picture of the human person, which compromises the usefulness of the strategies born from these pictures. In many societies, far more people suffer from, for example, natural and environmental disasters, traffic accidents or tobacco exposure than from violence or organized crime.

The paper concludes that a useful and feasible principle will be to regularly alternate broad-horizon studies that help to identify priority areas and their linkages, with narrower horizon studies that explore in depth the threats and alternatives within selected specific fields.

Introduction

2014 marks 20 years of work worldwide around the idea of human security, work that took off due to the Human Development Report of 1994. It is a good time to reflect on the evolution in thinking and doing with the concept, discourse and practice of human security. Probably it is too soon for definitive judgements about its contribution; we should remember how the partner idea and movement of human rights has grown gradually but not smoothly over many decades, and how human development ideas became mainstreamed in the 1990s only after a preceding generation of gestation.

The first generation of human security analysis was characterized by much opposition to the concept in the traditional security epistemic community, as well as an often sceptical reception in a

development community already busy with other concepts and urgent agendas. Yet the idea of human security has not only survived but attracted continuous, growing and widespread attention and application, as reflected in the UN General Assembly resolution of 2012 (66/290) and the now large literatures in various areas, such as the work drawn on for the 2014 report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).¹ While caution is appropriate, the ground seems fertile. The present paper analyses this spread and evolution, and suggests a way to understand the place of human security ideas in the toolbox of researchers and practitioners who identify with or feel close to a human development approach.

The first section highlights four fundamental and linked aspects of a human security perspective, following the analysis by Amartya Sen, and groups these under headings provided by O'Brien and Leichenko (2007): an 'equity dimension' and a 'connectivity dimension'. The second section clarifies the role of a human security perspective in the human development and capabilities approach. It aims to move a step forward in understanding the interface between the concepts of human development and human security, beyond discussion on which is part of which (Alkire 2010) or chicken-and-egg debates (Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy 2007). A more complex analysis includes an enriched picture of the person, as explicit or implicit in capabilities thinking, one that recognizes contingency, threats, vulnerability, (in)stability and prioritization as major life themes. Just as the themes of development and security have always coexisted in policy agendas, their human development and human security counterparts represent 'boundary objects' catalysing transformation of thinking and practice beyond established narrow visions of economic growth and military strength (Gasper 2005).

Accordingly, the paper examines the evolution and prospects of human security ideas and practice as it enlarges the picture of the person and her environment from the starting point that traditional 'security' thinking adopts, namely a focus on bodies, and on violence and crime. The third section gives an overview of the lines of evolution and application. The fourth, fifth and sixth sections look in detail at the role of the 'personal security' component inside human security thinking, including in the variant form of 'citizen security'. The 2013 global Human Development Report commented on human insecurity in relation to crime and military spending, showing how there is little correlation between homicide rates and Human Development Index (HDI) values, and that crime is not generally higher in poorer cities; neither is military spending correlated to HDI performance (UNDP 2013b, pp. 38-40). These facts show the distinctiveness of human security issues and propositions, but still fail to present the larger picture of challenges and transformations raised by the perspective of human-centred security. Reflecting on the example of the 2005 Human

¹ See the outline at: www.ipcc-wg2.gov/AR5/ar5-outline.html.

Development Report of the Philippines (UNDP 2005a), and its decision about whether to prepare a human security report about armed conflict or about disasters, this paper offers a cross-sectional perspective on human security studies, moving the picture of the person from bare survival to a fuller one that directs attention to protection and empowerment against threats that people fear and have reasons to fear.

Present and future evolution of human security thinking and doing will involve engaging both with unfinished traditional security issues and with the transformative dynamic necessary to overcome the inadequate silo approach to threats. These two steps depend heavily on the success of stakeholders in incorporating a broader view of the person into their approach to social problems. In the case of security, this broader view includes, in part, attention to subjectivity and human limitations in assessing different risks that correspond to values and needs highlighted through human development ideas.

The later parts of the paper show how transformation of security thinking beyond dealing with violence alone is being framed through human security research, including by country and regional teams at UNDP. It suggests a dialectic process in which task forces on specific emerging priority threats are both preceded and followed by more general reviews across threats. These will facilitate reallocating attention when and where required.

The human security concept

FOUR FEATURES

In his contribution to the new *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*, Amartya Sen distinguishes four features in the concept of human security (Sen 2013, p. 18). First, a focus on what happens to individual persons, rather than to the nation-state, the economy, the military, or some other entity. Second, an understanding of individual persons in their total context of living. These first two features are common across the human development approach, which asks what reasonably valued attainable options persons have open to them, and what do they actually attain—their capabilities and their functionings. Sen's work on entitlements analysis exemplifies the investigation of persons' total context—economic, social and cultural, legal, political, physical, epidemiological, etc.—to examine what they can and cannot achieve. This understanding is incorporated in his overall approach and exemplified in his books with Jean Drèze on hunger and socio-economic development in India (Drèze and Sen 1989, 1990, 1995, 2002, 2013; see Gasper 2008 for a picture of the implied methodology). Some work on human development emphasizes mostly the first feature and the associated measuring of valued attainable goods. With respect to the second feature, while attention

to diversity in people's situations and needs is characteristic of the whole human development approach, work on human security emphasises also the multi- and transdisciplinary systems of interconnection that determine individual persons' capabilities and vulnerabilities. It has continued with the full agenda of entitlements analysis: to investigate threats and risks, how these affect diverse groups, and how people can and do respond.

The concept of human security, Sen notes, has two further key features. The third is a focus on basic priorities including, not least, life and health and dignity. The idea of human security rethinks and transforms the preceding work on basic human needs, but builds on it. Using the language of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a human security approach emphasizes: "The right of people to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair. All individuals, in particular vulnerable people, are entitled to freedom from fear and freedom from want, with an equal opportunity to enjoy all their rights and fully develop their human potential." This is the first component of the elucidation provided in the UN General Assembly's 2012 resolution 66/290. This return to the fundamental concepts of the United Nations was present in the 1994 Human Development Report on human security and in many statements by its director Mahbub ul Haq. Human security analysis serves the necessary role of helping public prioritization within the otherwise open-ended human development panorama of what people have reason to value.²

Fourth, such analysis considers the stability or instability of fulfilment of these basic priorities and the 'downside risks' to which ordinary people are vulnerable. The concern with stability is with regard to the fulfilment of basic human priorities. Human security analysis is not, for example, independently concerned with the stability of returns to billionaire financial speculators.

In sum, human security analysis looks at threats to the fulfilment of basic priorities in the lives of ordinary persons, and at the generation and interconnection of these threats in real-world

² One might perhaps say that human security analysis is concerned with reduction and avoidance of suffering, which is one of the three well-being categories identified by well-being research, the other two being happiness and reflective satisfaction. Alternatively, much human security work adopts declared human rights as the criteria of basic priorities. While "the capability approach expresses an ideal of a community sitting together to decide the priorities that it will seek to assure or promote [, the] sister human rights approach recognises that 'communities' can exclude and marginalise. It expresses the priority of some basic entitlements that stem from global and nationally endorsed values that override community habits and that ensure all residents and workers can adequately participate in the deliberating community" (Frediani et al. 2014, p. 7).

systems, rather than only as considered in artificially restricted and abstracted disciplinary formulations.³ In other words, it considers the intersection of deprivation and vulnerability.

The four elements above were present in the 1994 Human Development Report. Each deserves underlining, not least the second—comprehensive attention to the social and physical contexts that constrain and enable people, and help determine their vulnerabilities and capabilities—and the fourth, attention to threats and risks. Both the second and fourth elements are motivated by the first: the concern for seeing how ordinary individuals live, can live and can die. The fundamental principle behind the introduction of a human security perspective 20 years ago was thus indeed the first feature stated above, that security analysis and policy must place people as the centre of attention. Established security thinking and doing have been related more to nation-states' interests and to external aggression, and/or to the interests of wealthier groups, than to the threats that ordinary individuals and communities have to endure in their daily lives. Yet the means to provide security that were emphasized during the years of interpretation of 'security' only as defence of territorial or economic sovereignty or civil order are frequently of little use to protect and empower populations in terms of their most pressing daily concerns, argued Haq and others. People-centredness thus requires a transformation in the way that values and threats are prioritized through security discourse and in how strategies for response are designed.

THE 'EQUITY' AND 'CONNECTIVITY' DIMENSIONS OF HUMAN SECURITY

The focus on people and the priority given to basic needs together constitute what O'Brien and Leichenko, for example, in their work for the Human Development Report 2007-2008 (UNDP 2008), called the equity dimension of human security analysis (O'Brien and Leichenko 2007, O'Brien 2010; see also Leichenko and O'Brien 2008). The stress on transdisciplinary systems analysis and the focus on threats and risks correspond to what they call the connectivity

³ A recent draft document for the 2014 Human Development Report stated: "While [1] human development is a broader concept of expanding people's choices; [2] human security focuses on whether people can exercise these choices safely and freely—[3] including being confident that the opportunities they have today will not be totally lost tomorrow." Clause [1] is too open, since the relevant criterion is *valuable* choices, not every choice; so we could say "expanding their range of attainable valuable options." Clause [2] is too narrow if 'safely' means only bodily/physical safety. Further, if the choices [= options] cannot be exercised [= attained] freely then they are not options. Perhaps the term 'freely' is a way of hinting at fulfilling basic requirements for making choices: the basics of health and agency that were clarified in basic needs theory (Streeten et al. 1982, Doyal and Gough 1991). Clause [3] is liable to be again too open, since human security analysis concerns stability of basics rather than stability of all riches.

dimension.⁴ Threats typically involve the interaction of numerous factors, as entitlements analyses and risk analyses have shown. Anomic patterns of living, for example, could encourage many to seek consolation in high-carbon consumption that increases the occurrence of extreme weather events that accelerate urban expansion and anomie. Extreme weather events primarily affect the economically poor and socially marginal, who are typically those living in more exposed locations, and who are already also vulnerable through lack or loss of economic entitlements and non-inclusion in systems of public support or insurance.

The multidimensional poverty analysis prominent in much human development research takes up the concerns of the equity dimension: basic needs and people-centredness. Several branches of human security research examine—in addition to the other features—the nature and operation of threats in interconnected systems. We can note in particular the extensive research on human security and environmental change, for example, in volumes from the 1999-2010 Global Environmental Change and Human Security project in the United Nations' International Human Dimensions Programme (predecessor of Future Earth), the follow-on programmes, and the work associated with the United Nations University's Institute for Environment and Human Security.⁵ These studies do not restrict themselves to the environment, but explore all the categories introduced in the 1994 Human Development Report and their interconnections. The report noted the long list of human security threats, but suggested most fall under seven categories (UNDP 1994, pp. 24-25):

- Economic security
- Food security
- Health security
- Environmental security
- Personal security
- Community security

⁴ Similarly: "Human development thinking, as formulated by Mahbub ul Haq, Paul Streeten and others, contains both an ethical perspective and a theory of interconnections. Both arose in reaction to the traditional perspective in economics. The principle of interconnection holds that linkages that are not mediated and measured through economic means are often centrally important..." (Gasper 2009).

⁵ For example, volumes edited by Matthew et al. (2010) and Sygna et al. (2013), and the Hexagon book series on Human and Environmental Security and Peace—see: www.springer.com/series/8090.

- Political security

This is a listing of threatened values (or sets of values), not of specific threats/threat vectors. It was presented as an initial framework for looking at values at risk, and the systems of threats that can endanger them. It was not intended to entrench a silo-approach in which the categories are considered in isolation. As articulated by Haq, a human focus demands a comprehensive analytical perspective—a transdisciplinary systems approach—that captures O'Brien and Leichenko's 'connectivity dimension'. For human lives are not sectoral, but are created and constituted by the intersections of all aspects; the intersections involve not merely the addition of separate effects, but major interactions. Unless this interconnectedness is kept in mind, there is a danger that freedoms and choices will be analysed as if they were separable, additive goods that can be aggregated like the commodities in a budget set. Much research on human dimensions of environmental change highlights how trends and events in all seven categories interconnect. Differences in the particular combinations of factors bring about major differences in what happens in the lives of people, and resulting differences between families and between persons. Corresponding implications for policy responses and public action, not only for research, are articulated in the 2012 General Assembly resolution's (66/290) second point of characterization: "Human security calls for people-centred, comprehensive, context-specific and prevention-oriented responses that strengthen the protection and empowerment of all people and all communities..." (United Nations General Assembly 2012).

These implications for explanatory analysis and policy design were drawn already in the entitlements analysis work led by Sen in the 1980s (e.g., Drèze and Sen 1989, 1990), and have been followed up in important streams of human security research. They add value through person-centred attention to the intersections in specific contexts of multiple dimensions of life.

Human security analysis in relation to discourse on capabilities and human development

Human security analysis is an aspect of human development analysis broadly conceived, an approach initiated by Haq, Sen and associates. The same researchers formulated human security and human development as part of the same enterprise. If the overall system is not kept in mind, then different aspects are in danger of being placed in artificially antagonistic relation to each other. The previous section outlined how human security analysis looks at threats to the fulfilment of basic priorities in the lives of ordinary individuals. Here we see the first feature: Individual people's lives are described, in terms of ideas from human development theory, of functioning, capability and agency; and the second feature, attention to the contexts in which

functionings of basic importance are or can be promoted and sustained, or endangered and thwarted. This takes us too to the third feature: Human security analysis looks at basic functionings and capabilities, such as living a life of normal human span, roughly the Biblical ‘three-score years and ten’, the average that is attainable even in well-ordered, low-income countries, and not easily greatly exceeded even in very rich countries. Countries with 20 times higher per capita income may show only 5 or 10 percent greater life expectancy than some low-income countries, or even none at all. More elaborately stated, human security analyses, as in the work on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), look at the fulfilment of the requirements for functioning as an autonomous agent; an effective, responsible citizen and ‘householder’: including, inter alia, sufficient education, adequate health, a basic level of income and social inclusion with a dignified accepted status. They also consider the factors that prevent, undermine or jeopardize these requirements. There is some heritage here from basic needs theory, as worked on earlier by Haq, Sen, Streeten, Stewart and others

The fourth vital feature of human security analysis that we noted is the focus on the multifarious intersecting forces that can threaten and disrupt fulfilment of these basic needs and/or rights. The ‘downside risks’ that these forces and conjunctures can threaten include more than merely temporary fluctuations; they can comprise downside spirals of disadvantage; of physical, mental and emotional damage and disability; and death. But, for example, in climate change research, “it is rare to see an academic or policy discourse about adaptation which identifies the specific risks that adaptation seeks to avoid, and to whom those risks most apply (such as, for example, the risk of increased malnutrition among women in the highlands of Papua New Guinea)” (Barnett 2011, p. 270). An exception is work that sees itself as human security analysis. “An emphasis on human capabilities and human security draws attention to the differential consequences of climate change for individuals and communities resulting first and foremost from disparities in human development” (O’Brien and Leichenko 2007, p. 14). Without such insight, appropriate adaptation policies are impossible.

The concept of capabilities is used here not only as a way of describing what people can attain, but also with reference to their capacities and abilities. As in the General Assembly resolution’s (66/290) second point of characterization, human security analysis examines the role of empowerment—expanding people’s own capacities and agency—as fundamentally important for reacting to threats and fulfilling basic requirements, and looks for the opportunities that may accompany threats. Relatedly, human security analysts in Latvia’s 2002-2003 Human Development Report (UNDP 2003b) consolidated a concept of ‘securitability’, people’s ability to establish, maintain and restore their own security; this has now been adopted as a national policy objective.

If we see human development analysis as including attention to basic needs, and to threats, disruptions and fluctuations, as it should and typically does, then human security analysis is a wing or dimension within it. If though—using an analogy to the Hindu trinity of creation, sustenance/preservation, and transformation/destruction—human development analysis looks only at creation and expansion of valuable capabilities, then human security analysis adds special attention to the counterpart concerns: vulnerabilities, risks, and forces of disruption and destruction. The two types of analysis can then be described as partners: “...work on human security recognises that situations are not stable, and that we must plan not only for how to fulfil aspirations but how to deal with threats and adversities, many of which are situation-specific, group-specific, intersectional” and require locally determined response (Frediani et al. 2014, p. 7).⁶

Something more needs to be said, concerning the conceptualization of ‘human’. Human development analysis requires more than only distinguishing individuals behind the aggregations in our statistics. It must consider the real lives of real mortals, behind the abstractions in social and human sciences. The theme of vulnerability is part of a richer picture of the human than only capability (and lack of capability) and reasoned choice.⁷ Emotions, for example, are central parts of human personality, perception, motivation and experience. These themes are articulated by, among others, Martha Nussbaum, regarding how part of what makes people human (and not gods) is vulnerability, and how our vulnerability is a (potential) source of or condition for sympathy with the vulnerability of others. As Haq and Sen have emphasized too, without this fellow feeling, measurement and analysis will sometimes not achieve much. “One reason why human security thinking has gathered momentum is because it draws on a deeper picture of human personality, emotion, sociability and lived experience than has been used in some thinking on human rights and human development... Human security thinking connects to the roots in humanistic psychology, humanistic philosophy and daily moral life that [underlie] development ethics” (Gasper 2009).

Both ‘vulnerability’ and ‘security’ are useful terms, as two sides of the coin. Whether the language of ‘security’ and ‘insecurity’ is itself a safe choice has though been intensely debated. To

⁶ The 2010 Human Development Report adopted the ‘separate but equal’ formulation: “Human development and human security are distinct concepts—the first relating to expanding people’s freedoms and the second to ensuring against threats to those freedoms.” (UNDP 2010, p. 17). But later on the same page it moved to the ‘part of the whole’ formulation: “Human security is not an alternative to human development—it is a critical part of it that focuses on creating a minimum set of capabilities and protecting them from pervasive threats” (ibid.). Staying with the latter formulation, we can say that human (in)security covers both deprivation and vulnerability, not only the latter as proposed on p. 85 of the report.

⁷ Remarks in this paragraph and the next draw on comments and suggestions provided by D. Gasper, O. Gomez and A. L. St. Clair for the 2014 Human Development Report.

talk about vulnerability is less politically exposed, if ‘security’ is a language of priority-claiming that becomes strongly connected to power politics. But ‘human security’ language was devised precisely to try to counter the priority-claiming by established privileged groups. Compared to ‘vulnerability’, the concept of ‘insecurity’ may bring out better the essential subjective dimensions. Issues of security, insecurity and threats link to fear, emotions and partly subjective perception.⁸

Arguably, the list of fundamental features of human security analysis should be extended to reflect a more adequate picture of ‘human’, and to include attention to perceptions and emotions of security and insecurity. Such attention figures as an important and fruitful element of much recent and ongoing human security research.

Evolution from and beyond the 1994 Human Development Report

The 1994 Human Development Report’s seven categories for discussing threats, and the corresponding seven areas of values that could be threatened—personal, health, economic, food, political, environmental and community⁹—was a rough starting point. The report itself noted that the categories overlap and do not cover all relevant issues. Overlaps arise because the seven areas were not all identified by the same criterion, and they were somewhat arbitrarily selected and delineated.¹⁰ For example:

- Food security and environmental security can be seen as inputs towards health and other more fundamental values¹¹ Reflecting this, the 1994 report’s discussion of environmental (in)security was about a diverse set of threats more than about a separate set of ‘environmental’ values.
- ‘Economic security’ included housing as well as employment and income, but we could easily make ‘shelter’ a separate security category. Further, economic security and food security are often closely related, especially in rural settings.

⁸ Martha Nussbaum’s writings on human development cover parts of the agenda of human security, with detailed consideration of emotions, vulnerability, risk and happenstance, including the interconnections that can increase both vulnerabilities and responsibilities. Human security analysis takes further the science-based investigation of these themes, and of the choices and necessary prioritizations that arise.

⁹ An acronym, PHEFPEC, may assist recall.

¹⁰ The conceptually more ambitious Commission on Human Security (2003) correspondingly did not adopt the list.

¹¹ The Doyal-Gough theory of need provides a systematic way of trying to link and rank these different aspects.

- 'Personal security' covered diverse concerns: security from physical violence, other crimes against life and property, accidents, abuse and self-abuse (e.g. drugs), and neglect.¹²

- 'Community security' covered threats from intercommunity conflict, plus the rights of indigenous peoples, and more. Intercommunity conflict is indeed worth considering separately from (other) physical violence (which was placed under 'personal security') if group identity is considered an important value and psychological violence an important threat.

- 'Political security' referred to respect for 'basic human rights' (p. 32). If the phrase meant basic civil and political rights, then 'political security' could absorb much or all of 'personal security'.¹³ It perhaps then refers instead to basic political rights alone.

What has been the subsequent evolution? The six columns in table 1 represent six major streams in work since 1994 that has used a human security framework. Such a table can be drawn in many different ways, none of which is perfect. The categories overlap. The table is presented simply as a heuristic aid that helps guide the following remarks.

First, while the 1994 list was a quick ad hoc construction, it has provided for many users a 'handrail' in complex terrain. Further, it had the unstated rationale that its categories often linked to existing policy portfolios and ministry or department titles. This helps to explain the list's durability despite its lack of exact conceptual basis. Several of the categories could be fitted largely to existing portfolios: economics, housing, food, health, environment, community development, social welfare or indigenous affairs. The list can too easily lead to a silo approach, however, in which different but profoundly interconnected aspects become treated in isolation from each other. Haq himself made little or no reference to it in his presentations of the 1994 report and the human security perspective.¹⁴

¹² The label 'personal security' was also an uneasy one, suggesting that the other categories did not concern persons. Some authors, like Inglehart and Norris (2012), distinguish instead the security of persons (in terms of all aspects and threats), the security of communities and the security of nations. The approach in the national Human Development Reports of Latvia (UNDP 2003b) and Thailand (UNDP 2009c) is also close to this interpretation.

¹³ One common conceptualization of human security in toto is simply as the assurance of all basic human rights. However, the concept of 'basic' is always open to dispute, and some citizen security reports have used the expression 'basic human rights' to promote a narrow view of human security, focused only on prevention of violence and protection of property.

¹⁴ For example, when launching the 1994 report, or in the overview of that report, or in his presentation at the 1995 Copenhagen World Summit for Social Development.

Table 1: Leading streams in work explicitly described as human security research

	Conflict-related, including state-(re)building	Crime-related	Psychological (in)security	Diverse areas of case-specific concern	Environmental change	Comprehensive
1994 Human Development Report	X	X			X	X (as sum of the list)
National and regional Human Development Reports	X	X	X	X	(X)*	X
Other work	E.g., work in the European Union, London School of Economics, Canada	E.g., work in Latin America	E.g., work for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Harvard University	E.g., much work on migration and health	E.g., Global Environmental Change and Human Security project, IPCC, UN University Institute for Environment and Human Security	E.g., sponsored by Japan

* Human Development Report Office categories and United Nations inter-agency relations seem, however, to lead to national reports on climate change and other environmental changes as not being classified as human security analyses, regardless of the approach used by the reports.

Second, while ‘personal security’ partly fits a law-and-order portfolio, it also transcends that, as we will see; hence human security work here has provided distinct new perspectives and value added. A recent review of leading emphases in national and regional Human Development Reports on human security (Gomez et al. 2013) suggests that in terms of the 1994 categories, the most prominent has indeed been personal security. Even so, it is still a minority choice, and we must distinguish within it between a stream of work that focuses on actual, potential or recent organized

armed conflict (involving attempts to capture the state or create a state), and a ‘citizen’ security stream of work that focuses mainly on crime (attempts to ignore state authority).¹⁵

Third, also prominent among Human Development Reports on human security have been three other types:

- Studies that focus not on a particular category of threatened values, but instead on a potentially important agent for defending those values (and also potentially for violating them), the state, and on ‘state-building’ in contexts of conflict management and/or post-conflict reconstruction. This type of study often connects to narrowly focused human security work concerned with organized conflict and open violence, well represented in, for example, Canada and the United Kingdom.

- Studies that focus not on a standard pre-specified list of presumed threatened values, but on what has been identified as requiring priority attention in a particular time and place, for example, social exclusion or psychological insecurity. See, for example, the Human Development Reports on Chile in 1998 (UNDP 1998), the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in 2001 (UNDP 2001) and Latvia in 2002-2003 (UNDP 2003b). The topic of psychological insecurity is sufficiently important and distinct to be considered a significant stream of work in itself.

- ‘Comprehensive mapping’ studies that try to guide situational identification of priorities by reviewing all the major possible threats and potentially threatened values.

Fourth, in elaboration of this third point: Diverse traditional and non-traditional threats, such as climate change, financial crisis, pandemics, disasters or terrorism, may be considered

¹⁵ ‘Citizen security’ work in Latin America has treated this issue as covering both physical violence and crimes against property. The recent regional Human Development Report that synthesises this body of work thus refers to both “the physical and material integrity of people” (UNDP 2013a, p. v). Unfortunately, the 2011 *World Development Report* chose to adopt the term ‘citizen security’ and tried to impose its own definition in terms only of physical violence. “The [World Development Report] defines ‘citizen security’ as both freedom from physical violence and freedom from fear of violence. Applied to the lives of all members of a society (whether nationals of the country or otherwise), it encompasses security at home; in the workplace; and in political, social, and economic interactions with the state and other members of society. Similar to human security, ‘citizen security’ places people at the center of efforts to prevent and recover from violence” (World Bank 2011, p. 116). Despite its own definition in terms of physical violence, the report excludes domestic or interpersonal violence (*ibid.*, p. xv). Unlike the UNDP regional report, it focuses only on ‘organized violence’. The bank report asserts: “Our hope is to complement the discussion on the aspect of freedom from fear in the human security concept” (*ibid.*, p. 45). It perhaps confuses ‘freedom from fear’ with ‘freedom from fear of violence’, although it does on one or two occasions use the latter more accurate formulation for what it is concerned with.

human security issues by local and international communities because of their urgency and severe actual or potential effects (see, for example, the series of regional human security studies summarized in UNESCO 2008). The large and complex, sometimes fluctuating, sometimes conflicting collection(s) of values that humans hold dear may not permit the standardized simple security categories that analysts, statisticians and bureaucrats might prefer; but complex views of insecurity are crucial for the relevance and sustainability of responses. The practice of thinking and doing on human security has shown that pre-fixed approaches are doomed to fail. A sensible balance may be to combine or alternate periodic comprehensive mapping studies that help to prioritize within the panorama of human development and human rights in a context-sensitive way, with follow-up, more narrowly focused studies on identified priority problems. We return to this suggestion in the concluding section of the paper.

Fifth, one may tentatively identify a pattern that while some comprehensive studies have used the 1994 categories as a 'handrail', those categories that fit existing policy portfolios have often not become leading self-standing foci for in-depth work that uses a human security language and framework. Work on economic security (and social protection), health security and food security have instead largely proceeded inside their own already established frameworks.

Sixth, a large exception concerns environmental change, where a major human security literature has emerged, perhaps because most people are not mainly concerned about the environment in isolation, but precisely because of its impacts on how people live and can live. A recent example of such literature is the chapter on human security in the IPCC AR5 draft report, which—given the IPCC rule of using only published peer-reviewed scientific literature—reflects a substantial body of completed work.¹⁶ In environmental change, interactions between all the categories—economic (in)security, personal (in)security, food (in)security, environmental (in)security, etc.—are often extremely significant, so that the comprehensive perspective and yet human focus of human security analysis has been widely attractive. Literature by the Global Environmental Change and Human Security project and the United Nations University Institute for Environment and Human Security is thus a type of quasi-comprehensive human security research. In some respects, it is more comprehensive than work that ignores the inseparability of social and ecological systems. The preferred term in this stream of work is 'socio-ecological system' or 'social-ecological system'.

Seventh, a major gap in the 1994 list concerns psychological security, which rarely corresponds to an existing policy portfolio or department title. Instead this theme can and should be combined with every type of sectoral focus. Over time, the centrality of psychological security and insecurity to

¹⁶ See also the new *Handbook on Climate Change and Human Security* (Redclift and Grasso, eds. 2013).

human security analysis and human security policies has become increasingly clear. They are central to well-being and ill-being, to peace and conflict, and to effective personal agency. ‘Personal security’ is perhaps the 1994 category that links most readily to psychological security (though community security and health security also connect). This is one reason why, despite its weak conceptualization in 1994, ‘personal security’ has become a robust area of attention in work on human security, as discussed in the following sections.

‘Personal security’ and ‘citizen security’: refining the unfinished traditional security agenda

The opening of the 2005 Philippines Human Development Report (UNDP 2005a) illustrates the importance, as well as the uneasiness, of the category of ‘personal security’ inside human security analysis. While setting the mood, to justify the report’s focus on ongoing armed conflicts, the authors recognized an inconvenient fact, one underlined again by the Typhoon Haiyan tragedy in 2013: Many more people in the Philippines lose their lives because of disasters than because of armed conflict. Still, the report’s focus on armed conflict remained.¹⁷ How far is the persistence of the preoccupation with armed conflict compatible with the theme that human security analysis helps in the public prioritization of major issues? A look at the factors contributing to this persistence helps to illuminate how ‘personal security’ is situated in human security analysis. The contributory factors can be divided into three, namely: the continuing traditional security agenda; the weakness as yet of a system to guide the shifts in attention, over time, across human insecurities; and the slow pace of introduction into security thinking of a broader image of the human person. We will discuss each in turn, beginning with the unfinished agenda of traditional security concerns.

The equity dimension in a human security framework requires us to look at the risks and threats affecting ordinary people in their specific varied situations. Threats to personal security—in the traditional sense of threats of violence/harassment to bodily integrity or personal property—remain important, especially in some parts of the world, and form barriers to exercising freedoms. Krause (2013), for example, well underlines why personal safety and bodily security are so important. To enrich and go beyond the entrenched traditional predominant conception of security requires still

¹⁷ Similarly, while the UNDP report on human security in Bangladesh (UNDP 2002) focused on ‘personal security’ in the sense of basic civil rights, a later book-length human security study found that most people ranked ‘natural’ disasters much higher than crime as a felt threat (Saferworld 2008, in association with the BRAC research department).

devoting serious attention to those issues and clarifying ways to operationalize human security ideas that will help here. In describing this unfinished agenda, we need to distinguish two major sets of threats: conflict and crime.

CONFLICT AND ‘PERSONAL SECURITY’

Several advances from applying human security thinking inside the conflict agenda have happened at a macro level, notably the Ottawa treaty banning anti-personnel mines, and the establishment of the International Criminal Court (Bosold and Werthes 2005). Human security ideas also inspired the proposal of the ‘responsibility to protect’ principle (ICISS 2001), which later became a doctrine on its own, separate from human security work. While this notion has been mainstreamed into the toolbox of the Security Council, it has become excluded from human security discourse, as seen in the 2012 General Assembly resolution (66/290). Thinking under this principle is narrow in terms both of its picture of the human person and of the means it mobilizes to protect people—i.e., military intervention. It neglects the range of relevant means identified in human security analysis, generates strong resistance among governments and typically proves counterproductive. Instead, relevant examples of the application of human security/citizen security ideas at the local level need study and synthesis, to the degree possible, so that they can provide appropriately qualified suggestions for societies elsewhere facing similar threats. Reviews of strategies to deal with fragility and public order have stressed, however, how context specific successful solutions are, and warn against attempts at simple replication (World Bank 2011, UNDP 2013a).

Human security thinking has framed peace efforts that go beyond a focus only on military victory. During the first years of this century, after an all-out-war in Mindanao, the UNDP helped to mainstream human security ideas in the Philippines as a way to promote broader changes based on the needs of local people (Oquist 2002). The Office of the Presidential Adviser on the Peace Process, supported by international cooperation, promoted efforts to design conflict-sensitive development plans in affected municipalities, as well as to assess needs of culturally complex localities (Gómez 2011). Newman (2011) argues that such emphasis is lacking in the dominant peace-building paradigm, where local ownership seems to be absent, mediation is top-down, and reconstruction and coercion get combined while neglecting underlying causes of conflict. Newman thus considers that the emphases on bottom-up empowerment and context specificity that are part of a human security perspective make it an appealing candidate to guide upcoming peace-building agendas.

The person focus, bringing an emphasis on understanding the root causes of conflict and on due context-specific attention, is a way that human security thinking at the micro-level adds value. It can promote analyses of the conflict situation that all stakeholders may recognize. But such

situations can be very thorny to address. The Philippines report (UNDP 2005a) includes, for example, a general survey on attitudes towards Muslims among the majority of the country's population. It showed many ways in which they are stigmatized and socially discriminated against, especially outside Mindanao, even though only 14 percent of the respondents had had direct contact with Muslims. Such insights are essential when trying to form a sustainable, long-term strategy for national stability.

The Afghanistan Human Development Report of 2005 (UNDP 2004) similarly confronted the challenge of illuminating a complex situation without being simplistic. The report's recommendations centre on addressing the causes of conflict in order to achieve at least a minimum standard of security that allows for survival, livelihood and dignity. It shows that armed conflict is just one among many stressors resulting in the fragility of people's welfare; drought is the main cause of rural poverty shocks, underlying the continuity of internal displacement. Although field conditions made it difficult to collect local voices, the team made a major effort, including to disaggregate analysis in terms of social, ethnic, gender and regional groups, in order to build a detailed picture of the root causes of instability. The report also highlights the importance of incorporating the psychological sequels of conflict, as the evidence of its deleterious effects across the Afghan population has mounted.¹⁸

CRIME AND 'CITIZEN SECURITY'

Human security ideas have proved very relevant for examining threats to personal security that are related to crime and the weakness of rule-of-law institutions. This field has been relatively less explored but will have great importance. Scholars and practitioners from Latin America and the Caribbean have been leading on this front, as the region has faced a crisis over the conception of security and in its experiences of insecurity since the late part of the last century, resulting in the emergence of the 'citizen security' approach. Notwithstanding early reform efforts, several countries in the region still show exceptional levels of violence associated with organized crime, including the drug trade, endemic community violence and anomic crime (HumanSecurity-Cities.org 2007). This has motivated several national and regional reports by UNDP (e.g., 2003a, 2005b, 2009a, 2012b, 2013a), as well as by the Inter-American Development Bank (Alda and Beliz, eds. 2007).¹⁹ Since the first report in the Human Development Reports series that employed a 'citizen security' concept, for

¹⁸ This is consistent with the work of Leaning et al. (2000, 2004; Leaning 2013).

¹⁹ These studies usually draw on existing local experts working on citizen security in order to gather better data and produce useful recommendations, which may help explain why the approach remained for long as a Latin American speciality.

Colombia in 2003 (UNDP 2003a), the concept has been assimilated as a near equivalent to ‘personal security’ inside the broader perspective of human security analysis.

Arms control, an issue that cuts across conflict and crime, has received attention in human security literature and practice, starting with the Ottawa anti-personnel mine ban treaty, and continuing in citizen security reports and some human security projects (Gómez and Saito 2012). Highlighting the opportunities in this area, Basu Ray (2013) points out that while lethal armed violence accounts for over half a million deaths across the globe each year, the vast majority occur not through conflicts but from organized crime or gang killings, against which the heavy armaments that soak up so much public spending are irrelevant. When we take into account that suicide, often by use of guns, is an even higher source of deaths (WHO 2002), a strong argument favouring small arms control initiatives emerges as a pending policy agenda item in human security work.²⁰

THE CENTRALITY OF STUDYING PERCEPTIONS

Relevant to all the experiences just mentioned is a methodological feature that has become recognized as central in the study of human security: identifying and examining perceptions about insecurity (Jolly and Basu Ray 2006, Gómez et al. 2013). There are several reasons for the crucial role of perceptions in human security studies, not limited to cases of conflict or crime but crossing all study of insecurity (Acharya et al. 2011, Inglehart and Norris 2012, Kostovicova et al. 2012, Mine and Gómez 2013).²¹ The process of capturing perceptions offers a good opportunity to give voice to affected populations. The plurality of these voices becomes essential to grasping the complexity of situations and carefully tailoring sustainable strategies in response. The methodology reveals the human face of vulnerability and shows how insecurity and agency interact in daily life (Kostovicova et al. 2012). Evidence-gathering through dialogue also allows insight into aspects of security that cannot be documented in any other form.

Research on people’s perceptions offers direct feedback on policy efforts and sheds light on the burden of fear in their lives. Perception-gathering on crime in particular enables us to: contrast perceptions with official statistics, capture public opinion on institutional performance, and understand the consequences and costs of possibly disproportionate fear of crime among the population. The three functions correspond to mainstream practices in modern criminology. In

²⁰ On small arms flows and control, see, for example: www.smallarmssurvey.org/.

²¹ The Inglehart and Norris study is particularly important: It analyses the answers to wide-ranging questions about security perceptions that were included in the sixth cycle of the huge World Values Survey (2010-2012—see: www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp), develops measures of people’s perceived human security, tests for determinants of these perceptions and explores the impacts of high felt security or insecurity.

the Latin American context, they became urgent as the downfall of authoritarian regimes made the reform of the security apparatus, especially the police forces, a major priority for rebuilding trust in the government. Some examples of the insights drawn from perception-gathering in citizen security surveys are as follows:

- *Insights into the cohesion of communities.* In situations where one thinks anyone can be a criminal, fear of crime is likely to affect the bonds supporting the community; hence, we need to get insights into the degree of cohesion and how it changes. For instance, the UNDP report for the Caribbean (UNDP 2012b) used proxies for populations' feelings of belonging, inclusion, participation, legitimacy and respect, which were matched against the existence of gangs as reported by the same respondents. The evidence suggested that the presence of gangs goes together with less support to the formal mechanisms of social control and regulation, opening the way for criminal groups to supply protection.

- *'Security dilemmas' exist at the personal level.* Measurements show that the availability of arms is correlated with deaths. The increase in homicides in Latin America, unique across the world, has come along with a larger share of deaths by firearms than in the world average (UNDP 2013a). Yet, as in the United States, controversy still exists about the relative weight of this death toll versus the claimed benefit of holding arms in terms of deterrence. UNDP found that 38 percent of the population in the region would keep a firearm to protect themselves if they could.

- *Fear of crime results in individuals sacrificing freedoms and resources in order to feel secure.* The 2005 Human Development Report on Costa Rica (UNDP 2005b) and the 2013 regional report on Latin America (UNDP 2013a) have shown how people avoid going out at night or travelling during vacations because of fear. The resources spent on means for security, such as fences and private services, can also be quantified.

- *Scapegoating of some populations.* In order to ease anxieties about the possible presence of criminals, and also to simplify protection strategies, people tend to associate crime with easy-to-spot groups. Reports on Costa Rica (UNDP 2005b), Uruguay (ONU Mujeres et al. 2012), the Caribbean (UNDP 2012b) note the tendency to attribute responsibility for criminal acts to foreigners, persons deported from the United States or young people. In most cases, objective evidence does not match these claims, but the perceptions underlie popular support for harsher laws and zero-tolerance, as part of what is called penal populism.

Reports have recurrently shown that good practices and successful initiatives are not reflected in the subjective perceptions of fear (UNDP 2013a). Some experts maintain that “the dilemma of modern policing is not necessarily about how to decrease crime rates but about how to reduce the feeling of insecurity” (Ruiz Vásquez et al. 2006, p. 74; authors' translation). Citizen security reports

identify the perverse influence here of mass media, urban legends, urban disorder, distrust of institutions, and the greater attention that crime receives as the middle classes and elite groups grow. Such identification of distortions has yet to be translated into perception corrections. However, the added value of these analyses is also to offer a broader spectrum of activities for sustainable reduction of crime and violence, through acknowledging root causes, including poverty, inequality, joblessness, and rapid social changes that fracture cohesion and the informal institutions constraining crime. Solutions then require tools beyond criminal law and prisons, including from economic, social and educational policy (Commission on Human Security 2003, UNESCO 2008).

The challenge of the required flexibility of attention and responses

One unintended consequence of the silo approach to threats is that the ideas and institutions that were developed to deal with particular threats tend to outlive their earlier relevance. Concentrating on the means—the conventional established means and methods—the silo approach can lose sight of the ends; correspondingly, its work can become ineffective and thus never finishes. Citizen security analysis has engaged in rethinking the role of police forces in particular, including in relation to the most egregious types of crimes. Necessary steps in the evolution included both a rethought vision of security and a scientific approach to the phenomena of crime, based on data and deeper research. Then, gradually, citizen security analysis has extended the range of crimes and vulnerable populations considered. For instance, the Human Development Report on Costa Rica (UNDP 2005b) notes how domestic violence and gender-related crimes had often been omitted by earlier analyses. Similarly, the 2013 Latin America Regional Human Development Report adds attention to corruption, something that deeply undermines popular trust in government institutions, but has so far usually been omitted in citizen security analyses (Medina Ariza 2011, UNDP 2013a). This gradual expansion of coverage has allowed citizen security strategies to grow organically with the evolution of local attitudes and institutions, giving time for data, experiences and good practices to accumulate, and for feedback in the epistemic community around citizen security.

This way of deepening has its limits. The value of approaches can become exhausted in the absence of out-of-the-box thinking. And in the case of threat-based organizational silos, an exit strategy may not exist once the targeted threat ceases to be an important danger. Security as a concept keeps being associated with certain specific means—the military, the police, especially in their traditional forms—instead of with the changing agenda of threats. To avoid mistaking means for ends, we require frameworks for transformation that allow moving beyond intellectual and organizational silos (Sygna et al. 2013, Lodgaard 2004). Piecemeal approaches to threats leave blind spots in our understanding of insecurities, and reinforce the silos that are part of the problem.

One of the gaps in need of spanning exists between the two main threats originally grouped under 'personal security': conflict and crime. Research using the human security concept about personal security usually addresses conflict situations, especially in Africa and Asia, while citizen security reports are nearly always about local rule of law institutions in Latin America and the Caribbean.²² A recently published *Handbook of Human Security* (Martin and Owen, eds. 2013), for example, gives little consideration to crime, except when crime is synonymous with terrorism. The collection is dominated by authors on war and conflict.²³ In contrast, in Latin America a UNDP review (2011a) about a decade of work on citizen security and conflict prevention gives even-handed attention to both areas. Abrahamsen and Williams' (2011) study of private security and international politics in Africa makes a similar point, when they warn readers that their book is not about mercenaries but about the "seemingly mundane protection of life and assets... so integrated into our daily activities of work and leisure as to go unnoticed" (p. 1). Abrahamsen and Williams find a relative dearth of empirical investigations on this issue in Africa.

The World Bank's (2011) report on violence and fragility argued for reducing the gap between treatments of conflict and crime.²⁴ Given "the successes in reducing interstate war, the remaining forms of conflict and violence do not fit neatly either into 'war' or 'peace', or into 'criminal violence' or 'political violence'" (World Bank 2011, p. 2). Citizen security serves as a goal for the process of moving out of conflict despite the tremendous stresses that underlie the occurrence of violence. The image of a spiral was used by the report to indicate how transformation can lead out of conflict and towards security. Citizen security also involves strengthening local institutions and restoring confidence, along with emphases on justice and jobs. Building on successful peace initiatives from around the world, 'citizen security' thus replaces 'peace' as a transformative goal, for the stage of history after war.

²² The report of Bangladesh in 2002 is an exception (UNDP 2002).

²³ An exception is the chapter on cities. The relation between urban studies and an interest in crime may help to explain the origin of the concept of 'citizen security'.

²⁴ It is worth noting that, despite the report's attempt to introduce its own definition of citizen security deviating from the established usage in Latin America, "this [2011 World Development] Report has been developed in an unusual way— drawing from the beginning on the knowledge of national reformers and working closely with the United Nations and regional institutions with expertise in political and security issues, building on the concept of human security" (World Bank 2011, p. 2). The report makes considerable cross reference to human security discussions, and uses human security and human development ideas as parts of its key arguments. For example: "When facing the risk of conflict and violence, citizen security, justice and jobs are the key elements of protection to achieve human security" (p. 11). It moves beyond a narrow conception of human development as only human resource development ("The MDGs have raised the profile of broad-based human development..."; p. 21), and its overview even concludes by emphasizing as central "the concept of shared global risk" (p. 38).

Human security ideas too emerged from a period of transformation both in regard to security threats and approaches to development (Haq 1995). The end (or major reduction) of the nuclear war menace was followed by the less obvious observation that levels of violence in general have been decreasing, and that armed conflict is mutating into a more complex, low-intensity phenomenon, in a limited set of hotspots. Research behind the Human Security Reports (Human Security Centre 2005; Human Security Report Project 2009, 2012), as well as Mary Kaldor's work (e.g., 2007), has highlighted these trends and suggested how human security ideas could and should be used to transform state security systems accordingly. Kaldor and her colleagues (Human Security Study Group 2007, Kaldor et al. 2007) have advanced within the European Union a set of principles to operationalize human security ideas. The principles put human rights at the forefront, acknowledge the limitations of military force, and promote multilateralism, a regional focus, a bottom-up approach and military security forces that resemble the police. The principles are combined with an emphasis on analysing crises, not only conflicts, which matches the present approach of UNDP to addressing conflict, citizen security and disasters under the umbrella of 'crisis prevention and recovery'.²⁵ The continuing gap between most work on conflict and work on citizen security, not to mention the wider gap between these two and work on disasters, or on the broader agenda of menaces that are highlighted through human security analyses, shows that there is still much to do to assist transformation out of fragility, so that the next generation of solutions better fits emerging and present challenges.

The experience in work on citizen security provides several lessons to promote transformation of mind-sets. One is that changing the scale of analysis and action, for example, from the state to the city, which is where the global and the local converge (Sassen 2006), enables important changes in understanding security. This approach has been creeping up in human security research as trends in urbanization and migration lead us into an 'urban century' (HumanSecurity-Cities.org 2007; Mushakoji and Pasha, eds. 2008; van der Maesen and Walker 2012; Liotta and Bilgin 2013; Stiglitz and Kaldor 2013). Indeed, the appeal of the 'citizen security' wording in Latin America derives from the way it focuses on the vital stability of cities and municipalities, while reinforcing the state-building processes taking place in the region. The change of scale allows getting closer to people, closer to the reality of threats, and closer to the existing local protection/empowerment practices.

A citizen security approach seemingly reaches one of its limits when non-citizens enter into the picture of insecurities and vulnerability (Edwards and Ferstman, eds. 2010). Supporters of the approach argue this is not the case, but only pointing out efforts to consider non-citizens among the

²⁵ From: www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home.html.

factors influencing citizen security (Rico and Chinchilla 2002) is not enough. Both the Costa Rica and Caribbean Human Development Reports (UNDP 2005b, 2012b) comment on the stigmatization of foreigners as supposedly the main criminals even when statistics show the contrary, a phenomenon that is common elsewhere. The complexity added by non-citizens may have been irrelevant in Latin America in the nineties, when globalization pressures were less important. But, for applicability to the more interconnected societies of the 21st century, and to contexts of fragility where resistance to an imposed identity is part of the dispute, citizenship as a central criterion might become an obstacle. For instance, UNDP's recent regional report on citizen security fails to affirm that citizen security should cover everyone regardless of nationality (2013a).

Another important lesson from citizen security work is the methodological elaboration reached through inclusion of perceptions in the study of (human) security, as described in the previous section. Citizen security reports have shown how perceptions of personal insecurity from violence and crime can be far greater than the reality of the threat, which helps to explain why the Philippines human security report (UNDP 2005a) chose to focus on violence rather than disasters. This repeated finding has failed to reverse the trend, however, and some citizen security proponents continue to declare a priori that violence and dispossession are the most important among human security threats (see, for example, UNDP 2009a), despite the evidence showing that contingency in the circumstances, combination and impact of threats disqualifies a priori hierarchization. Any threat can become the most critical, depending on the circumstances. This limitation leads us to a last factor that helps explain the decision behind the Philippines report, and the relation between ideas of personal and human security.

Embedding 'personal security' in a broader human security framework as part of a richer view of 'human personhood'

The now established inclusion of perceptions in the assessment of personal insecurity makes the 'personal security' category a gateway for enriching security thinking and practice. It identifies overlooked dangers and can help to introduce a richer picture of human personhood, including of ~~people's fears and wants,~~ and what disregards their dignity. When, for example, the team of the Philippines report (UNDP 2005a) defended its decision to focus on armed conflicts despite their far lesser impacts on life-expectancy and health, it noted that violence is voluntarily inflicted by aggressors, while blame for 'natural' disasters cannot be assigned to anyone in the same way. The

difference impacts the perceptions of the general public.²⁶ This characteristic of violence as a threat is particularly highlighted in the case of terrorism. Terrorism causes fear and anxiety, affecting the psychological well-being of the populations that feel targeted. It is malevolent, in large part random, and directed not only to immediate victims but also to an audience, delivering a message about the zero moral worth of some of them. Terrorism, like other violence and crime, “disrupts one’s sense of being safe within one’s own community; the sense of trust in the normal everyday workings of life” (Wolfendale 2007, pp. 81-82). The general population often becomes ready to forego some freedoms and to support harsher punishments in order to regain a sense of security—even though the direct impact of terrorism is minuscule compared to many other threats.

One response to the possible mismatch between perception and reality has been to show that the countermeasures adopted can be worse than the actual threat. Allowing the state to govern through fear, and companies to profit from it, can result in ‘too much security’ (Zedner 2003): pursuing risk reduction but constantly presuming the persistence of crime, continually expanding the penal state, promising reassurance while increasing anxiety (as perhaps in airports around the world, for example). What is presented as a global good may in fact typically foster social exclusion, such as stigmatization of minorities, and distrust of the other, for instance, because notionally anyone might be a criminal. This response thus supports a stance critical of mainstream security policy, and the associated penal populism and similar attitudes. Human security analysts have pointed out too how terrorism discourse biases the ways international aid is allocated between countries that have otherwise similar situations of vulnerability (Duffield and Waddell 2006). Haq already noted something similar when he introduced human security ideas: “(H)igh military spenders among developing countries receive more than twice as much official development assistance per capita as more moderate spenders” (1995, p. 132). The decision by the Philippines team for their 2005 national Human Development Report (UNDP 2005a) suggests how experts might sometimes be forced to follow popular demand for lower priority issues, despite evidence at hand. Similarly, from the four types of urban violence described by the Human Security Cities project (2007), the only one that was not found to be very significant—anomic crime committed by individual actors—is apparently the one that worries Latin American populations the most (UNDP 2013a). In Costa Rica, the 2005 Human Development Report (UNDP 2005b) reported that popular estimates of the chance of particular crimes were up to eight times higher than the actual occurrence.

²⁶ Similar arguments were used in the Central America Human Development Report (2009a) to justify the centrality of citizen security, and in the Costa Rica Human Development Report (UNDP 2005b) to defend the exclusion of traffic accidents and suicides

Perceptions research more generally, not only on violence and crime, continually suggests a mismatch between the objective risks and harm from various threats, and the frequency and severity attributed to them by public opinion. Citizen security surveys at the personal level often show how the amounts of income families allocate to additional protective measures, or sacrifice of their freedoms, are disproportionate to the reality of the threats—sometimes disproportionately too much, sometimes disproportionately too little. Broader assessments of human security issues can allow societies to reflect about such mismatches and possible ways to reallocate attention and resources.

Various types of gaps in perception exist, including between different ‘experts’ (such as from different disciplinary traditions), between different ‘citizens’ (for instance, from different social milieus, strata and cultural traditions, and from the non-citizenry too), as well as between experts and citizenry. Consequently, several types of risk misperceptions exist: over- and underestimations, varying from panics to time bombs, as well as indeterminate conundrums. Identifying these gaps allows necessary discussion and more considered responses.²⁷

A deeper implication of the mismatch between the perception and the objective reality of violence is to acknowledge that we humans are often bad in assessing risks (Slovic 1987, Kahneman 2011). For instance, Gigerenzer (2006) notes that after the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks, many people opted to travel by car instead of airplane, although airplanes are much safer; he attributed more than 1,000 additional deaths in the United States to this switch. On the other hand, some critical threats go unnoticed despite their severity. In 2009 a study showed that smoking kills an average of 55 Iraqis a day, five times more than the then-average daily toll from terrorism shootings and bombings (*The Economist* 2009). As has been often remarked, the number of babies and children worldwide under the age of five who as of 2001 died every day from poverty-related causes was 10 times the number of people killed in the 9/11 attacks.

Conceptions of security require a view of the human person that includes physical and psychological vulnerabilities, strengths and limitations, including limitations in the perception of risk. Such a view will facilitate navigation through different types of threats, as all societal actors get more used to acknowledging the near ubiquity (including often for ‘experts’ too) of gaps between objective and perceived risks. This too is part of the agenda of long-run transformation, towards a human-centred approach to security. We observed that the equity dimension in a human security framework requires us to look at the risks and threats affecting ordinary people in their specific varied situations. A second function of a human security framework, building on the

²⁷ See Tables 1 and 2 in Gómez and Gasper (2013) for a classification of possible situations.

first, is to help us consider the interactions and relative weights, both felt and ‘objective’, of different threats, tracing the interconnections between conventionally separated ‘sectors’ and adopting a comparative perspective—as seen for example in work on the health impacts of alternative economic policy choices.

The 2012 regional Human Development Report on Africa (UNDP 2012a) showed disproportions between budgets for defence and agriculture, stressing how much could be gained through simple interventions on nutrition. Some similar unnecessary spending on various purported means of security happens at the level of families and individuals too, as seen in behavioural economics studies. All these studies follow the principle articulated by Jolly and Basu Ray in their 2006 review of Human Development Reports, namely, to compare the security benefits from alternative possible expenditures. Picciotto et al., eds. (2007) provide many detailed further illustrations. Comparisons between regions can also help, showing that different futures are possible.

Human security analyses have allowed mapping of both the occurrence and the perception of a wider pool of threats, so that traditional personal security issues can be understood in their deserved dimensions and not disproportionately. Good examples of these ‘comprehensive mapping’ studies, reviewing all the major possible threats and potentially threatened values, are found in Human Development Reports for Latvia, the Arab Countries, Thailand and Benin (UNDP 2003b, 2009b, 2009c, 2011b). In addition, some other reports identify generalized fears and uncertainties requiring priority attention in a particular time and place—for example, Chile’s 1998 report (UNDP 1998) and Burgess et al., 2007—and connect the root causes of fear to the larger picture of social changes and transitions, highlighting at the same time the opportunities opened by a new vision of the situation.

The introduction of a richer picture of the human person is intended to influence the way experts approach the study of insecurity/security. Similar enrichment is taking place in much of social policy, welfare economics and development studies, especially in work on well-being (e.g., Gough and MacGregor, eds. 2007; Wood 2007; Stiglitz et al. 2011; OECD 2013), and in behavioural economics applied to poverty reduction (for example, Banerjee and Duflo 2011). The human security approach offers a related view with special attention to reduction of fear, want and indignity, in a way that can address some of the vices of traditional security thinking, by motivating evolution according to the progress in dealing with threats, and as required for coping with changing agendas and new contingencies.

Ideas of human security allow deep, targeted efforts to face particular felt priority issues, such as citizen security currently in Latin America and the Caribbean, but they also later motivate panoramic views once more, so that the means adopted for a particular current task do not displace the ends: human well-being, dignity and fulfilment. This dialectic is important for counteracting

the typical vices of security practice, by which certain priorities become frozen, fixed in organizational and intellectual silos that do not talk to each other enough, and are hardly subject to review. There is scope too to reframe some issues in terms of human development or other approaches that highlight opportunities lying behind threats.

The person, and thus personal security, is a crucial and contentious category in human security analysis. As Tadjbaksh (2013) remarks, narrow views of threats and means for realizing human security match a too limited picture of the person, and compromise the usefulness of the strategies born from these pictures, such as perhaps the 'responsibility to protect' approach. A picture of humans focused on bodies can lead to emphasis only on body counts and physical violence; a picture of people as primarily individual property holders may bring a focus only on crime. Human security thinking in general, and work on 'personal security' in particular, can be turned into either just a slightly modified continuation of established security thinking related to conflict and crime, or instead be the way through which a fuller picture of humans is introduced and maintained in security-related policies and practices, rendering them more equitable, more relevant and more effective.

References

- Abrahamsen, R., and M. C. Williams. 2011.** *Security Beyond the State: Private security in international politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Acharya, A., S. K. Singhdeo and M. Rajaretnam, eds. 2011.** *Human Security: From Concept to Practice*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Co.
- Alda, E., and G. Beliz, eds. 2007.** *¿Cuál es la salida? La agenda inconclusa de la seguridad ciudadana*. Washington: Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo.
- Alkire, S. 2010.** "Human Development: Definitions, Critiques, and Related Concepts. Human Development Research Paper 2010/01." New York: UNDP.
- Banerjee, A. V., and E. Duflo. 2011.** *Poor Economics: A Radical Rethinking of the Way to Fight Global Poverty*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Barnett, J. 2011.** Human Security. In J. Dryzek, R. Norgaard and D. Schlosberg, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Society*: 267–277. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Basu Ray, D. 2013.** "Navigating the 'National Security' Barrier: A Human Security Agenda for Arms Control in the Twenty-First Century." In M. Martin and T. Owen, eds., *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*: 197–209. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bosold, D., and S. Werthes, 2005.** "Human security in practice: Canadian and Japanese experiences." *Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft* 1: 84–102.
- Burgess, J. P., et al. 2007.** *Promoting Human Security: Ethical, Normative and Educational Frameworks in Western Europe*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Commission on Human Security. 2003.** *Human Security Now*. New York: United Nations.
- Doyal, L., and I. Gough. 1991.** *A Theory of Human Need*. London: Macmillan.
- Drèze, J., and A. K. Sen. 1989.** *Hunger and Public Action*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____, eds., 1990. *The Political Economy of Hunger*. Three volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____. 1995. *India: Economic Development and Social Opportunity*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2002. *India: Development and Participation*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2013. *An Uncertain Glory: India and Its Contradictions*. London: Penguin.
- Duffield, M., and N. Waddell. 2006.** "Securing Humans in a Dangerous World." *International Politics* 43: 1–23.
- Edwards, A., and C. Ferstman, eds. 2010.** *Human Security and Non-Citizens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frediani, A. A., A. Boni and D. Gasper. 2014.** "Approaching Development Projects from a Human Development and Capability Perspective." *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities* 15(1): 1–12.
- Gasper, D. 2005.** "Securing Humanity—Situating 'Human Security' as Concept and Discourse." *Journal of Human Development* 6(2): 221–245.
- _____. 2008. "From 'Hume's Law' To Policy Analysis For Human Development—Sen after Dewey, Myrdal, Streeten, Stretton and Haq." *Review of Political Economy* 20(2): 233–256.
- _____. 2009. "Development Ethics and Human Development." *Human Development Insights* 24. http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HD_Insights_January2009.pdf, <http://re-pub.eur.nl/res/pub/17973/>.
- Gigerenzer, G. 2006.** "Out of the Frying Pan into the Fire: Behavioral Reactions to Terrorist Attacks." *Risk Analysis* 26(2): 347–351.
- Gómez, O. A. 2011.** "Introducing the 'Human' into Philippine Security Discourses: Convergence or Dialogue?" *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies* 26(1–2): 153–182.

- Gómez, O. A., and D. Gasper. 2013.** "Human Security: A Thematic Guidance Note for Regional and National Human Development Report Teams." New York: UNDP. http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/human_security_guidance_note_r-nhdrs.pdf.
- Gómez, O. A., D. Gasper and Y. Mine. 2013.** "Good Practices in Addressing Human Security through National Human Development Reports." HDRO Occasional Paper. New York: UNDP. http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/good_practices.pdf
- Gómez, O. A., and C. Saito, 2012.** "Implementing Human Security: Japanese perspective through the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security." In C. Banpasirichote, P. Doneys, M. Hayes and C. Sengupta, eds.. *Mainstreaming Human Security: Asian Perspectives*: 150–158. Bangkok: Chula Global Network.
- Gough, I., and J. MacGregor, eds. 2007.** *Wellbeing in Developing Countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haq, M. ul. 1995.** *Reflections on Human Development*. New York: Oxford University Press. See also enlarged edition, 1999, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Human Security Centre. 2005.** *Human Security Report 2005: War and Peace in the 21st Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- HumanSecurity-Cities.org. 2007.** "Human security for an urban century: local challenges, global perspectives." European Urban Knowledge Network. www.eukn.org/E_library/Security_Crime_Prevention/Security_Crime_Prevention/Human_security_for_an_urban_century_local_challenges_global_perspectives
- Human Security Report Project. 2009.** *Human Security Report 2009: The Shrinking Costs of War*. Vancouver: Simon Fraser University.
- _____. 2012.** *Human Security Report 2012—Sexual Violence, Education, and War: Beyond the Mainstream Narrative*. Vancouver: Human Security Press.
- Human Security Study Group. 2007.** *A European way of security*. Madrid: Human Security Study Group.
- ICISS (International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty). 2001.** *The Responsibility To Protect*. Ottawa.
- Inglehart, R. F., and P. Norris. 2012.** "The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: Understanding Human Security." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 35(1): 71–96.
- Jolly, R., and D. Basu Ray. 2006.** "The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports." NDHR Occasional Paper no. 5. New York: UNDP.
- Kahneman, D. 2011.** *Thinking Fast and Slow*. London: Allen Lane.
- Kaldor, M. 2007.** *Human Security*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Kaldor, M., M. Martin and S. Selchow. 2007.** "Human security: a new strategic narrative for Europe." *International Affairs* 83(2): 273–288.
- Kostovicova, D., M. Martin and V. Bojicic-Dzelilovic. 2012.** "The missing link in human security research: Dialogue and insecurity in Kosovo." *Security Dialogue* 43(6): 569–585.
- Krause, K. 2013.** "Critical Perspectives on Human Security." In M. Martin and T. Owen, eds., *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*: 76–93. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Leaning, J. 2013.** "Human Security and War." In M. Martin and T. Owen, eds., *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*: 159–173. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Leaning, J., and S. Arie. 2000.** *Human Security: A Framework for Assessment in Conflict and Transition*. Tulane: United States Agency for International Development.
- Leaning J., S. Arie and E. Stites. 2004.** "Human security in crisis and transition." *Praxis: The Fletcher Journal of International Development* 19: 5–30.
- Leichenko, R., and K. O'Brien. 2008.** *Environmental Change and Globalization: Double Exposures*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Liotta, P. H., and A. Bilgin. 2013.** “Why Human Security? The Case for Resilience in an Urban Century.” In M. Martin and T. Owen, eds., *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*: 109-121. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Lodgaard, S. 2004.** “Human Security—concept and operationalization.” In M. Muller and B. de Gaay Fortman, eds., *From Warfare to Welfare*: pp. 16-38. Assen: Royal van Gorcum.
- Martin, M., and T. Owen, eds. 2013.** *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Matthew, R., J. Barnett, B. McDonald and K. O'Brien, eds. 2010.** *Global Environmental Change and Human Security*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Medina Ariza, J. 2011.** *Políticas y estrategias de Prevención del delito y Seguridad ciudadana*. Montevideo: Editorial B de F.
- Mine, Y., and O. A. Gomez. 2013.** “Multiple Interfaces of Human Security: Coping with Downturns for Human Sustainability.” *Journal of Human Security Studies* 2(1): 10–29.
- Mushakoji, K., and M. K. Pasha, eds. 2008.** *Human (In)Security in the Networks of Global Cities*. Matsumoto: Center for Human Security Studies.
- Newman, E. 2011.** “A Human Security Peace-Building Agenda.” *Third World Quarterly* 32(10): 1737–1756.
- O'Brien, K., 2010.** “Shifting the Discourse: Climate Change as an Environmental Issue versus Climate Change as a Human Security Issue.” In O'Brien et al., eds., *Climate Change, Ethics and Human Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Brien, K., and R. Leichenko. 2007.** “Human Security, Vulnerability and Sustainable Adaptation.” Occasional Paper 2007/9. New York: UNDP. http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2007-2008/papers/o'brien_karen%20and%20leichenko_robin.pdf.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). 2013.** “OECD Guidelines on Measuring Subjective Well-being.” OECD Publishing.
- ONU Mujeres (UN Women), UNICEF (United Nations Children’s Fund) and PNUD (UNDP). 2012.** *Seguridad Humana en Uruguay. Un enfoque que abre alternativas*. Montevideo: Sistema de Naciones Unidas en Uruguay.
- Oquist, P. 2002.** *Mindanao and Beyond: Competing Policies, Protracted Conflict, and Human Security*. Fifth Assessment Mission Report, Multi-Donor Group Support for Peace and Development in Mindanao.
- Picciotto, R., F. Olonisakin and M. Clarke. 2007.** *Global Development and Human Security*. New York: Transaction Publishers/Springer.
- Redclift, M., and M. Grasso, eds. 2013.** *Elgar Handbook of Climate Change and Human Security*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Rico, J. M., and L. Chinchilla. 2002.** *Seguridad Ciudadana en América Latina*. Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.
- Ruiz Vásquez, J. C., O. Illera Correal and V. Manrique Zuluaga. 2006.** *La tenue línea de la tranquilidad: Estudio comparado sobre seguridad ciudadana y policía*. Bogotá: Editorial Universidad del Rosario.
- Saferworld. 2008.** *Human Security in Bangladesh*. London.
- Sassen, S. 2006.** *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Sen, A. 2013.** “Birth of a Discourse.” In M. Martin and T. Owen, eds., *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*: 17–27. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Slovic, P. 1987.** “Perception of Risk.” *Science* 236 (4799): 280–285.
- Stiglitz, J.E., and M. Kaldor. 2013.** *The Quest for Security: Protection without Protectionism and the Challenge of Global Governance*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Stiglitz, J. E., A. Sen and J. P. Fitoussi. 2011.** *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*. Paris: Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress.

- Streeten, P., 1982.** With S. J. Burki, M. ul Haq, N. Hicks and F. Stewart. *First Things First: Meeting basic needs in developing countries*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sygn, L., K. O'Brien and J. Wolf, eds. 2013.** *A Changing Environment for Human Security: Transformative approaches to research, policy and action*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Tadjbakhsh, S. 2013.** "In Defense of the Broad View of Human Security." In M. Martin and T. Owen, eds., *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*: 43-57. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Tadjbakhsh, S., and A. Chenoy. 2007.** *Human Security: Concepts and implications*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- The Economist. 2009.** "Smoking in Iraq." 13 August.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 1994.** *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. **1998.** *Chile Human Development Report—Paradoxes of Modernity: Human Security*. Santiago.
- _____. **2001.** *Social Exclusion and Human Insecurity in the FYR Macedonia*. Skopje. <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/social-exclusion-and-human-insecurity-fyr-macedonia>.
- _____. **2002.** *Bangladesh Human Development Report—In Search of Justice and Dignity*. Dhaka.
- _____. **2003a.** *El Conflicto, callejon con salida—Informe Nacional de Desarrollo Humano para Colombia 2003*. Bogotá.
- _____. **2003b.** *Latvia Human Development Report 2002/2003: Human Security*. Riga.
- _____. **2004.** *Afghanistan Human Development Report—Security with a Human Face*. Kabul.
- _____. **2005a.** *Philippines Human Development Report—Peace and Conflict Prevention: Human Security*. Manila.
- _____. **2005b.** *Venciendo el Temor — (In)seguridad Ciudadana y Desarrollo Humano en Costa Rica*. San José.
- _____. **2008.** *Human Development Report 2007/2008. Fighting Climate Change: Human solidarity in a divided world*. New York.
- _____. **2009a.** *Abrir espacios para la seguridad ciudadana y el desarrollo humano: Informe sobre Desarrollo Humano para America Central 2009-2010*. Bogotá.
- _____. **2009b.** *Challenges to Human Security in the Arab Countries*. New York.
- _____. **2009c.** *Thailand Human Development Report—Human Security, Today and Tomorrow*. Bangkok.
- _____. **2010.** *Human Development Report 2010: The Real Wealth of Nations: Pathways to Human Development*. New York.
- _____. **2011a.** *A Decade of Work on Citizen Security and Conflict Prevention in Latin America and the Caribbean 2001-2010*. Panama City.
- _____. **2011b.** *Sécurité Humaine et Développement Humain au Bénin*. Cotonou.
- _____. **2012a.** *Africa Human Development Report 2012: Towards a Food Secure Future*. New York.
- _____. **2012b.** *Human Development and the Shift to Better Citizen Security: Caribbean Human Development Report 2012*. New York.
- _____. **2013a.** *Citizen Security with a Human Face: Evidence and Proposals for Latin America*. New York.
- _____. **2013b.** *Human Development Report 2013. The Rise of the South: Human Progress in a Diverse World*. New York.
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). 2008.** *Human Security—Approaches and Challenges*. Paris.
- United Nations General Assembly. 2012.** Follow-up to General Assembly resolution 64/291 on human security. www.unocha.org/humansecurity/resources/publications-and-products/Reports-Secretary-General-Human-Security.
- van der Maesen, L., and A. Walker. 2012.** *Social Quality: from theory to indicators*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- WHO (World Health Organization). 2002.** *World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva.
- Wolfendale, J. 2007.** "Terrorism, Security, and the Threat of Counterterrorism." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 30: 75–92.

Wood, G. 2007. "Using security to indicate wellbeing."
In I. Gough and J. MacGregor, eds.,
Wellbeing in Developing Countries: 109–
132. Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press.

World Bank. 2011. *World Development Report
2011—Conflict, Development and
Security*. Washington, DC.

Zedner, L. 2003. "Too much security?" *International
Journal of the Sociology of Law* 31: 151–
184.

UNDP Human Development Report Office
304 E. 45th Street, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10017, USA
Tel: +1 212-906-3661
Fax: +1 212-906-5161
<http://hdr.undp.org/>

Copyright © 2014
by the United Nations Development Programme
1 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017, USA

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without prior permission. This paper does not represent the official views of the United Nations Development Programme, and any errors or omissions are the authors' own.

