CRIME PREVENTION AND SECURITY MANAGEMENT

# THE NEW SECURITY

## Individual, Community and Cultural Experiences

HELEN FORBES-MEWETT

Crime Prevention and Security Management

**Series Editor**
Martin Gill
Perpetuity Research
Tunbridge Wells, Kent, UK

It is widely recognized that we live in an increasingly unsafe society, but the study of security and crime prevention has lagged behind in its importance on the political agenda and has not matched the level of public concern. This exciting new series aims to address these issues looking at topics such as crime control, policing, security, theft, workplace violence and crime, fear of crime, civil disorder, white collar crime and anti-social behaviour. International in perspective, providing critically and theoretically-informed work, and edited by a leading scholar in the field, this series will advance new understandings of crime prevention and security management.

More information about this series at
http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/14928

Helen Forbes-Mewett

# The New Security

## Individual, Community and Cultural Experiences

palgrave
macmillan

Helen Forbes-Mewett
School of Social Sciences
Monash University
Melbourne, Australia

Crime Prevention and Security Management
ISBN 978-1-137-59101-2 ISBN 978-1-137-59102-9 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59102-9

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018934692



Cover credit: Dougall_Photography

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Limited
The registered company address is: The Campus, 4 Crinan Street, London, N1 9XW, United Kingdom

*Dedicated in memory of my parents,*
*Gregor Charles and Margaret Grace Forbes, for the security they provided throughout my life.*

The original version of this book was revised. An erratum to this book can be found at https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59102-11

# Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge the interviewees who gave so generously of their time and shared their views on the topic of the new security. Their contributions are what made this book possible.

My sincere thanks to Martin Gill for his interest in my work and inclusion of this book in the Crime Prevention and Security Management series. Also, to Stephanie Carey at Palgrave Macmillian for her continuous support throughout the process.

The interviews were most ably transcribed by Judith McGinnis, who also provided formatting and editing services as well as long-distance support over late night writing sessions.

Grateful thanks to Kien Nguyen who provided skilled and enthusiastic research assistance and to Grant Paterson for taking care of all computer and technological issues to ensure work continued efficiently. Also, special thanks to my wonderful PhD students for their interest in my work.

My colleagues in the School of Social Sciences and the Faculty of Arts at Monash University have provided an exciting and supportive research environment in which to complete this project. My colleague, Rebecca Wickes and the Population, Migration and Social Inclusion research team deserve special mention for their support, collegiality and academic integrity.

Finally, love and gratitude to my family for providing a supportive and stable environment for me to enjoy the completion of this book.

# Series Editor's Introduction

This book tackles the complex subject of what is meant by the term 'security' in a modern context. Many of us have tended to skate around the issue, often uneasily. As the author summarises, the word 'security' has previously been referred to as 'slippery', 'contested' and 'confused'. In this book, 'security' is analysed from the viewpoint of different disciplines, extending beyond the author's sociological home. The inevitable conclusion is that while there are some common elements, it encompasses a wide variety of meanings and values that render it an important and perhaps urgently needed study.

Helen Forbes-Mewett presents the concept of the 'New Security' which she argues is 'fluid and changing'. She covers territory rarely incorporated within one volume. The contexts vary, including university campuses and off campus environments but it would be limiting to see this book as just about security in education settings. Of course, campuses encompass large communities of young people typically from a range of countries providing cultural characteristics that are often associated with a range of threats and insecurity. This renders it an interesting and relevant focus for the development of her ideas. Other contexts in the book are far broader and include community settings and more individual perspectives relating to everyday life.

The book covers related but diverse topics such as the relationships between security and rights and security and religion, which the author

refers to as the 'wideners' of security. It also includes broader discussions of security such as employment security, variously interpreted by different stakeholders; housing security and how different types of provision have implications for different forms of security; food security, and issues relating to the availability of culturally acceptable types of food; as well as subjective and objective personal security that incorporates, physical, material, social relationship, cultural and institutional aspects.

The points made are supported by and drawn from the author's own original research undertaken in Australia, the UK, the US and China. The research incorporates the experiences of a variety of stakeholders including communities, workers, law enforcement and students, both local and international. Through these studies, issues of trust, legitimacy, barriers to collaboration between the different nodes of governance, the challenges posed by different cultures and religions, and keeping pace with the threats and opportunities offered by technology, are debated within a broader context of the challenges generated by resource constraints.

This book invites us to think of security in new and different ways reflecting changes in contemporary society. It also provides a new research base for examining how security is thought of in a community and campus context. Forbes-Mewett's positioning of the 'New Security' challenges boundaries of traditional security studies and in so doing demonstrates that this is an area where critical thinking is paramount. This book highlights just how wide the thinking about security needs to be.

December 2017 Martin Gill

# Contents


# 1

# Introduction

This book addresses the concept of '*The New Security*'. The book illustrates the diversity of the concept of security; clarifies how security impacts on individuals and groups; and documents the various responses to this private and public concept. Over many years it has become apparent to me that the notion of security is a desired attribute that comes in many different forms and is both highly objective and subjective. What it means for one person is very likely to be different for another. It is often elusive. This book is an empirically-led contribution to a field that has to date remained largely conceptual.

Because of its broad application, *The New Security* is likely to be of interest to a diverse and international audience. It contributes to the growing momentum of literature relating to various interpretations and applications of security. It pays tribute to existing work on the topic and acknowledges the conceptual shift of the notion of security into a broader context. This shift enables the term to be considered from the diverse perspectives of people with contemporary societal concerns. The contents address notions of security relating to everyday lives. The conceptual framework is based on five key principles that underpin what is considered 'the new security':



H. Forbes-Mewett, *The New Security*, Crime Prevention and Security Management,
https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59102-9_1

1. Security is both objective and subjective.
2. Security relates to risk and opportunity.
3. Security involves interconnecting social influences including education, employment, economic, cultural and other social factors.
4. Security extends well beyond national issues and links to people's everyday lived experiences.
5. People have a right to the new security.

Guided by these principles, the notion of security is examined and redefined in Chapter 2. Following the redefining of the concept of security, I present a contemporary view of the notion through various case-studies that relate to the notion of 'the new security'. The case-studies are based on research I have undertaken that examines different perspectives of 'security' through individual, community and cultural experiences. The findings are based on qualitative research involving a total of 246 in-depth interviews conducted in the Unites States (US), the United Kingdom (UK), Australia and China and an additional 44 qualitative surveys in Australia. The data is drawn from six separate projects between 2009 and 2016.

The case-studies centre on specific topics including campus security, employment security, housing security, food security and personal security. Chapters 3 and 4 focus on campus security. Chapter 3 is a comparative study of the topic across the US, the UK and Australia, while Chapter 4 is an examination of a 'Police on Campus' pilot program in Australia. Chapter 5 looks at employment security and is based on a community in a coastal town in the Australian state of Queensland. The town is challenged by a lack of employment opportunities and proposed Chinese foreign direct investment that promises work for the locals. Chapter 6 examines housing security for international students in Australia, the UK and the US. The issue of housing security is believed to affect many thousands of international students. There are also two chapters on food security, both unique in that they discuss the issue in the context of Australia as a developed nation with broader international impacts. Chapter 7 is dedicated to the problem of food security in the Liverpool Plains in the Australian state of New South Wales. Known as 'Australia's Food Bowl', the Liverpool Plains is crucial to food production for Australia and

beyond, yet the area is threatened by foreign direct investment in the form of a Chinese owned mining venture. Chapter 8 considers the issue of international students and food security, which is a topic that to date has escaped the attention of international education researchers. Chapter 9 considers the notion of personal security, which introduces new forms of security that are revealed by poignant individual cases. Chapter 10 is the closing chapter – it concludes the book with an overview of the preceding chapters and discusses the significance of the research findings in terms of *The New Security*.


# 2

# Security Redefined

## Introduction

The conceptualisation of security encompasses numerous standpoints. It embodies several major perspectives including international relations and security per se, economic and human security understandings of the concept. This broadening has extended the notion of security from physical protection that concerns freedom from interference by others that amounts to negative liberty to the provision of welfare support that enables the ability to fulfil one's potential through the means of positive liberty.

There are many varied notions of what security involves, which discuss a diverse range of sources of security and indeed insecurity. Drawing on the international relations literature, this chapter demonstrates that 'security' is definable in an abstract sense and explores various dimensions of the term as explained by others from this and other disciplines. For example, the literature also encompasses notions of economic and human security, which includes ideas of economic security such as market stability, growth, equity and income guarantees (Commission on Human Security 2003). The chapter introduces questions that will be addressed throughout the book, such as: Security for whom? For which values?



H. Forbes-Mewett, *The New Security*, Crime Prevention and Security Management,
https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59102-9_2

From what threats? By what means? How much security? At what cost? In what time period? It will be noted that national economic security often does not equate to security for a nation's people.

The many dimensions of security, particularly in relation to human needs, continue to unfold when examined from the psychological and sociological disciplinary perspectives. A psychological perspective will consider the works of Adler (1930) on notions of security and insecurity, Berne's (1947) ideas of security being freedom from anxiety and Maslow's (1943) presentation that safety/security is a basic human need. The concept of 'security' from a sociological perspective will be presented as a broad and all-encompassing notion incorporating community and individual elements of security, including the socialisation of people in a way that makes them aware of threats to their security. It is held that these levels of security are interrelated and that each level needs to be understood in relation to the others.

The chapter will conclude with the more contemporary works of Buzan, Waever and de Wilde (1998), which shift security studies from the restrictions of traditional politico-military issues to an even broader scheme of socio-economic and environmental sectors – that is, the new security studies. They set out the case for the new security studies in the much broader framework of securitisation. This treatment of the term security raises levels of concern above and beyond what is considered normal political applications. That is, it widens what security encompasses by analysing security speech action and introducing the notion of 'securitisation' rather than analysing 'security' per se. Two schools of thought now exist in security studies: traditionalists want to restrict the subject to politico-military issues; while wideners want to extend it to the economic, societal and environmental sectors. It also seems that there are many dimensions beyond the traditional approach. Indeed, Buzan et al. (1998) present a comprehensive statement of the new security studies, establishing the case for the broader agenda. Following in a similar vein are the works of Wood and Dupont (2006), Wood and Shearing (2007), Loader and Walker (2007) and Zedner (2009). Combined, they complete the frame for the remainder of this book and will be revisited later in the chapter.

While many scholars have advanced the notion of security and what it involves, the slipperiness of the term has led to discussions of a diverse range of sources of security and insecurity.

## International Relations and 'Security' as an Abstract Concept

It is within the international relations framework where an abstract definition of the term can be found. Nonetheless, Ullman (1983) suggests that in seeking to grasp an abstract understanding of what security entails we should consider what we would relinquish for the sake of security. Baldwin (1997) responds with the clarification that while determining the value of security through examining its opportunity costs, this does little to determine what security is. Indeed:

> Understanding the concept of security is a fundamentally different kind of intellectual exercise from specifying the conditions under which security may be attained. Indeed, conceptual clarification logically precedes the search for the necessary conditions of security, because the identification of such conditions presupposes a concept of security. (Baldwin 1997, p. 8)

Baldwin's (1997) work is set apart from much of the literature of the time because of his focus on explicating how and why we should define security. He builds on Wolfers' (1952) work relating to national security to conceptualise security in its broadest sense. Set against the background of the Cold War but progressive for its time, Wolfers' classic essay was concerned with security in relation to national interest but nonetheless it guided beyond its context to a conceptualisation of security that was much more widely applicable. In his conceptualisation of 'national security', Wolfers (1952, p. 484) provided the basis for further analysis by indicating that '[s]ecurity points to some degree of protection of values previously acquired'. Baldwin seized this understanding and set it in a broader and more contemporary literary sense. Without denying the legitimacy of normative and empirical concerns such as human rights, social and economic issues, and military threats to nation-states, Baldwin looked beyond the various perceptions of security to identify a commonality – a commonality that allows us to use the concept in any circumstance. In discussing the importance of conceptual analysis, Baldwin (1997, p. 6) asserts:

> Conceptual analysis is not concerned with testing hypotheses or constructing theories, though it is relevant to both. It is concerned with clarifying the meaning of concepts. Some would dismiss such undertakings as 'mere semantics' or 'pure logomachy'. Without clear concepts, however, scholars are apt to talk past each other, and policy-makers find it difficult to distinguish between alternative policies.

Baldwin's conceptual analysis of security adheres to Oppenheim's (1975) set of criteria for explicating a concept. Oppenheim's criteria stipulate that concepts should be broadly applicable; preferably relatable to other terms; should encourage empirical investigation rather than simply defining existing phenomena; and should be termed using the standard language and application used by most people in varying situations.

It has been suggested that security is an 'essentially contested concept' (Gallie 1956, p. 168; Buzan 1991). In other words, because its application is so diverse, it is thought by some to be indefinable. Baldwin (1997) denies that this is the case and seeks to improve upon the ambiguous usage of the term. He argues that to be classed as an essentially contested concept, security would need to be appraised and it is not, because it does not represent a valued achievement. It would also need to have been subject to 'serious conceptual debate', which it has not (Baldwin 1997, p. 11):

> Writers often fail to offer any definition of security. And if one is offered, it is rarely accompanied by a discussion of reasons for preferring one definition rather than others. This is hardly the kind of toe-to-toe conceptual combat envisioned by Gallie (1956) with respect to such matters as to what constitutes justice, democracy, or a good Christian.

Rather than being a contested concept, Baldwin (1997, p. 12) insists, '[s]ecurity is more appropriately described as a confused or inadequately explicated concept'. Freedman (2003, p. 5) asserts, 'There can never be an absolute definition of security because it is an inherently relational concept'. He indicates that if the individual were the central focus of analysis then the possibilities of the application of the notion of security would be endless, including short and long term, circumstances that may be physical or mental.

The works of Wolfers and Baldwin are concerned with the security of nation states; however, while focussing on the conceptualisation of 'national security', Wolfers unwittingly sets the scene for Baldwin's endeavour to conceptualise 'security' as a widely applicable concept. Baldwin's (1997, p. 6) analysis is far-reaching and applicable to all levels, 'individual, family, society, state, international system, or humanity'. Building upon Wolfers' (1952) definition, which presents security as 'the absence of threats to acquired values', Baldwin (1997, p. 13) acknowledges the difficulty of expecting a total absence of threat and consequently reformulates the definition to conceptualise security as '*a low probability of damage to acquired values*'. Baldwin's reformulation shifts the focus from the presence or absence of 'threats' and places it on the preservation of acquired values, and by so doing offers a definition of 'security in its most general sense [that] can be defined in terms of two specifications: Security for whom? And security for which values?' (Baldwin 1997, p. 13). The objective character of the definition is clear, however, once the notion of specification is introduced then the subjective dimensions begin to emerge.

When considering security for whom and for which values, it becomes apparent that the concept of security is objective in its abstract state and subjective in its application. Wolfers (1952, p. 485) defined the subjective sense of security as 'the absence of fear that such values will be attacked'; however, neither Wolfers nor Baldwin suggest that the neglect of security as an abstract concept is due to the concentration on the subjective dimensions relating to sources of security. The distinction between the objective and subjective dimensions of security becomes clearer when we consider that the answers to the question 'Security for whom?' can be as diverse as 'some, most or all' individuals, states, or international systems, depending on the research question under consideration (Baldwin 1997, p. 13). This diversity is further extended by the necessity of specifying the values for which security is being sought. There is, of course, the possibility of overestimating or underestimating the likelihood of damage to acquired values, a process thought to be related to the objectiveness and subjectiveness of security (Wolfers 1952). For example, in relation to national security it may be the objective of security policy to reduce unjustified fear; in such an instance, the likelihood of damage to acquired

values may be overestimated. On the other hand, the subjectiveness of security may lead to an underestimation of the likelihood of damage to acquired values when a state perceives itself to be more secure than it is. The notion of overestimation and underestimation of security need not be restricted to the state. Like the concept of security, the risk of overestimation and underestimation of the likelihood of damage to acquired values can relate to the individual, the state or the international system. Wolfers (1952) makes the important distinction between the objective and subjective dimensions of security, a distinction that has allowed the conceptualisation of security to be separated from the application that identifies sources of security. It is the failure of others to make this distinction that has led to confusion as to what constitutes security as an abstract concept and a tendency for it to remain under-defined.

Other specifications outlined by Baldwin (1997, pp. 14–17) concern specific subjective dimensions – for example, 'How much security? … From what threats? … By what means? … At what cost? … [and] In what time period?' How much security tends to be viewed primarily from two perspectives. From one viewpoint security is a matter of degree, suggesting that one can have greater or less security depending on circumstances (Wolfers 1952). The other perspective refutes the notion of varying degrees of security by taking an all or nothing approach – that is, one either has security or one does not (Brodie 1950; Buzan 1991). Security, however, is commonly referred to by degree and it stands to reason that analysis should be in accordance with this usage (Baldwin 1997). Responses to the remaining questions relate to the pursuit of security and will necessarily vary in relation to the research question being addressed. It is the specifications, regardless of number and degree of specification that put the concept of security into use. Baldwin (1997, p. 17) suggests that specification requires 'at least some indication of how much security is being sought for which values of which actors with respect to which threats'.

The analytical theme presented by Baldwin (1997) accommodates a security agenda that goes way beyond that of international relations; however, it is Wolfers' 1952 article that is attributed with providing the conceptual foundation for defining security in a setting that is not restricted to military issues. The reference to the nation state in the works of Baldwin and Wolfers does not detract from a most useful conceptual analysis of

security that explicates what is meant by the term 'security' in this book. Baldwin's characterisation of security as '*a low probability of damage to acquired values*' is a definition that is acceptable to all disciplines and situations and this is demonstrated by the focus of the following discussion, which moves from the abstract to consider security from four perspectives. The perspective of security studies, which is a subfield of international relations, together with the economic, psychological and sociological perspectives form the holistic approach adopted for this book.

## Security Studies

Within the field of international relations, security studies form an important subfield that focuses on 'the phenomenon of war' (Walt 1991, p. 212). Indeed, Nye and Lynn-Jones (1988) have defined security studies as the study of the threat, use, and control of military force. Security studies scholars appear intent on maintaining this restricted perspective by rejecting the broadening of the notion of security to encompass security issues relating to groups and individuals. Traditional neorealist security studies specialists in particular fear that an 'excessive' broadening of their area of expertise would be detrimental to the discipline and therefore should be avoided. Noted for his work relating to security studies, Walt (1991, p. 213), for example, strongly advocates retaining the prevailing boundaries on security studies as he suggests doing otherwise would 'destroy its intellectual coherence and make it more difficult to devise solutions to any of these important problems'. Mindful of this view, the broadening of security studies from its original nuclear threat focus has been limited to such topics as 'grand strategy, conventional warfare, and the domestic sources of international conflict' (Walt 1991, p. 211). The field of security studies has been criticised for not having 'a common understanding of what security is, how it can be conceptualised, and what its most relevant research questions are' (Haftendorn 1991, p. 15). Given this perspective, it becomes abundantly clear why other disciplines have sought to fill the void by addressing issues relating to security that fall outside a military focus.

Defending the separation of security studies from the interests of other academic disciplines that address the wider perceptions of security, Walt

(1991, p. 229) reminds us that the 'danger of war will be with us for some time to come, and states will continue to acquire military forces for a variety of purposes'. The value of independent national security scholars having expertise on national security matters becomes apparent, particularly since 'history suggests that countries that suppress debate on national security matters are more likely to blunder into disaster, because misguided policies cannot be evaluated and stopped in time' (Walt 1991, p. 229). Thus, the 'ivory tower' nature of the area of security studies is an unusual and acceptable phenomenon within academia. The multi-disciplinary approaches to the concept of security and the practice and importance of security studies' narrow focus on military force are testament to this. According to Haftendorn (1991, p. 5), the 'security puzzle' reflects competing interpretations and the fact that '[e]ach concept of security corresponds to specific values, threats, and capabilities to meet the perceived challenges'.

Despite the limitations of security studies, this sub-discipline of international relations remains a field of direct relevance to this book. First, it is relevant because the current international concern relating to terrorism inevitably impacts upon specific groups and individuals who are deemed, often without justification, to present a threat (Fletcher 2005). Second, it is relevant because it is 'the traditional concern with security from external military threats' that provides the background for defining security in an abstract sense (Baldwin 1997, p. 5). Baldwin is not alone in his use of a national security perspective to develop the concept of security. The national security perspective, particularly the work of Baldwin, is well utilised by Nesadurai (2005) in her endeavour to define 'economic security'.

## Economic and Human Security

At the core of the notion of economic security is market stability, growth, equity and income guarantees (Commission on Human Security 2003). The interactions of these elements are highlighted by the Commission on Human Security (2003, p. 75) when it observes that '[e]conomic growth is essential for reducing income poverty'.

Economic security is an issue invariably high on the agenda of nation states. However, like the truncated term 'security', there appears to be an assumption that the meaning of the concept is known by all. Nesadurai (2005, p. 4) addresses this assumption by scrutinising the term 'economic security' in a global era that is both prosperous and fraught with apparent uncertainty. She argues that 'any conception of economic security needs to pay close attention to the economic insecurities generated by global capitalism', must acknowledge historical, political and social influences on states and societies and should have both a macro and micro relevance (Nesadurai 2005, p. 3). Nesadurai (2005, p. 5) is keen to avoid inflating the notion of economic security to encompass all possible economic threats while concomitantly holding 'it is equally vital to avoid an overly narrow definition that normalises the particular security preoccupations of one or another state for *all* states and societies' (original emphasis). These specifications are implicit in her adaptation of Baldwin's (1997, p. 13) abstract conceptualisation of security which she modifies to render it specific to the economic realm. Thus, she defines economic security as:

> A low probability of damage to a set of three key economic values: (a) streams of income and consumption necessary for minimal human/family needs; (b) market integrity; and (c) distributive equity. (Nesadurai 2005, p. 2)

Adding depth to this definition, Nesadurai identifies four of Baldwin's (1997, pp. 12–18) specifications as appropriate to further refine an economic view of security – in particular, 'Security for whom? … Security for which values? … From what threats? … And, by what means?' Surprisingly, however, she omits Baldwin's (1997, pp. 13–17) three other specifications – 'How much security? At what cost? [and] In what time period?' – all of which appear to have economic connotations.

The notion of economic security has salience in national economic policy and ecological disasters (Commission on Human Security 2003, p. 76). However, national economic security often does not equate to security for a nation's people. Indeed, 'state-centric' security can often run counter to human security. For example, forms of economic development and monetary and fiscal policies that advance the security of the nation may further marginalise disadvantaged groups. For this reason, the notion of 'human

security' has come to have greater prominence in the economic security literature. The 1994 Human Development Report of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP 1994) saw the notion of human security become formally presented as a referent of security representing the individual. Human security suggests the '[i]ndividual is to be made secure from two basic kinds of threats: freedom from fear and freedom from want' (Nesadurai 2005, p. 9). The UNDP (1994, p. 23) definition states that human security gives 'protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life – whether in homes, jobs or in communities' and 'safety from chronic threats such as hunger, disease and repression'. This definition encompasses security relating to food, health, environment, personal issues, community and politics and just as state-centric security can run counter to human security, the latter may run counter to national economic security. For instance, economic security for the individual gained by employment and an assured regime of income support may be to the detriment of the 'collective economic security for the national community by going against the logic of a market economy and consequently, undermining national economic growth prospects' (Nesadurai 2005, p. 10).

The notion of human security is discussed by King and Murray (2001/2002, p. 585) who advance what they describe as 'a simple, rigorous, and measurable definition of human security: [specifically] the number of years of future life spent outside a state of "generalised poverty"'. Alkire (2003, p. 34), however, subsequently canvassed the main competing definitions and characterisations in the human security literature and concluded that they remain disparate and that '[a] concept of human security would do well to give a coherent account of the elements it contains, how these might be amended and how potential security claims will be identified and pursued in practice'. A definition presented in the Commission on Human Security Report, *Human Security Now* (Commission Report) (2003, p. 4), suggests human security aims: 'to protect the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfilment'. The notion of 'vital core' is defined as 'a set of elementary rights and freedoms people enjoy', however the Commission Report (2003, p. 4) refrains from itemising the elements that constitute human security because of their variability. Assisting clarification of the notion of human security, former United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan (2000) articulates:

> Human security in its broadest sense embraces far more than the absence of violent conflict. It encompasses human rights, good governance, access to education and health care and ensuring that each individual has opportunities and choice to fulfil his or her own potential. Every step in this direction is also a step towards reducing poverty, achieving economic growth and preventing conflict. Freedom from want, freedom from fear and the freedom of future generations to inherit a healthy environment – these are the interrelated building blocks of human, and therefore national security. (Commission on Human Security 2003, p. 4)

The Commission Report (2003, pp. 72–73), lists three factors that impact upon human security – 'insufficient economic resources, unstable economic flows and asset losses' and suggests some strategies to alleviate these problems that are most relevant to developing countries. First, they suggest, 'an obvious step towards human security would be to prevent or mitigate crises. How? By developing early warning systems' and by constructing and maintaining an effective social protection regime (Commission on Human Security 2003, p. 84). In respect to the latter the Commission Report (2003, p. 85) asserts:

> Social protection aims to provide a social minimum to ensure that every person is able to develop the capabilities to participate actively in all spheres of life. Measures to ensure that there is adequate social protection for all, including the working poor and those not in paid work, are critical interventions required of governments, business and citizens.

The Commission also argues that human security can be advanced by:

- Putting systems in place to ensure basic economic security before catastrophic crises hit.
- Expanding existing programmes if the crisis has already hit. Scaling up existing programmes is one of the most cost-effective and time-effective ways of responding to a financial crisis or emergency.
- Setting up regular in-depth information-gathering mechanisms. (Commission on Human Security 2003, p. 85)

It is further suggested that policy and program measures should 'emerge from social dialogue with all actors, not just the government, the private sector and workers organisations', as in many cases these groups do not represent those in most need (Commission on Human Security 2003, p. 86). Consequently, there is a need for policies to be developed that are:

> Ethical and basic socio-economical obligations … that respect and protect people's right to core capabilities and minimum economic security … [indeed], the state must take appropriate legislative, administrative, judicial and budgetary action … [to] protect people's rights to basic education, health care, food, shelter, water and income – [these] must be made accessible and available to the most vulnerable and at-risk as a first priority. (Commission on Human Security 2003, p. 86)

The Commission on Human Security's assertion that the poor should contribute to policy relating to the needs of the poor can be translated into the circumstances of other vulnerable groups. Essentially, this suggests that vulnerable groups should contribute to the development of policy relating to their needs. The development of social policy needs to be accompanied by mechanisms that ensure implementation. The provision of social protection needs to be broad-based and monitored, with a range of institutional support and the availability of resources to draw on. This is particularly important for vulnerable groups as often they lack easy access to the traditional support provided by family and friends.

It has been suggested that the inclusiveness of the concept of human security is an 'obvious shortcoming' because of the numerous levels of responsibility – individual, group, state, and international (Rothschild 1995, p. 70). The reflections of Juan Somavia, Director-General of the International Labour Office (1999, p. 8), however, advise us that '[w]e have the responsibility of thinking about security in a more ample context' than simply the view of the state. Focussing on the lives of people, Somavia (1999, p. iv) relates the progression of humanity to the quality of life by identifying poverty, employment and social integration as representative of life concerns and level of security experienced by people. Somavia asserts: 'It is high time that we acknowledge the primary importance of human security' (1999, p. v). The most efficient and

economic measure of security is to provide humans with their basic needs, to be concerned for others' wellbeing, rather than deal with the manifestations of the pervasiveness of lack of security. Fitting with Somavia's broad-based view, the many dimensions of security, particularly in relation to human needs, continue to unfold when examined from the psychological and sociological disciplinary perspectives that follow.

## Psychological Security

While the psychological perspective is primarily concerned with trying to understand the minds and behaviours of organisms, its boundaries are few. Therefore, the concept of security is a difficult explicate from a psychological perspective. Adler (1917, 1926, 1930) began to discuss the concepts of security and insecurity, focussing on insecurity and its tendency to be associated with feelings of inferiority.

Berne (1947) later equated security with freedom from anxiety. While the use of the notion of insecurity is helpful to conceptualise the notion of security, Maslow's (1954, p. 33) statement that '[h]ealth is not simply the absence of disease or even the opposite of it', suggests security should not be simply the absence of insecurity or even the opposite of it.

Maslow's (1943) work provides an ideal starting point to present a psychological perspective of security. While scholars from various disciplines have argued that security is a basic human need (Maslow 1943, 1954; Doyal and Gough 1991; Straub 2003), it was Maslow who ranked security under the guise of 'safety' as a psychological need second only to basic physiological needs, such as oxygen, food and water. Needs are required as opposed to desires, which are unsatisfied longings or cravings. The difference is clarified when we consider needs as rights and desires as requests. Maslow's (1943) *Hierarchy of Needs* indicates that when all fundamental physiological needs are satisfied, the psychological need for safety or security comes into play. Commonly, 'safety' refers to being physically safe, however, the *need* to feel safe or secure is mostly psychological (Norwood 2005). It is this dimension that explains why safety or security needs follow rather than precede the fulfilment of physiological needs referred to by Maslow. After one's safety needs are