HUMAN SECURITY IN A DIVIDED CITY: URBAN SECURITY DIVIDE AS A TOOL FOR HUMAN SECURITY-ORIENTED RESEARCH AND POLICIES

MA Ana Paraušić, Research Associate*
Institute of Criminological and Sociological Research, Belgrade

*   parausicana@gmail.com

HUMAN SECURITY IN A DIVIDED CITY: URBAN SECURITY DIVIDE AS A TOOL FOR HUMAN SECURITY-ORIENTED RESEARCH AND POLICIES

Summary: *Besides being the sites of economic development, centres of social mobility and cultural creativity, cities are also places marked by inequalities and divisions along a range of axes, including class, race, ethnicity, gender, generation, as well as security. The paper`s goal is to present the urban security divide, as an analytical tool for exploring divisions in human security in the city, which stem from the unequal levels of access to security service and/or readiness of security actors to provide the service. The concept is based on the assumption that security, like some other services in the city, is a common good, a resource that should be equally or universally available to city dwellers. Its absence or presence can be an indicator of spatial inequality and division. Additional to the description of the concept, the author will try to suggest the conceptual framework for urban security divide analysis through the lens of the seven dimensions of human security. The urban security divide could be seen beyond its theoretical or methodological usage, but also as a practical tool for urban security policies whose goals would be to narrow the differences in human insecurities and inequalities in urban areas.*

Key words: *urban security, human security, urban security divide, dimensions of human security, city.*

Introduction

Undoubtedly, life in the city is marked by significant advantages, such as greater economic opportunities, better living standards, and a wealth of cultural and social content. The leading institutions in education, research, medical care, and finance are found there (Paraušić, 2019c: 254). As the number of people who inhabit and live in the cities increases, social, political and economic relations more and more have the label of urban. Besides being the sites of economic development, centres of social mobility and cultural creativity, contemporary cities are likewise marked by various security problems, ranging from crime, violence, terrorism to the poverty,

infrastructural issues, environmental degradation etc. (Paraušić, 2019a). Unless the population can be assured a reasonably safe and secure life, no amount of social services or economic resources would make life in the city sustainable (Branscomb, 2006: 225–226). It also should be noted that United Nations, as well as the European Union have prioritized urban security to tackle issues of human security, orienting on the individuals facing threats in the urban environment. Some authors argue that one of the basic aspects of urban security is well-being of its citizens (besides crime and disorder prevention and physical quality of urban areas) (Recasens et al., 2013). Bearing that urban security could take people-centric approach to tackle security issues, it is reasonable to explore overlapping points of human and urban security. It seems obvious that some knowledge from urban security field could be fruitfully applied when exploring inequalities and discrepancies concerning individuals in the contemporary cities.

One of the strongest features of the cities across the globe, are divisions and disparities that result in different levels of security in different parts of the urban environment and for the people living in them. These inequalities could go along a range of axes, including class, race, ethnicity, gender, generation, creating what has been named the "divided city". Urban security divide is, hence, the concept based on the assumption that security, like some other services in the city, is a common good, a resource that should be equally or universally available to city dwellers. Its absence or presence can be an indicator of spatial inequality and division.

The paper`s goal is to present the urban security divide, as an analytical tool for exploring divisions in human security in the city, which stem from the unequal levels of access to security service and/or readiness of security actors to provide the service. Additional to the description of the concept, the author will try to suggest the conceptual framework for urban security divide analysis through the lens of the seven dimensions of human security. The urban security divide could be seen beyond its theoretical or methodological usage, but also as a practical tool for urban security policies whose goals would be to narrow the differences in human insecurities and inequalities in urban areas.

Security in the Divided City

The notion of urban security divide is derived from the broader concept of urban divide. It`s intellectual roots could be traced to founders of urban sociology – the Chicago School researcher who systematically paid

attention to the identification and description of spatial segregation. In their ecological research, they discovered that different parts of the city (i.e. zones, sectoral patterns or nuclei) were inhabited by population groups with distinctive characteristics, which marked the landscape of a city (Burgess, 1925; McKenzie, 1925; Park et al., 1925). Further research in the spatial divisions in the cities was developed through deductive social area analysis in the 1940s and 1950s (Bell, 1953; Shevky & Bell, 1955; Shevky & Williams, 1949), as well as through inductive factoral ecology in the 1960s and 1970s (Berry & Kasarda, 1977; Murdie, 1969; Robson, 1969). Around the same time representatives of the behavioural approach "acknowledged that segregation should be seen as at least partly a result of individual preferences, perceptions and decisions" (Van Kempen & Murie, 2009: 378). On the other hand, institutional approach explored the role of the state and other institutional factors affecting urban spatial differentiations (Damer, 1974; Damer & Madigan, 1974; Henderson & Karn, 1987; Lipsky, 1980; Pahl, 1975, 1977; Tomlins, 1997). At the end of the 20th century unequal incomes and social and spatial polarisation were seen as a result of economic changes driven by globalization (Sassen, 1991). Nowadays, research on urban divide is more diverse, and these divisions are explored in different types of cities, multiple social categories and along the range of axes. Security could be seen as one among the axes of discussion in the urban divide research.

In the broadest sense, urban security divide could be understood as a divergence or gaps in security conditions in urban areas. Urban security divide lies on the assumption that security is unequally distributed among people and spaces due to constrained access to and/or ineffective provision of public security (Barbak, 2018), which sources could be various, such as social exclusion, flawed urban infrastructure, ignoring the voices of people in demand etc. Security, in this regard is seen as a common good, a resource that should be equally or universally available to city dwellers. Its absence or presence can be an indicator of spatial inequality and division. We must acknowledge that equality for every individual regarding security is, undoubtedly, an ideal, but "as overall security of a city will worsen as the urban security divide or the unequal distribution of security increases" (Barbak, 2018: 4).

Inequalities in contemporary cities could go along a range of axes, including class, race, ethnicity, gender, generation etc., creating a state of deprivation for marginalized individuals, groups and communities. Economic agenda usually dominates in explanation of inequalities, defining them in terms of unequal distribution of incomes or resources. However,

this agenda was broadened, especially thanks to sustainable development, stating that every individual must have access to clean water, healthcare, housing, education (United Nations, 2015), and other public services. These inequalities could be further explored in the field of security, whether it relates to state or sense of security, or provision of it. Moreover, unequal distribution of security could enhance and/or create gaps in related fields, such as political, economic, environmental, making situation even harder for already deprived groups and individuals.

Security and (in)equality have complex relationship, since it has been stated that insecurity develops inequalities, and *vice versa* inequalities worsen the state or sense of security (Hurrell & Woods, 1999; Oosterveld et al., 2018; World Bank, 2011; World Bank, 2018: 109–130). Several studies indicate that the endangered urban population is usually associated with low levels of education, lack of employment opportunities, large family size, as well as poor housing conditions (Mitlin & Satterhwaite, 2013). On the other hand, the better the housing, health and social support of the urban dwellers the higher the quality of life and overall sense of security (Đurić & Paraušić, 2017). Bearing this in mind the concept of urban security divide could help in exploring these phenomena, their mutual influence and connectedness, and hopefully, shed light on specific problems people and groups face in urban reality.

Some Manifestations of Urban Security Divide in Contemporary Cities

Urban security divide could take many forms, but it always relates to disparities between those "who have" and those "who have not". State security actors, traditionally main provider of security, may be perceived as a source of danger and fear. In cities marked by high rates of crime and violence, poor economic conditions, poverty, rapid and unplanned urbanization, illegal electoral processes and corruption, security forces are more often seen as actors of violence and intimidation, rather than protection (Aguja, 2018; Godoy et al., 2018; Lamb, 2018; Oosterveld et al., 2018). Law enforcement institutions, such as the police, the judiciary and the penal system, or other subjects of social control, are dysfunctional and lack the legitimacy given to them by citizens (Paraušić, 2019c). Local and national governments may lose control of certain urban areas, which are left to criminal groups, such as drug traffickers, gangs or paramilitary forces (Arias, 2006; Arias & Goldstein, 2010; Goldstein, 2004).

Upper-class and wealthier citizens respond by gating themselves and installing expensive alarm systems and hiring private security. Poor and marginalized citizens feel abandoned or even threatened by state security forces, and are forced to seek protection elsewhere. Large sections of the population must share urban space with illegal actors and show them respect in exchange for a minimum level of security. While some areas, such as central business districts, are becoming examples of security in the city, others are seen as ghettoes that are not approached by representatives of public institutions and are stigmatized as hotbeds of crime (Moralle & Tadié, 2011: 3).

Physical and psychological divisions resulting from the prevalence of urban insecurities can create a divided city and socio-symbolic segregation that undermines the social and economic structure and formal and informal organizations involved in city governance (Beall et al., 2002). In this sense, the institutional policies and activities of citizens in the field of security provision reveal spatial injustices on various scales (Morelle & Tadié, 2011). This issue is especially important in cities where areas outside major public security measures are deprived (Moralle & Tadié, 2011: 2). Moreover, security for some can result in insecurity for others. Achieving security may involve restrictions on an individual's freedom (Coleman & Sim, 2000; Davis, 1992), which results in confrontation and conflicts.

Maintaining public order, i.e. order in the city, implies the implementation of formal and informal measures, and depending on their nature and who implements them, they can result in deepening divisions in the city, increasing differences between neighbourhoods, isolating and stigmatizing settlements, and to the detriment of security for all citizens (Dikeç, 2007). Divisions can arise both from inequalities in access and the ability of people to be protected, or from the inefficiency or unwillingness of security providers to provide them with protection. The progressive collapse of the relationship between government and citizens and the ways in which people are excluded from participation and planning can lead to the breakdown of the social contract, which is the basis of effective city government.

A strong sense of insecurity, a statistically higher exposure to danger, or an over-representation of criminal groups in some urban areas reflect specific processes of inequality. Lack of security and a sense of insecurity are used to stigmatize not only the neighbourhood, but entire cities. The injustice here is twofold: locally, the chances of residents becoming victims are higher, and at the city level, neighbourhoods and people are stigmatized (Moralle & Tadié, 2011: 4).

In addition to the political nature of these processes, economy and economic change affect the provision of security, as well as the restoration of the mechanism of domination and exclusion. Austerity measures and structural adjustments meant the end of certain public initiatives during the 1980s, which had consequences for the activities of the police force, but also for the living conditions of the inhabitants of the city. The pauperization of many residents has increased perceived insecurity and launched private initiatives to increase the security of mostly wealthy settlements, which the poor could not afford (Blakely & Snyder, 1997; Flusty, 1994).

This privatization of security is transforming urban areas by increasing inequality. Exclusive security spaces have been physically created in the city, with fenced communities, surveillance infrastructure and design and architecture that have the role of deterring potential perpetrators (electric fences, spikes that prevent people from sitting down, etc.). They impose social differences in the city and deny access to public space to certain categories of citizens by creating defensive cityscapes, inspired by military motifs (walls, towers, barbed wire, etc.), but which do not necessarily affect crime reduction. They contribute to increasing inequality by making certain security practices clearly visible (Moralle & Tadié, 2011: 8).

Urban Security Divide and Seven Dimensions of Human Security

Urban security and human security share the same reasons for their actualization in security studies, the main being the need to reconceptualize traditional understanding of security in the post-Cold War period (Alkire, 2003; King & Murrey, 2001; Owen, 2004). As Muggah mentions: "In a world comprised of nation states, it is worth recalling that more than half the population today resides in cities" (Muggah, 2012: 25). Intercepting ground for these two fields was previously explored in the study on human security concept as an analytical framework for studying and explaining urban security problems (Đurić & Paraušić, 2017). In the study, authors examined how people-centred approach in previous research was applied in investigating urban security challenges. Derived conclusions indicate several important advantages of holistic human security approach applied to explore urban security issues, namely:

 – "Widening of the research focus to include diverse problems of public urban spaces and its residents;

- Changing research focus from state security, towards narrower social environment, i.e. city;
- Implementation of research findings into preventive and reactive programs". (Đurić & Paraušić, 2017: 115)

The present analysis is somehow similar and different. Here, we will try to find common ground for human and urban security, based on the assumption that bottom-up, people-centred approach has been useful analytical tool in exploring urban residents` security. On the other hand, we will deploy an urban security divide, as a framework for exploring human security, precisely its seven basic dimensions. In doing this task, we will use Conceptual Framework for Urban Security Divide proposed by Ahmet Barbek in his paper from 2018 (Table 1), and modify it for the seven dimensions of human security.

Table 1. Conceptual Framework for Urban Security Divide

Dimension	Concern/Research Question	Variables/Factors (Selected)
Demography	How do the security conditions differ among people depending on their demographic features?	Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Religion, Marital Status, Disadvantaged Groups, Livelihood, Education etc.
Spatial	How do the security conditions differ among urban spaces?	Physical Structure, Location, Proximity to Insecure Spaces, Limited Access to Public Spaces, Environmental Degradation etc.
Socio-Economic	How do the security conditions differ among people depending on their socio-economic conditions?	Speed of Urbanization, Social Cohesion and Solidarity, Income Distribution, Poverty, Migration, Access to Basic Needs and Services etc.

Physical Threat	How do the security conditions differ among people depending on the quality of public security governance?	Organized Crime, Terrorism, Gun Violence, Gangs, Armed Conflict, Domestic Violence and Abuse, Homicide Rates, Robbery etc.
Public Security Governance	How do the security conditions differ among people depending on the quality of public security governance?	Number of the Units in Service, Right Financing, Effective Allocation and Distribution of Resources, Professionalization, Institutional Capacity, Impunity, Citizen Participation, Involvement of Municipalities, Rule of Law etc.
Public Policy	How do the public policies affect security conditions at urban spaces?	Firearm Controls, Urban Development and Planning, Technology, Addiction, Migration, Taxation, Social Policy, Public Service Delivery; Inclusion, Responsiveness, Accountability, Participation etc.

Source: Barbek, 2018: 5–6.

Proposed framework for urban security is wide enough to include different dimensions of security in different urban areas, but specific enough not to lose the research focus. What is absent, however, is the author`s reasoning to include certain indicators for particular dimension. Some of them could clearly be indicators for more than one dimension, while other are not urban specific. However, author acknowledges that "variables to be included in the analysis may change depending on the dimension that is being studied, the purpose and the scope of the research, the research paradigm and so on" (Barbek, 2018: 6). Concerning author`s suggestion, we will propose urban security divide framework applicable for seven dimensions of human security.

As introduction to our urban security divide framework, in this place we will outline the basic conception on seven dimensions of human security, namely: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security, and political security. For this purpose, we will, foremost, consult the basic step stone for human security, the Human Development Report from 1994, as well as other relevant sources.

Economic security in the most general sense, relates to basic income which is necessary for satisfying essential needs. It usually relates to productive and remunerative work (UNDP, 1994: 25) and financial independence, but also to welfare, when a person is incapable to work based on personal or social disabilities. But people with jobs could also feel insecure, especially in the modern proleterization and precarization: being employed for minimal wage, or/and being employed in insecure workplace. The unemployed must often accept any work they can find, however unproductive or badly paid. Unemployment, job insecurity, poverty, income inequality, underdeveloped social security networks and homelessness are some of the biggest threats to economic security. Economic security in the city should be measured through achievements of the cities in terms of creating wealth and how it's shared, or cities contribution to economic growth and development, generation of income, provision of decent jobs and equal opportunities for all.

Food security is a dimension of human security that implies a state in which all people at all times have physical and socio-economic access to sufficient amounts of adequate food they need for a healthy and active life (FAO, 2008). It could be described "as physical and economic access to basic food" (UNDP, 1994: 27). This means that a person at all times, has, not just enough food, but an "entitlement" to food. It relates to satisfaction of basic nutritional needs in qualitative and quantitative terms. Food security has four basic components: physical availability of food[1]; economic and physical access to food[2]; food utilization[3]; stability of the other three dimensions over time[4]. It is inevitable that the most deprived from food are ones who could not afford it, meaning that, insecurity could also stem from inability to pay for the food, not from lack of availability.

Health security is defined as protection of human health from various threats like deadly infectious and parasitic diseases, malnutrition, inadequate lifestyle, limited access to health care and numerous health consequences of a polluted environment. Insecurities in this dimension are also

---

[1] Food availability addresses the "supply side" of food security and is determined by the level of food production, stock levels and net trade (FAO, 2008).

[2] An adequate supply of food at the national or international level does not in itself guarantee household level food security. Concerns about insufficient food access have resulted in a greater policy focus on incomes, expenditure, markets and prices in achieving food security objectives (FAO, 2008).

[3] Utilization is commonly understood as the way the body makes the most of various nutrients in the food (FAO, 2008).

[4] Even if your food intake is adequate today, you are still considered to be food insecure if you have inadequate access to food on a periodic basis, risking a deterioration of your nutritional status. Adverse weather conditions, political instability, or economic factors (unemployment, rising food prices) may have an impact on your food security status (FAO, 2008).

related to other factors and social context, such as insufficient nutrition, poverty, unsafe living environment etc. The threats to health security are usually greater for the poorest, people in the segregated urban areas and particularly children (UNDP, 1994: 28). Although the presumption was that the rural population suffers from severe threats to human security, recent data show that child mortality and malnutrition are more common in urban areas (Aguilar & Sumner, 2019).

Environmental security relates to healthy physical environment, free from pollution and degradation. In relation to urban security divide, it could be measured through average achievement of the cities in ensuring the protection of the urban environment and its natural assets. This should be done simultaneously while ensuring growth, pursuing energy efficiency, reducing pressure on surrounding land and natural resources and reducing environmental losses through creative and environment-enhancing solutions. The most serious threats to environmental security are water, air and soil pollution, access to healthy drinking water (especially in developing countries), deforestation, desertification, acid rain, lake acidification, increased greenhouse gas emissions, ozone depletion, biodiversity loss, climate changes (UNDP, 1994). In contemporary cities urban environment is severely endangered by rapid industrialization and urbanization in the past, which consequently lead to the problem of slums, shanty towns and squatter areas, where people live in extremely unsafe environment, lacking clear water, sewerage, electricity, which deepens the problem of healthy urban environment. Besides that, disasters in urban environment could cause significant loses of human life, assets and infrastructure.

Personal security is usually defined in respect to physical violence, protection from injuries to body and life. UNDP report (1994: 30) enlists some forms of violent threats: 1) threats from the state (physical torture); 2) threats from other states (war); 3) threats from other groups of people (ethnic tensions); 4) threats from individuals or gangs against other individuals or gangs (crime, street violence); 5) threats directed against women (rape, domestic violence); 6) threats directed at children based on their vulnerability and dependence (child abuse); 7) threats to self (suicide, drug use). For the purpose of our paper, we could exclude threat related to state and inter-state violence, since it is not related specifically to urban context. Group violence could refer to civil conflict in the country, but it could also be related to communal conflicts, if the city is strongly marked by some divisions related to national, ethnic or cultural heritage.[5] Violent threats to

---

5   We find this more applicable for community dimension of human security.

personal security from 4 to 7, are grounded in the urban security research, since the city has always been the place where, for historical and social reasons, crimes, violence, rape and substance abuse were widespread phenomena. This is especially true for lower income urban areas, who tend to experience higher rates of violence and victimization and within this areas, poor, marginal and vulnerable social groups are more at risk than others (Winton, 2004).

Community security is associated with preservation of the identity of ethnic communities and survival of traditional cultures (UNDP, 1994). It also includes the elimination of ethnic discrimination, the prevention of ethnic conflicts and the protection of indigenous people. Moreover, it relates to social exclusion, violence by other social groups or threats by the state. A family, a community, an organization, a racial or ethnic group could be seen as a source of individual safety. In urban environment these groups could be communal groups organized on the level of neighbourhoods, communities living in the separate part of the city (being privileged or marginalized), a subculture etc. The security problems could stem from communal groups with differing set of values and principles, based on some personal or social characteristics. For many individuals and groups, cities are attractive destinations in pursue for better life, which manifests in migrations from developing countries and underdeveloped rural regions to urban centres. But rather than finding promising job or better standard of living, they face discrimination and segregation. The unfulfilled expectations of the new dwellers become a potential cause of social unrest. There lies the danger for cities to become "large, ungovernable, and unmanageable nightmares in which urban decay feeds on rural decay and vice versa" (Nef, 1999: 54).

Political security means that people should live in a society that honours their basic human rights and freedoms (UNDP, 1994: 32). It relates to protection from political repression and discrimination. Political insecurity is most prevalent in undemocratic, authoritarian regimes, where the monopoly over the legitimate use of physical force is abused through regime repression. In conditions of political turmoil, instability and unrest, there is a violation and abuse of human rights, systematic torture and ill-treatment of individuals. Insecurity in this dimension in the city will probably not take these extreme forms, but it is rather manifested through unequal provision of security for some urban communities or city quarters, where citizens are failed by city and local government in pursue for security.

Among these seven dimensions of human security are considerable links and overlaps. They are manifestations of interrelations between the human security dimensions. Their separation serves the analytical purpose – in order to gain insight on state of human security in a city, one must delve into all the presented dimension, regardless of overlapping indicators.

Table 2. Urban Security Divide for Human Security[6]

Dimension	Concern/Research Question	Variables/Factors (Selected)
Economic dimension	How do the security conditions in urban environment differ among people depending on the economic features?	Income per capita; unemployment rates; poverty rates (percentage of people living under poverty line); number of people relaying on welfare; income disparity[7]; livelihood; city product per capita; old age dependency ratio; economic density
Food security	How do the security conditions in urban environment differ among people depending on the features related to food?	Purchasing power; food production per capita; food import dependency ration index; daily per capita calorie supply; food prices
Health security	How do the security conditions in urban environment differ among people depending on the health features?	Access to health care; mortality rate at childbirth; life expectancy at birth; under-five mortality rate; HIV, malaria, covid19, etc.; population using at least basic sanitation; population using at least basic drinking water sources

---

6   Proposed indicators for human security dimensions related to urban security divide, besides the original source (Barbek, 2018) are selected from Human Development Reports (1994–2019), Urban Governance Index and Urban Prosperity Index created by UN-Habitat and Safe Cities Indicator by the Economist Intelligence Unit.

7   This indicator could be somehow similar to Gini coefficient, a measure of statistical dispersion intended to represent the income inequality or wealth inequality within a nation or any other group of people.

Environmental security	How do the security conditions in differ among people depending on the features of urban environment?	Waste management; emergency service in the city; fossil fuel energy consumption; renewable energy consumption; carbon dioxide emissions; forest area; fresh water withdrawals; natural resource depletion
Personal security	How do the personal security conditions in urban environment differ among people?	Homicides per 100,000; reported rapes per 100,000; drug crimes per 100,000; traffic accidents per 100,000; Gun violence; gangs; property crimes; level of police engagement; private security measures
Community security	How do the security conditions in urban environment differ among people depending on the communal features?	Age; gender; ethnicity; religion; disadvantaged groups; speed of urbanization; social cohesion and solidarity
Political security	How do the security conditions in urban environment differ among people depending on the political features?	Right financing; effective allocation and distribution of resources; access to basic needs and services; citizen participation; public service delivery; inclusion; responsiveness; accountability; access to public information; women in local government; share of seats in city parliament for women and minority groups; level of corruption

For analytical purposes, each dimension of this framework could be explored separately, if there is a need to identify and assess specific field of security divide in urban environment. This proposal is not without its flaws. Some long-lasting processes in the cities have apparent consequences in all dimensions of human life. For example, rapid and hyper urbanization led to unmanageable enlargement of human settlements, which resulted in substandard housing, uncontrollable health hazards, and increased pollution, alienation, addiction, and crime. Therefore, the level of urbanization could serve as an indicator for all dimensions of urban security. More apparent example of this situation is poverty, which is tangled with economic, health, environmental, food, personal, community and political security. It would be rather unfair to position poverty as an indicator of

certain dimension, without referring to other six. This restriction could, perhaps, be overcome, if researcher is interested in exploring the divisions in human security in urban environment related to particular dimension of human security.

Placed in the mentioned manner, urban security divide serves to human security since it collects data on individuals and groups. Instead of beginning from national security priorities (but not excluding them), it represents a bottom-up approach to security research and practice. In the conclusion that follows, we will explore the benefits of urban security divide for investigating human security as a policy tool.

Concluding Remarks – Evidence-based Policies

Unprecedented urbanization and enlargement of human population led to problems, that could not only be related to traditional, "hard" notions of security, meaning conflicts, terrorism or crime, but also to issues entangled to wider framework of adequate quality of life (Paraušić, 2019b: 100). According to UN-HABITAT (2007: 235), emerging agenda of urban security urges effective urban planning, design and governance, community-based approaches, focusing on most vulnerable groups to reduce risk of crime, and enhancing social capital by developing the ability of individuals and communities to cope with crime and violence. This localized, bottom-up and linked (to urban planning) view to urban security first necessitates understanding how and to what extent security inequalities occur at urban spaces (Barbek, 2018: 5). Here, human and urban security are most obviously connected and create a common ground for empirical research and policies.

Urban security hinges upon the basic argument that security policies should address people's needs instead of focusing solely on priorities of public institutions (Edwards & Hughes, 2013; Menichelli, 2015). The urban security divide as a human security research tool provides not only the complex scientific assessment, but also a basis for creating effective reactive and preventive programs. It opens a space for evidence-based policies aimed at meeting the needs of specific communities, or neighbourhoods which display concrete inequalities and divisions related to dimensions of human security. Application of the urban security divide in exploration of human security issues can contribute to the implementation of research findings in diverse local activities, and best result could be achieved if

researchers, practitioners and citizens are partners in the research process and jointly identify and analyse the problems. Policy based on urban security divide focuses effort primarily on human beings in the most dire situations.

Besides focusing on specific communities or parts of the city, urban security divide enables focusing on separate dimensions of human security – one that exhibits the largest gaps related to security for individuals. The different kinds of security covered by the urban security divide framework could require distinct interventions, often by different providers or actors, such as police for public order, health system for medical care, city officials for policies for wider citizens` participation. However, as already mentioned, different kinds of security are thoroughly intertwined and mutually supportive, and would require cooperation of many actors in urban space (local government, citizens` associations, police, NGOs etc.) in order to enhance the overall state (or sense) of security.

Proposed approach could, at some extent, remove one of the biggest criticisms of the human security in general – i.e. broadness, which hinders its operationalization and definition of precise set of indicators, by focusing on selected criteria of the urban security divide for each of seven human security dimensions. It also narrows the focus of human security to specific urban neighbourhood, settlement, quarter or community. This means policies that are more people-centred and focused on specific problems people face in their everyday life.

This approach is not without its flaws, considering that the holistic nature and comprehensiveness of human security often leads to the loss of research focus. Urban security divide, if not applied properly, could also suffer from same "disease" of becoming "hot air" (as Roland Paris frames human security in his seminal article from 2001). Solution may lay in systematic choice of human security dimension, measurable indicators, which could point to the severe differences in conditions in urban environment that present serious threat to human life and well-being.

REFERENCES

Aguilar, G. R., and Sumner A. (2019). "Who Are the World's Poor? A New Profile of Global Multidimensional Poverty". Working Paper 499. Center for Global Development, Washington, DC.

Aguja, M. J. (2018). *Security and Sustainable Development in General Santos City, Philippines*. Geneva: DCAF.

Alkire, S. (2003). *A conceptual framework for human security*. Oxford: Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity, University of Oxford.

Arias, E. D. (2006). The dynamics of criminal governance: networks and social order in Rio de Janeiro. *Journal of Latin American Studies, 38*(2), 293–325.

Arias, E. D., Goldstein, D. M. (2010). *Violent democracies in Latin America*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Barbak, A. (2018). Analyzing security gapsat urban areas: conceptual framework for "Urban Security Divide". Available at https://www.academia.edu/40424127/Analyzing_Security_Gaps_at_Urban_Areas_Conceptual_Framework_for_Urban_Security_Divide_ retrieved at 1.10.2020.

Beall, J., Crankshaw, O., Parnell, S. (2002). *Untying a Divided City: Governance and Social Exclusion in Johannesburg*. London: Earthscan

Bell, W. (1953). The social areas of the San Francisco Bay region. *American Sociological Review*, *18*(1), 39–47.

Berry, B. J. L. & Kasarda, J. D. (1977), *Contemporary Urban Ecology*. New York: Macmillan.

Blakely, E. J., Snyder, M. G. (1997). *Fortress America. Gated Communities in the United States*. Washington D.C. et Cambridge (Massachusetts): The Brookings Institution et Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Branscomb, L. M. (2006). "Sustainable cities: Safety and security". *Technology in Society*, Vol. 28, No. 1–2, 225–234.

Burgess, E.W. (1925/1974). The Growth of the City – an Introduction to a Research Project. In: R. E. Park, E. W. Burgess & R. D. McKenzie (eds.), *The City*, pp. 47–62. Chicago, IL/London: University of Chicago Press.

Coleman, R., & Sim, J. (2000). 'You'll never walk alone': CCTV surveillance, order and neo-liberal rule in Liverpool city centre1. *The British journal of sociology*, *51*(4), 623–639.

Damer, S. (1974). Wine Alley: the sociology of a dreadful enclosure. *The Sociological Review*, 22(2), 221–248.

Damer, S., & Madigan, R. (1974). Housing investigator. *New Society*, *29*(616), 226–226.

Davis, M. (1992). *City of Quartz. Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*. New York: Vintage Books.

Dikeç, M. (2007). *Badlands of the Republic: Space, Politics and Urban Policy*, London: Blackwell.

Đurić, S. & Paraušić, A. (2017). Human Security Concept as Analytical Framework for Examining Urban Security. In: S. Stanarević, I. Đorđević & V. Rokvić (Eds.) *The Third International Academic Human Security Conference (Proceedings)*. November 04–05, 2016, Belgrade, (pp. 113–121). Belgrade: Human Security Research Center.

Edwards, A., Hughes, G. (2013). Comparative European Criminology and the Question of Urban Security. *European Journal of Criminology, 10*(3), 257–259.

FAO (2008). An Introduction to the Basic Concepts of Food Security. Available at http://www.fao.org/3/a-al936e.pdf, retrieved 6.10.2020.

Flusty, S. (1994). *Building Paranoia: The Proliferation of Interdictory Space and the Erosion of Spatial Justice*. Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urban Design, West Hollywood.

Godoy, J. F., Rodriguez, C., Zuleta, H. (2018). *Security in Sustainable Development in Bogota, Colombia*. Geneva: DCAF

Goldstein, D. M. (2004). *The spectacular city: violence and performance in urban Bolivia*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Henderson, J. & Karn, V. (1987). *Race, Class and State Housing: Inequality and the Allocation of Public Housing*. Aldershot: Gower.

Hurrell, A., Woods, N. (1999). *Inequality, Globalization, and World Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

King, G., Murray, C. J. (2001). Rethinking human security. *Political science quarterly*, *116*(4), 585–610.

Lamb, G. (2018). *Security and Sustainable Development in Cape Town, South Africa*. Geneva: DCAF.

Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York: Russell Sage.

McKenzie, R. D. (1925/1974). The Ecological Approach to the Study of the Human Community. In: R. E. Park, E. W. Burgess & R. D. McKenzie (eds.), *The City*, 63–79. Chicago, IL/London: University of Chicago Press.

Menichelli, F. (2015). The national picture: The reconfiguration of sovereignty, the normalization of emergency and the rise to prominence of urban security in Italy. *European Journal of Criminology, 12*(3), 263–276.

Mitlin, D., Satterthwaite, D. (2013). *Urban poverty in the global south: scale and nature*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Morelle, M. & Tadié, J. (2011). The Making of Urban Security. Available at https://www.academia.edu/2288919/The_making_of_urban_security, retrieved 29.9.2020.

Muggah, R. (2012). *Researching the urban dilemma: Urbanization, poverty and violence*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.

Murdie, R.A. (1969). *Factorial Ecology of Metropolitan Toronto 1951–1961*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Nef, J. (1999). *Human Security and Mutual Vulnerability: The Global Political Economy of Development and Underdevelopment (Second Edition)*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.

Oosterveld, W., Bergema, R., Siebenga, R., Schneider, B. (2018). *How Cities and States Can Cooperate to Combat the Violence Nexus and Promote Human Security*. The Hague: Hague Centre for Strategic Studies.

Owen, T. (2004). Challenges and opportunities for defining and measuring human security. *Disarmamentforum, 3*, 15–24.

Pahl, R. (1975). *Whose City?* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Pahl, R. (1977). Managers, Technical Experts and the State. In: M. Harloe (ed.), *Captive Cities*, pp. 49–60. London: John Wiley.

Paraušić, A. (2019a). Nasilnički kriminal kao bezbednosni problem u gradovima. *Zbornik Instituta za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, 38*(3), 119–135.

Paraušić, A. (2019b). Bezbednost u gradovima van granica nacionalnog i lokalnog – Politike urbane bezbednosti evropskih organizacija. *Revija za kriminologiju i krivično pravo*, *57*(2)*,* 99–111.

Paraušić, A. (2019c). Urban Security Providers: State, Non-state and Private Actors. International Academic Conference "Urban Security: Enhancing Security in an Urbanizing World", Ohrid September 4–6, 2019, (pp. 253–264). Skopje: Institute for Security, Defense and Peace.

Paris, R. (2001). Human Security: Paradigm shift or hot air? *International Security, 26* (2), 87–102.

Park, R. E., Burgess, E. W. & McKenzie, R. D. (eds.) (1925/1974). *The City*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Recasens, A., Cardoso, C., Castro, J., & Nobili, G. G. (2013). Urban security in southern Europe. *European Journal of Criminology*, *10*(3), 368–382.

Robson, B. T. (1969). *Urban Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sassen, S. (1991). *The Global City; New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Shevky, E. & Bell, W. (1955). *Social Area Analysis*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

Shevky, E. & Williams, M. (1949). *The Social Areas of Los Angeles*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Tomlins, R. (1997). Officer discretion and minority ethnic housing provision. *Netherlands journal of housing and the built environment*, *12*(2), 179–197.

Un-Habitat (2007). *Enhancing urban safety and security: Global report on human settlements 2007*. London: Routledge.

United Nations (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. New York: United Nations.

United Nations Development Program (1994). Human Development Report. Available at: http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/255/hdr_1994_en_complete_ nostats.pdf, retrieved 1.10.2020.

Van Kempen, R., & Murie, A. (2009). The new divided city: Changing patterns in European cities. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, *100*(4), 377–398.n

World Bank (2011). *World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development*. Washington, DC.: World Bank.

World Bank (2018). *Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict*. Washington, DC.: World Bank.

ЉУДСКА БЕЗБЕДНОСТ У ПОДЕЉЕНОМ ГРАДУ: ПОДЕЉЕНА УРБАНА БЕЗБЕДНОСТ КАО АЛАТ ЗА ИСТРАЖИВАЊЕ И ПОЛИТИКЕ УСМЕРЕНЕ НА ЉУДСКУ БЕЗБЕДНОСТ

маст. Ана Параушић, истраживач сарадник
Институт за криминолошка и социолошка истраживања, Београд

Сажетак

Поред тога што су места економског развоја и седишта друштвене мобилности и културалне креативности, градови су такође места која карактеришу неједнакости и поделе по више основа, укључујући класне, расне, етничке, родне, генерацијске, као и безбедносне. У овом раду биће представљена подељена урбана безбедност као аналитички алат за истраживање подела у људској безбедности у граду, које су узроковане неједнаким нивоима приступа услугама безбедности и/или спремности безбедносних актера да пруже те услуге. Концепт се заснива на претпоставци да је безбедност, као неке друге услуге у градовима, јавно добро и ресурс који треба подједнако и универзално да буде на располагању становницима града. Постојање или одсуство безбедности може бити индикатор просторне неједнакости и подела. Поред описивања овог појма, аутор је покушао да предложи концептуални оквир за анализу подељене урбане безбедности кроз призму седам димензија људске безбедности. Подељена урбана безбедност може се посматрати и изван теоријске и методолошке употребе, али и као практични алат за политике урбане безбедности с циљем смањења разлика у неизвесностима и неједнакостима у урбаним подручјима.

Кључне речи: *урбана безбедност, људска безбедност, подела урбане безбедности, димензије људске безбедности, град.*