Filipino Conceptions of Human Security:
Developing a Human Security Index for the Philippines[1]

Maria Ela L. Atienza, Ph.D.[2]
Deputy Director/Associate Professor
Third World Studies Center (TWSC)
and Department of Political Science
University of the Philippines, Diliman
ela_atienza@yahoo.com; ma_ela.atienza@up.edu.ph

Human security, which seeks to shift the meaning of security away from its traditionally military-oriented and state-centric focus, has become one of the most important concepts since the late twentieth century. Since the 1990s, the concept has been the focus of many debates in the United Nations (U.N.) system, international organizations, various governments and different regions, and the academic and intellectual field. Various efforts were made at developing dimensions and variables of human security. The United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP) *Human Development Report* (HDR) of 1994 was the major document which first acknowledged human security's importance. Human security was defined by the HDR as safety from chronic threats such as hunger, disease and repression, as well as protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions to the everyday lives of people. In the report, human security incorporates seven broad categories of concerns, namely economic, environmental, personal, community, health, political and food concerns (UNDP 1994). In the central document of an international seminar with the theme "Human Security and Mutual

Vulnerability", Nef (1999) proposed at least five dimensions of human security — ecology, economy, society, politics and culture. Then, on April 3, 2000, then U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan in a speech placed human security at the forefront of the global agenda. He defined human security in terms of three clusters of concerns: (1) freedom from want, (2) freedom from fear and (3) freedom of future generations to sustain their lives in this planet (Kraft 2006).

However, together with various attempts to define as well as develop indicators of human security, there are also some criticisms about the concept. Thomas and Tow (2002), for instance, argued that the term would have to be defined more narrowly if it were to acquire greater analytical and policy value. It needs to be more precise and clear. Goucha and Rojas Aravena (2001) also noted that "human security is still under construction, considering the number of priorities and dimensions to be taken into account in order to achieve integrated action" that is able to respond to urgent and wide-ranging needs, especially on behalf of the most unprotected sectors of the population. They added that the specific links between the promotion of human security, the prevention of conflict and action in favor of human rights and democracy should also be clearly established (Goucha and Rojas Aravena 2001).

This paper seeks to highlight the Philippines' contributions to the ongoing debates on human security. This paper is composed of several parts. The first part is a brief review of general understandings of human security, particularly as defined by international institutions, aid agencies, government agencies, and scholars from different parts of the world. The second part discusses the different dimensions of human security

in the Philippine context, including attempts by different groups (both government and non-government) in the country to come up with their own definitions, frameworks and dimensions of human security. The third part focuses on the ongoing efforts of the Third World Studies Center of the University of the Philippines to come up with a proposed human security index (HSI) that could serve as an indispensable planning and evaluation tool for government and non-government groups alike to assess the human security situation as well as threats to human security in the country. Since it is an ongoing project, many of the draft documents of the project will be the basis of portions of this paper. The last part of this paper discusses the possible contributions of the HSI Project in efforts to mainstream human security in the Philippines as well as the problems of mainstreaming human security in the country.

The Development of Human Security as a Concept

Bajpai (2000) asserts that the "genealogy of the idea" of human security can be traced to changes in the notions of development from the 1960s to the 1980s. As he chronicles the evolution of the concept, he cites the importance of two independent commissions that further expanded notions of security. These are the Independent Commission on International Development Issues and the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues. The former securitizes the issues of hunger, economic inequalities and conflict while the latter advances the ideas of common security and common responsibility in which the issues of environment, population growth and migration, and undemocratic institutions are considered security threats (Bajpai 2000). Rothschild (quoted in Alkire 2002), on the other hand, goes back further and gives a

historical account of the development of "extended security" and traces its roots to European political thought.

The term human security was first used in the 1994 HDR published by the UNDP. Mahbub Ul Haq, the economist chiefly responsible for crafting the Humane Governance and Human Development Indices, is the person most closely identified with the concept of human security. The 1994 publication formally defines the concept and explicitly makes the individual the referent object of security. In 1999, the Human Security Network was formed through the initiatives of Norway and Canada and in 2001, the Commission on Human Rights was formed with Professor Amartya Sen and Sadako Ogata as co-chairs.

However, a review of literature shows that human security is essentially a contested concept. Various scholars, nations and institutions offer alternative definitions, referent objects, operationalization and proposed methods of measurement. (For a detailed review of literature, see Cabilo and Baviera, 2007. Refer also to Table 1 for a survey of human security measurements.) These proposals range from minimalist to maximalist definitions that tend to overload the concept with various dimensions. The tendency of defining human security in such broad or narrow terms largely depends on the interest of groups engaging in the theorizing or applying the concept of human security. It is important to note that the maximalist definitions are usually founded on normative grounds and that criticisms of the maximalist position and the preference for the minimalist definitions are grounded on empirical and methodological grounds.

There remains to be considerable debate on the scope of human security, the dimensions of the concept and the core values to be protected amongst scholars. There is

a lack of directional focus, which should direct the substantive and systematic study of threats under human security. Paris argues that various dimensions and values are selected arbitrarily without compelling justification. For him it is futile to attempt to narrow down the concept when it is in the interest of advocates of human security to keep the concept ambiguous. Paris (2001) argues that "… human security is powerful precisely because it lacks precision and thereby encompasses the diverse perspectives and objectives of all the members of the coalition". Instead, he proposes that human security should not be used as a concept but as a category of research of military and non-military issues concerning individuals, groups and societies (Paris 2001).

Filipino Understandings of Human Security

The national security framework in the Philippines incorporates some elements of human security. Talisayon (n.d.) enumerates (1) moral/spiritual consensus, (2) cultural cohesiveness, (3) economic solidarity/organicity, (4) socio-political stability, (5) ecological integrity, (6) territorial integrity and (7) external peace as the elements composing a broadened framework. Meanwhile, Honasan and Castillo (2002) identify the following as pillars or foundations of national security: social cohesion and stability, economic prosperity and stability, and political unity and stability. At first glance, it could be observed that these conceptualizations of national security closely approximate some of the dimensions of human security proposed by the UNDP.

After the 1986 People Power, national security was redefined as the "security of the people" (Talisayon n.d.). Honasan and Castillo (2002) consider the people, regime and state to be the referent objects of national security. However, the authors claim that there is an artificial "divide between the people and state" and that the government and

5

the people are the components of the state. The people or individuals are thereby subsumed under the state. They recognize that there may be divergent interests between the state and the people, but this point remains to be largely unaddressed.

Institutional mechanisms are generally unable to respond to threats to human security. For example, Aguirre (1998: 20) proposes the creation of an Organization for National Security (ONS) that "refers to the structure of the decision-making process that affect the national survival and general welfare and well-being of our people" and will be "mainly responsible for the management of the national security planning process". One of the organization's tasks is to address non-traditional security threats. However, the language of the process of going about this is still hinged upon a state-centered view of security. The National Intelligence Coordinating Agency, National Security Council and National Intelligence Board are cited as the partner agencies for the ONS. Honasan and Castillo (2002) propose that the "instruments for the attainment of national security" are diplomacy and the military.

National security framework nominally considers non-traditional security threats as security issues, but does not reflect the normative underpinnings of human security. While nominally the Philippine national security framework accommodates non-traditional threats, institutional capacities fall short of what can respond to these threats. Also, the term human security does not even appear in the documents examined. It can be observed that until recently, human security norms are not embedded in the security sector.

However, various attempts have been made by government agencies, civil society organizations, and other development actors to contribute to the human security discourse

in the Philippines. The concept of human security was first introduced in the Philippine public consciousness through *The Gathering for Human and Ecological Security*, which was convened in 1995 by key government agencies such as the Commission on Population, Department of the Interior and Local Government and the Department of Justice. The conference was not only attended by government but also by representatives from the labor, youth, and other sectors as well as nongovernment organizations and people's organizations. The result of the conference was the commitment through a covenant to place the protection of people and the environment at the forefront of the national agenda. This was merged with then President Fidel Ramos' Social Reform Agenda of the Philippine society's basic sectors to make up the people-empowerment pillar of *Philippines 2000*. This came a year after the term "human security" gained currency in development circles. Subsequent efforts to mainstream human security as a framework came in mid-2004 until the middle of 2005. A multi-agency effort was undertaken to re-introduce the concept of human security in public policymaking. This created the National Task Force on Convergence (NTFC) whose mandate was to "harmonize the perspectives between the military… and civilian agencies in defining and making operational a common framework for national security."

In the same year as the NTFC was re-working the national security framework, the *Philippine Human Development Report* (PHDR) (De Dios, et al. 2005) was released. It defined human security as the "freedom from fear, want, and humiliation." The Report, though, focuses only on what it calls "ideology-based armed conflict." It likewise provides the distinction between human security and human development. According to the Report, while "human development is the process that widens the range of people's

choices, human security means that people can make those choices safely and freely. [H]uman security is the external pre-condition for human development." Another value added of the Report is the provision of concrete indices to measure the costs and causes of armed conflict. These may be useful in putting together an initial list of human security indicators appropriate in the Philippine context.

To date, there have also been two attempts to develop a human security framework appropriate to Philippine realities. Tabang Mindanaw, an organization headed by former Ambassador Howard Dee, developed what it calls the Justice-Based Human Security Framework. This was presented in response to the 2005 PHDR. It points to injustice, particularly committed against poor sectors and communities, and not poverty, as the flame to armed conflict (Dee and Garilao 2005). The framework is based on justice, equity, and people-centered governance. This is the framework used by Tabang Mindanaw in working with indigenous peoples, the Bangsamoro, and the people of Basilan, Sulu, and Tawi-tawi. The framework basically responds to the root causes of armed conflict. According to Dee, for the justice-based human security framework to be adopted, three things are imperative. First, there is a need to acknowledge that inequalities indeed exist. The second step is to ask the important question of why such inequities persist. The third requisite is for institutions to transform to be more responsive in combating injustice. The thin line that divides human development and human security is best described by the following quote: "Human security complements state security, enhances human rights, and strengthens human development." (Dee and Garilao 2005)

A more recent effort was done by the Third World Studies Center, gathering various perspectives from multisectoral actors with development, governance, culture,

and violent conflict situation as key themes. Culled from a four-session series with the themes of development, governance, culture, and violent conflict situations (to be discussed in detail in the next section), human security's referent object in the Philippine context is the community instead of the individual alone. The proposed framework is hinged on four basic principles. These include "the *interconnectedness* of the various dimensions of human security, the centrality of *land ownership and stewardship* as part of human security, the emphasis placed on *community security* rather than the individual, and the *plurality of understanding* human security" based on local realities (Cabilo and Quinsaat 2007). As noted by keynote speaker Teresita Quintos Deles, the discourse on human security is "already moving beyond the formulations of basic principles and agenda, to designing operational constructions by which one can create, measure, and compare indices of human security…" (PDS 2006 Proceedings) This is the only way for the nebulous concept of human security to be rendered useful in public policy.

There have also been efforts to indirectly mainstream human security through the development of indicators that may be useful in development planning and governance (See Table 2). One such effort was undertaken by the Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS) to come up with a security sector reform index (SSRI). The index aims to facilitate the process of coming up with "informed analyses on the state of governance of the security sector, as well as its reform programs and initiatives" (ISDS 2007). Human security is used as one of the frameworks in the performance of the security sector's mandate. The SSRI has five dimensions, which include (1) democratic principles of governance; (2) extent of powers, knowledge, or awareness, and capacity of oversight institutions; (3) performance record of oversight institutions and core security

sector actors; (4) security sector reform programs; and (5) contribution to conflict prevention and peace building (ISDS 2007). The five principles upon which indicators of each dimension are based include transparency, responsibility, accountability, participation, and responsiveness.

The Office of the Presidential Adviser on the Peace Process (OPPAP) is also working on developing tools to integrate peace building and conflict prevention in the planning process at the local level. It seeks to mainstream human security and use a "conflict-sensitive lens" in local governance to ensure that plans and programs are responsive to the needs of the people. The draft document, entitled "Conflict Sensitive and Peace Promoting Local Development Planning" (2007) also indicates that in so doing, it adapts the dimensions of human security as defined by the UNDP. The conflict-sensitive approach is a strategy by which local government units (LGUs) identify the various forms of conflict in their locality vis-à-vis the context under which conflict arises to determine the root causes of conflict. This enables LGUs to draw up plans and programs that address factors bringing about or exacerbating conflict.

According to the OPAPP (2005), mainstreaming is achieved when the following conditions are met: (1) there is deeper awareness and appreciation of human security and conflict-sensitive approaches vis-à-vis local governance; (2) human security and conflict-sensitive approaches are integrated in local government processes by installation of appropriate mechanisms (legislations, local ordinances, local bodies, etc.); and, (3) there is legislation-resource match for local plans.

Human security is defined as the protection of people's "physical safety, socioeconomic wellbeing, dignity and worth, and human rights and fundamental

freedoms" (OPAPP 2007). It argues that the notion that human development is achieved only when people live in a secure and safe environment, thus ensuring their human security. While it recognizes that the tool is primarily useful for local governments in conflict situations, it asserts that the tool may also benefit local governments that are operating in relative peace. It also admits that the elements of human security, as defined by the UNDP, cuts across the developmental concerns in local governance (employment, environment, health, etc.), thus, it is not a totally new concept in local governance. In fact, what needs to be done to mainstream human security in local governance is to further strengthen the protection of the basic freedoms and provision of "basic survival needs," as well as empowering people to make decisions and take action. When framed as such, the human security approach in local governance is very similar with the minimum basic needs (MBN) approach, which is the strategy to prioritize the "primary requirements to ensure that the basic needs of survival, security from physical harm, and enabling needs of the individual, family, and community are attended to". The toolkit seeks to enhance the local development planning process by using conflict-sensitive and human security approach. It implicitly states the importance of developing human security indicators, which will be integrated in a local development indicators list, as well as in the Vulnerability to Armed Conflict Indicators at the Local Level, and a human security index for a conflict-sensitive and peace-promoting local development plans.

Other tools, which do not necessarily have explicit bias for the mainstreaming of human security, have been developed to measure the promotion and protection of the various dimensions of human security. The Philippine Human Rights Information Center (PhilRights) also developed the Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ESCR)

indicators. The ESCR indicators were generated through a process largely involving grassroots organizations and individuals through focus-group discussions in various municipalities nationwide (PhilRights 2002). Towards the end of the project, the indicators were categorized into five rights—rights to health, to food, housing, work, and education—to cover more than a hundred indicators. Providing indicators for the five ESC rights aims to extract accountability on the state to deliver on its commitments to the international Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. As a monitoring tool, it deals with the presence or absence of goods, services, or structures to address people's economic, social and cultural rights.

Another tool was developed to measure the presence or absence of people's capabilities. The Capability Poverty Measure developed by Manasan, Gonzalez and Gaffud (1999). It assesses three dimensions of capability namely, quality of life, reproduction, and literacy and knowledge. The tool makes use of three variables, which are given equal weights. Weights, however, may be determined by respondents depending on the value they place on each indicator.

Fairly recently, the Maguindanao Working Group of the Mindanao Economic Development Council (MEDCo) devised the human security indicators using datasets primarily culled from the Local Government Performance Monitoring System (LGPMS) and other available data at the municipal level. It also draws some indicators from Rosemarie Edillon's Vulnerability Index, which identified factors that bring about conflict. Pilot tested in the province of Maguindanao in the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao, the index covers all seven dimensions of human security as defined by the UNDP. The all-encompassing index, as expected, is composed of a handful of

indicators that is very much similar to the HDI. This brings to mind the question as to what differentiates the proposed HSI from the HDI.

In integrating conflict-sensitive and human security approach in local development planning, a human security index will be instrumental in measuring the extent to which insecurity occurs in localities. Where local development plans and programs are wanting in ensuring human security, identifying the causes of insecurity with the aid of human security indicators and an index makes possible crafting appropriate responses.

The Third World Studies Center's Attempts to Develop a Human Security Index
<u>**Project Background and Goals**</u>

The Third World Studies Center (TWSC) is an academic research center based in the College of Social Sciences and Philosophy (CSSP) of the University of the Philippines-Diliman. It is committed to develop critical, alternative paradigms to promote progressive scholarship and action for change by creating spaces for discussion and dialogue; undertaking pioneering research; publishing original, empirically grounded and innovative research; and building a community of activist-scholars and public intellectuals. The TWSC's programs—research, training and advocacy, publications, and fellowship and exchange—are anchored on five thematic areas of globalization, social movements, peace and human security, democratic governance, and culture and identity. For its research agenda, the TWSC has a long tradition of research on critical political economy, development issues, democratization, and governance. Research is focused on the search for progressive discourses and alternative paradigms. Guided by the principles

of participatory research, the main objectives of the Center's researches are to develop "Third World" or South perspectives on various issues and to translate knowledge generated in order to promote actions for change or to improve existing local actions, as well as to locate spaces for policy intervention. The TWSC enters into partnership agreements through the Social Sciences and Philosophy Research Foundation, Inc. (SSPRF, Inc.). SSPRF is a non-stock, non-profit, non-sectarian, educational and scientific research foundation composed of faculty members, researchers and retired professors of CSSP. The Foundation is dedicated to supporting basic and applied social science research and the scholarly works of the CSSP faculty and staff.

Under its training and advocacy program, the TWSC has successfully implemented the *Policy Dialogue Series 2006: Towards a Human Security Framework* with the support of the UNDP-Philippines' Conflict Prevention and Peace Building (CPPB) Programme. This five-part series brought together government representatives from the executive and legislative levels; civil society actors including, but not limited to, different sectoral representatives; members of the academe; and private sector representatives. Through its 2006 Policy Dialogue Series (PDS), the TWSC examined the different dimensions of human security in the Philippine context and facilitated the formulation of a proposed human security framework for the Philippines (Cabilo and Quinsaat 2007). Through this project, the TWSC has also facilitated the formation of a network of individuals and organizations that are willing and able to promote the adoption of a policy framework that is anchored on human security. To sustain these important gains and to build from these initial inroads, it is necessary to present a more vivid picture of the human security situation and threats in the Philippines in promoting a

human security-based plan as well as understand further the dimensions of human security in the Philippine context, assess the human security situation in the Philippines, and have a grasp of the various threats to human security.

To address this need, TWSC proposed a follow-up project entitled *Developing a Human Security Index for the Philippines* which UNDP-Philippines approved. UNDP-CPPB has also invited and successfully convinced the U.N. Act for Peace Programme in Mindanao to support the Mindanao component of the project. The project seeks to develop a human security index (HSI) that could serve as an indispensable planning and evaluation tool. The proposed HSI will be composed of several dimensions of human security to be determined by the research team. The HSI is intended to be a standard to measure the general human security situation in the country. It also describes the scope and intensity of human security in the Philippine context as it incorporates dimensions, which need to be taken into account in the process of conflict prevention and peace-building. It is also intended to be a planning and evaluation tool to strengthen the capacities of national agencies in peace-building and human security.

The project started in June 2007 and is expected to come up with a proposed HSI and formalize the creation of a Human Security Network (HSN) of individuals and organizations by December of the same year. Indicators of the project output results include: (1) use of comprehensive and up-to-date materials based on review of related literature; (2) integration of inputs from various stakeholders in the revision of the human security framework and the construction of the proposed index; (3) use of appropriate quantitative and qualitative methods and tools; and (4) conduct of survey, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions.

Proposed Human Security Framework

The human security framework presented during the last PDS 2006 received a number of comments and recommendations for revision in the forum. For the present HSI project, the project team revised the framework by incorporating the said comments and recommendations. Furthermore, in order to suit the objectives of the current project, the project team generated additional comments on the proposed framework from various sectors through e-mail and conduct of consultation meetings. The proposed framework was further revised.

In developing a human security index for the Philippines, the project adopts a narrow definition of human security. First and foremost, it takes the presence of armed conflict as its environment. Conflict in this case is also narrowed down; conflicts considered are those where one of the parties involved is the state. Hence, human security is a state or condition whereby the individual is protected from critical, immediate, and pervasive threats to his or her life, liberty, property, and community in the context of armed conflict. While human security takes the individual as its referent object, the individual is not disengaged or separated from his or her community for it is where he or she derives his or her freedom, rights, and identity. Threat has various dimensions. It is an undesirable, deliberate or accidental event that may result in harm. It is often the exploitation of an identified vulnerability. Human security is a relational concept (to defend a person from) and therefore conceived vis-à-vis a known and established direct threat against a person, his or her property, and community.

In sum, in the TWSC project, human security takes the individual and community as its referent objects, applies a threat-based approach, and operates in the context of armed conflict involving the state.

Based on this definition adopted by the project, the framework (See Figure 1) indicates the centrality of the individual that is deeply embedded in his or her community. As stated, the context is the persistence of armed conflict and overt violence. There may be threats to the individual's personal well-being such as death and injuries, displacement, destruction of property and livelihood, outbreak of communicable diseases in refugee camps, etc. These are the urgent problems that should be addressed in the short-term. In the long-run, however, difficulties may arise which are not only at the level of the individual but the community as well. These include distrust, competition over available resources, etc. which breed insecurity. Processes to ensure that human security is upheld should involve scaling up, first concentrating at the micro level (individual, community) then moving to the macro or national plane. In addition, every community is unique; the same way that individuals are differentiated based on class, gender, age, etc.

Recognition and identification of threat is fundamental to human security. As long as threats are unrecognized or actors fail to perceive them as such, no response by government would ever be founded based on the principles of human security. Situations, interests, lives, and values vary widely even among communities that have the same socio-demographic characteristics. What may be a threat to some may not be the same to others.

When people are caught in complex and precarious situations, wherein the problems are multifarious with multiple actors involved, there is a tendency to strike in

numerous fronts in the hope of addressing the various origins of the crisis. Determining what should be given priority is extremely important, especially when resources and time are limited. Human security is best applied in such a way that when a concern is identified as a security issue, it is afforded with a certain amount of urgency and thus it becomes a priority.

Research Methodology for Index Development

Building from its previous engagement with scholar-activists, public intellectuals and development workers, the TWSC will once again tap its network from government, civil society, private sector, and the academe from select areas in the Philippines to actively take part as discussants and/or participants. This study utilizes a participatory research approach which involves duty-bearers and stakeholders in the project to ensure that data to be generated are reliable and valid and that its users will assume ownership of the human security index which will be developed.

To encapsulate the different dimensions of human security, the study will gather multi-level data from various sectors using both quantitative and qualitative techniques:

(1) *Key Informant Interviews (KII)*. Respondents for the KII will include national and local government officials, national and local representatives of nongovernment organizations (NGOs) and people's organizations (POs), and members of the legislature.

(2) *Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)*. A total of eight (8) FGDs with at most 10 participants per discussion will be conducted covering the following areas: 2 each for Luzon and the Visayas, 3 for Mindanao, and 1 for Metro Manila or the National Capitol Region (NCR). Participants should come from different sectors, focusing on the marginalized (e.g. indigenous peoples, women, farmers, other agricultural workers, and fisherfolks). Facilitators of the FGDs will be coming from the areas, possibly from the Human Security Network, to ensure that sensitivity to the subtleties of the local language as well as local conditions will be exercised.

(3) *Survey*. The survey will be administered to 200 human security advocates, i.e. participants from the PDS 2006 using self-administered questionnaire.

(4) *Household Survey*. The survey will cover 800 individuals from selected

barangays in NCR, Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao

As emphasized earlier, the study approach is participatory. The study makes sure that the views of the vulnerable and marginalized sectors such as indigenous peoples, rural agricultural workers and farmers, women, children and poor people are incorporated in the proposed index. These data will be generated from the FGDs and will complement the survey data by providing the context to the estimates and enhancing statistical data analysis.

This research design serves as the foundation of the baseline survey that would generate the indicators that will be used to create an index for human security. The index will measure the political, economic, ecological, psychosocial and physical dimensions of human security and depict the context in which human security (as a condition) exists — the individual's susceptibility, exposure, coping capacity, adaptive capacity to threats; as well as physical social, economic, environmental and institutional features that either ensue or prevent the threats.

Specifically, as broadly defined by the UNDP, the survey will measure indicators of: (1) economic security threatened by poverty; (2) food security threatened by hunger and famine; (3) health security threatened by injury and disease; (4) environmental security threatened by pollution, environmental degradation and resource depletion; (5) personal security threatened by various forms of violence; (6) political security threatened by political repression; and (7) community security threatened by social unrest and instability.

Although the UNDP definition of human security is broad, the index will be inclusive but separates its components into different types of security in order to address

causality and setting a threshold demarcating the vital core in order to distinguish itself from human development. The threshold for what is deemed a human security threat is set by the terms "vital core" and "critical and pervasive threats". This is important in order to ingrain a necessary degree of limitation within the concept. The vital core, as the Commission on Human Security points out, is what constitutes a minimum level of survival. Reference to "critical and pervasive threats" establishes both **severity and immediacy**. As there are an unlimited number of possible threats, only the most serious, those that take or seriously threaten lives, are included.

The survey design will define the population, the sampling frame and the sample sizes, the sampling procedure, and the method of data collection for the household survey of individuals in selected communities or barangays (the smallest politico-administrative unit in the Philippines). The population targeted by the baseline survey include individuals ages 18 and above in 7 provinces in Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao that are considered as conflict areas and in two cities of NCR. The sample size is 800 distributed proportionately by gender. The sample will have approximately 50% females and 50% males.

The study adapts the 2005 PHDR definition in Appendix Table 8: Indicators of Human Insecurity where intensity of conflict is determined by the number of armed encounters in the past year. Areas to be selected will thus be based on intensity of conflict. In the case of the three Mindanao sites, the research team, together with MEDCo and U.N. Act for Peace representatives, has already selected Surigao del Sur, North Cotabato and Sulu not only because the levels of and participants in the conflicts vary but because of variations in composition of the communities (Muslims, Christians, and

others) and the degree of intervention of the two Mindanao-based organizations. Metro Manila will be used as "control site" in the sense that there might be low or no insurgency-related armed encounters. However, it may yield other human security issues related with other conflicts involving the state, e.g. land and housing conflicts, etc.

The study will employ a multi-stage stratified random sampling with provinces as domains and barangays as enumeration units. From the list of all barangays in the provinces covered in the study, barangays will be random selected. The households will serve as the primary sampling unit. One eligible respondent will be interviewed per household. The household head or the spouse of the household head will be the survey respondent but in case the two are unavailable, any responsible adult in the household will be interviewed. This person should be knowledgeable about the other household members since household data will also be derived from the respondent.

The sample will be distributed as follows:

(1) Two cities in NCR covering 5 barangays per city and 20 households per barangay yielding a total of 100 respondents;
(2) Two provinces in Luzon covering 10 barangays per province and 20 households per barangay yielding a total of 200 respondents;
(3) Two provinces in Visayas covering 10 barangays per province and 20 households per barangay yielding a total of 200 respondents;
(4) Three provinces in Mindanao covering 15 barangays per province and 20 households per barangay yielding a total of 300 respondents;

Data will be collected using three survey instruments. The survey instruments will include: a community profile questionnaire, a household form and the individual's questionnaire. The community profile questionnaire will be accomplished by the field supervisor in each barangay covered by the study. The data will be generated from

existing records in the barangay or municipality/city (if records are not kept in the barangay).

In each of the sample household, the interviewer will accomplish the household form and the individual's questionnaire. The household form contains information about the socio-demographic and economic characteristics of all household members and the housing characteristics of the household. The individual's questionnaire will have several blocks which will include information on the following:

(1) Block A: Identification and Call Record (province, city/municipality, name of sample barangay, urban-rural stratum, household number, respondent's name, complete address, etc.)
(2) Block B: Socio-economic and Demographic Characteristics
(3) Block C: Perception of Overall Life Situation
(4) Block D: Perception About Human Security
(5) Block E: Political Situation
(6) Block F: Capabilities, Coping and Vulnerabilities to Indirect Threats

The interviews, FGDs and surveys will be conducted until October this year.

Prospects and Challenges in Mainstreaming Human Security in the Philippines

Based on the review of literature and the ongoing experience of TWSC, there is already a loose network of individuals and groups, both from government and outside, in the Philippines that are already aware of the concept of human security, though ideas and definitions still vary. They are interested in mainstreaming human security, particularly in policy advocacy, assessment and planning. While some groups are pursuing different projects related to human security, there are occasions where these groups share their experiences, request for comments and suggestions, and exchange and debate about the concept of human security.

However, as the review of literature has shown and based on the many ongoing debates among the so-called human security advocates, human security in the Philippines is still a contested and vague concept. Advocates are divided by minimalist and maximalist tendencies as well as by adopting the UNDP concept or pursuing a more Philippine-specific human security definition and framework.

Perhaps, a recent development in the Philippines presents both a problem as well as an opportunity for human security advocates in the country to come together and come up with a definition and framework that really capture human security in the Philippines. Republic Act No. 9372, entitled "An Act to Secure the State and Protect Our People from Terrorism," was enacted this year. Its short title is the "Human Security Act of 2007" (HSA). According to Soliman Santos (2005), one of the authors of the PHDR 2005 and one of those who petitioned the Supreme Court to declare the law unconstitutional, the short title is a deception and a violation of "both substantive due process and the people's right to public information". The title, in a way, fools the people to think that counter-terrorism is equivalent to human security. But "the HSA, by its own definition of terrorism, might only 'secure the state' but not 'protect our people from terrorism.' Granting that it would also protect our people from terrorism, this comes under only the 'freedom from fear' aspect of human security." Santos continues that projecting counter-terrorism as human security is not only deceptive but "also dishonest as a misappropriation of a concept currently associated with the UNDP, the independent global Commission for Human Security, and the Human Security Network of countries." This "misappropriation" of the term or "theft of intellectual property" endangers the work

of UNDP, Tabang Mindanaw, Church leaders, and other peace advocates in the Philippines.

With this particular challenge, "genuine" human security advocates need to reclaim the concept of human security, find a better working definition suitable for the country, and understandable to a wider public. Otherwise, people may really be led to believe that human security is simply counter-terrorism.

References

Aguirre, Alexander. 1998. "National security: Concepts and organizations." *National Security Review*. Vol. 18: 2.

Alkire, Sabina. 2002. *A conceptual framework for human security*. CRISE working paper #2. http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~acgei/Publications/Akire/Alkire_Human_Security_Concept_CRISE_WP2.pdf. (accessed June 25, 2007).

Bajpai, Kanti. 2000. *Human security: Concept and measurement*. Kroc Institute Occasional Paper #19:OP:1. http://kroc.nd.edu/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF. (accessed June 27, 2007).

Cabilo, Zuraida Mae D. and Mara Yasmin S.P. Baviera. 2007. "Defining and Debating Human Security: A Review of Literature." Draft.

Cabilo, Zuraida Mae D. and Sharon M. Quinsaat. 2007. "Towards a Human Security Framework in the Philippine Context." In *Defining the Human Security Framework in the Philippine Context*. (forthcoming 2007). Proceedings of the Third World Studies Center Policy Dialogue Series 2006. Quezon City: Third World Studies Center in partnership with the Conflict Prevention and Peace Building Programme (CPPB) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) – Philippines.

Capuno, Joseph. 2000. "Good governance index: Advocating good governance for local development." *Issues and Letters*, December. Quezon City: Philippine Center for Policy Studies.

De Dios, Emmanuel, Soliman Santos Jr. and Sharon Faye Piza. 2005. *The Fifth Philippine Human Development Report: Peace, Human Security and Human Development in the Philippines*. Human Development Network and the United Nations Development Programme.

Dee, Howard and Ernesto Garilao. 2005. "A Justice-Based Development as a Fundamental Right. A reaction to the presentation of the highlights of the 2005 Philippine Human Development Report: Peace, Human Security and Human Development in the Philippines", 25 October, Heritage Hotel, Pasay City, Philippines.

Defining the Human Security Framework in the Philippine Context (PDS 2006 Proceedings). (Forthcoming) 2007. Proceedings of the Third World Studies Center Policy Dialogue Series 2006. Quezon City: Third World Studies Center in partnership with the Conflict Prevention and Peace Building Programme (CPPB) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) – Philippines.

Goucha, Moufida and Rojas Aravena, Francisco. 2001. "New Perspectives on Human Security in Latin America and the Carribean." In *Human Security, Conflict Prevention and Peace in Latin America and the Carribean*, edited by Moufida Goucha and Rojas Aravena. UNESCO and FLACSO-Chile, pp. 7-10.

Honasan, Gregorio and Michael Eric Castillo. 2002. "A national security framework for the Philippines." *National Security Review*. December 2002, 20: 4.

Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS). 2007. *SSR Update*, Issue 1, May 1.

Kraft, Herman Joseph S. 2006. "11 September 2001 and Human Security." *OSS Digest*. 1st and 2nd Quarter, pp. 11-20.

Manasan, Rosario G., Eduardo Gonzalez, and Romualdo B. Gaffud. 1999. "Indicators of good governance: Developing an index of governance quality at the LGU level." Philippine Institute of Development Studies Discussion Paper Series No. 99-04. Makati City: Philippine Institute for Development Studies.

Nef, Jorge. 1999. *Human Security and Mutual Vulnerability*. 2nd ed. Ottawa: IDRC Books. Rojas Aravena, Francisco. 2001. "Human Security: Emerging Concept of Security in the Twenty-First Century." *Human Security, Conflict Prevention and Peace in Latin America and the Carribean*, edited by Moufida Goucha and Rojas Aravena. UNESCO and FLACSO-Chile, pp. 11-25.

Office of the Presidential Adviser on the Peace Process (OPPAP). 2007. "Conflict Sensitive and Peace Promoting Local Development Planning". Draft.

Owen, Taylor. 2002. "Body count: Rationale and methodologies for measuring human security." *Human Security Bulletin*. October, 1 (3).

Paris, Roland. 2001. "Human security: Paradigm shift or hot air?" *International Security*. 26 (2): 87-102.

Philippine Human Rights Information Center (PhilRights). 2002. *Economic, social and cultural rights: The grassroots' view: ESC rights standards and indicators setting project phase II*. Quezon City: Philippine Human Rights Information Center.

Santos, Soliman Jr. "Petition on the unconstitutionality of and the grave abuse of discretion in the approval of the "Human Security Act of 2007." 16 July 2007.

Talisayon, Serafin. N.d. "The framework of national security".

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 1994. "Redefining Security: The Human Dimension." In *Human Development Report 1994*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Table 1. Survey of Human Security Measurements (largely based on Owen 2002 unless otherwise indicated)

Proponent	Title	HS Definition	Dimension/s	Indicators	Methodology	Remarks
King and Murray (2001)	**Generalized Poverty Index**	"…human insecurity as a state of 'generalized poverty'…, [which] exists when a human being ranks below a predetermined **threshold** in any of a number **of domains of well-being**" (Owen 2002).	Income Health Education Political Freedom Democracy	GNP per capita converted to purchasing power parity Quality of health scale Literacy rate or average years of schooling Freedom House measure of societal freedom Fraction of adults able to participate in elections	1. Measuring the **Years of Individual Human Security (YIHS),** which indicates the number of years that an individual spends in a state of 'generalized poverty' using a scale of 0 to 1. 2. Measuring **Individual Human Security (IHS)**, representing the proportion of an individual's lifespan that s/he could expect to spend outside of a state of generalized poverty. 3. Aggregating the YIHS for a particular population to yield the **Population Years of Human Security (PYHS)**	"'Generalized poverty' does not necessarily equate with poverty in the traditionally understood sense" (Owen 2002).

Kanti Bajpai (2000)	**Human Security Audit**	"…human security is…the protection from **direct and indirect threats** to personal safety and well-being of the individual" (Owen 2002).
		
		"Human security relates to the protection of the individual's personal safety and freedom from direct and indirect threats of violence" (Bajpai 2000).
			<u>Direct Threats</u>
			  Local
			
			  Regional
			
			  National
			
			  International
			
			<u>Indirect Threats</u>
			  Societal Level
			
			  Global Level
				Violent crime, abuse of women/children
				
				Terrorism, genocide, government repression
				
				Societal violence, international war, banditry, ethnic violence
				
				Interstate wars, weapons of mass destruction, landmines
				
				Lack of basic needs, disease, employment levels, population growth or decline, natural disasters
				
				Population movement, environmental degradation, unequal
					1. Measuring the potential threat to the individual
					2. Measuring the capacity of the individual to cope with potential threats (capacities of government and individual)
						Problems (Owen 2002):
						1. Problems with data continuity and accuracy given the broad range of indicators.
						2. Much of the data required is either aggregated from sparse and questionable data sources.
						3. Judgments about potential threats vs. actual physical harm are necessarily conjectural and unlikely to command consensus.
						4. Weight assigned to threats and capacities would have to be entirely subjective.
						5. There are no assurances that capacities will be

27

Proponent	Title	HS Definition	Dimension/s	Indicators	Methodology	Remarks
				consumption		directly relevant to the threats posed. Uses of HSI (Bajpai 2000): 1. Enables the development of a social early warning system 2. Attention can be focused on problem areas 3. National and international priorities may be redefined 4. Enables the setting of national and international standards 5. Generation of new social scientific knowledge may be facilitated Main challenges to an HSI (Bajpai 2000): 1. Dual problem of validity and reliability 2. Problems of aggregation of various measures 3. The index represents an aggregate measure at the national level, which may not be representative of local realities 4. While it may be an "objective" measure, it is still limited by interpretations of social reality.
Global Environmental Change and Human Security Project	**Index of Human Insecurity (IHI)**	Human security is "achieved when individuals have the option, physically and politically, to end or adapt to threats to their environmental, social or human rights," placing	Social Environmental	Urban population growth Young male population Maternal mortality ratio Life expectancy Net energy imports Soil degradation	1. **Time-series and national-level data** of all indicators are collected 2. **Standardization of data** into a common scale, which is crucial to the validity of the final measurement	Positive: 1. The only index so far actualized using real data Concerns: 2. What is the difference between development and security as defined by

Proponent	Title	HS Definition	Dimension/s	Indicators	Methodology	Remarks
		focus on "a cumulative causal relationship between the environment and personal safety (Owen 2002).		Safe water Arable land	3. Computation through **cluster analysis**, assigning a degree of severity (insecurity) between 1 to 10 per indicator	GECHS? 3. What differentiates the IH from the HDI?
			Economic	Real GDP per capita GNP per capita growth Adult literacy rate Value of imports and exports of goods and services		
			Institutional	Public expenditures on defense vs. education Gross domestic fixed investment Degree of democratization Human Freedom Index		
Human Security Centre, Liu Institute for Global Issues, University of British Columbia	**Human Security Report**	Human security is achieved when individuals are protected from violent threats (*Human Security Report* 2005).	Physical	Deaths from armed conflicts Death from criminal violence	Aggregation of national and regional level data	Challenges (Owen 2002): 1. No data are collected on the absolute numbers of conflict deaths per year. 2. The data are subject to a variety of biases. 3. Criminal violence data are also subject to inaccuracies… and are often subject to political biases. 4. Difficulty in making an annual index as data is collected over a period of several years.
Center for Humanitarian Dialogue	**A Typology of Indicators of Human (In)security**	Human (in)security as a condition brought about by proliferation of small arms and their misuse.	Physical	Sample Indicators Children • Rates of combat-related death and injury of children • Rates of unintentional firearm and injury of children • Incidence of psychosocial and psychological trauma associated with armed violence	The document on the typology did not elaborate on how it envisions measuring human (in)security may be carried out.	These indicators are drawn the context of determining th impact on human security of gun violence as a result of small arms availability and misuse. The multiplicity of indicators imperative to provide multipl sources of data on impacts of small arms misuse, provide accurate measure in

29

Proponent	Title	HS Definition	Dimension/s	Indicators	Methodology	Remarks
				Public Health Impacts • Hospital expenditures on firearm injury-related treatment • Death rate related to firearms • Economic loss from firearm-related disability Gender • Weapons use in sexual crimes • Gun-related death and injury rate disaggregated by gender Impacts on Humanitarian Assistance • Mortality and injuries among humanitarian workers • Staff turnover • Perceptions of threat to personal security Opportunity costs of programmes • Programme implementation impeded • Investment • Costs for transport if routes are diverted, or air travel is safer Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons • Incidence of firearm-related death, injury and disability among IDPs • Numbers of refugees/IDPs • Child mortality rates among displaced and relocated populations		assessing intervention of humanitarian agencies, and capture a wide variety of stakeholders such as the humanitarian, development, human rights, and health sectors.

Proponent	Title	HS Definition	Dimension/s	Indicators	Methodology	Remarks
Human Security as Threat Assessment (Leaning and Arie 2000)	Measuring human security using threat analysis	**Psychosocial** 1. Home 2. Community 3. Positive sense of the future	**Negative indicators** 1. Social dislocation 2. Horizontal inequality 3. High discount rate[3]		This exercise is in the context of assessing the United States Agency for International Development's intervention through the human security lens.	
Taylor Owen		Human security is the protection of the vital core of all human lives from critical and pervasive threats. Individuals require protection from environmental, economic, food, health, personal, and political threats (2002, 2003, 2004).	Economic Environmental Food Health Personal Political	In 2002, Owen suggests the use of deaths as a unit of analysis. These include: o Mortality from disease o Mortality from disasters o Mortality from armed conflict Mortality from criminal violence Threats identified by experts as affecting a local area (based on the definition that limits threats to those affecting the vital core of human lives and those that are pervasive and critical).	1. Identifying threats based on threshold of severity 2. Data collection at the local level 3. Spatial analysis and developing models to enable correlation	The use of spatial analysis in measuring human security is given emphasis in this proposed methodology.

Sources:

Cabilo, Zuraida Mae D. and Mara Yasmin S.P. Baviera. 2007. "Defining and Debating Human Security: A Review of Literature." Draft.

Owen, Taylor. 2002. "Body count: Rationale and methodologies for measuring human security." *Human Security Bulletin*. October, 1 (3).

---

[3] A discount rate is the value you place to a future possession.

Table 2. Existing Indicators used in Development Planning and Project Impact Assessment

	What it seeks to measure	Dimensions	Indicators	Methodology	Other comments
Human Security Indicators (Mindanao Economic Development Council)	State of human security in the context of armed conflict	1. Economic 2. Food 3. Health 4. Environment 5. Community 6. Personal 7. Political	**Economic**: Income, unemployment rate, access to electricity, homelessness **Food**: Food production per capita, daily per capita calorie supply **Health**: Disparities in access to health services, maternal mortality, nutrition, water supply **Environmental**: Deforestation **Community**: Education (primary, secondary, tertiary, vocational) **Personal**: Ethnic tension and violent crime **Political**: Human rights, state repression, political insecurity All of these indicators have proxy indicators derived from the LGPMS for socioeconomic indicators and the Coordinating Committee on Cessation of Hostilities.		

Security Sector Reform Index (ISDS)	Performance of security sector's mandate	1. Democratic principles of governance 2. Extent of powers, knowledge, or awareness, and capacity of oversight institutions 3. Performance record of oversight institutions and core security sector actors 4. Security sector reform programs; 5. Contribution to conflict prevention and peace building			
Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ESCR) Indicators (PhilRights 2002)	The extent by which ESCR, as defined by grassroots stakeholders, are addressed by government.	1. Right to health 2. Right to food 3. Right to housing 4. Right to work 5. Right to education	Right to health: 25 indicators Right to food: 25 indicators Right to housing: 53 indicators Right to work: 25 indicators Right to education: 35 indicators	Indicators are not assigned any weights. As a monitoring tool, it basically deals with the presence or absence of goods, services, or structures to address people's ESCR.	"Standards" and "indicators" are used interchangeably. Majority of the "indicators" generated from the grassroots are actually minimum standards to address the ESCR.
Capability Poverty Measure (UNDP 1996 cited in Manasan, Gonzalez, and Gaffud 1999)	Measures the "people's lack of capabilities."	1. Living a healthy, well-nourished life 2. Having the capability of safe and healthy reproduction 3. Being literate and knowledgeable	1. Percentage of children under 5 who are underweight 2. Percentage of births unattended by trained health personnel 3. Percentage of women aged 15 years and above who are illiterate	"The three variables…are given equal weight in the composite index…If flexibility in weights is desired, it has been suggested tat respondents to surveys be asked to assign weights to each capability by allocating a fixed total."	

33

			Survival:		Developed by the
Minimum Basic Needs (MBN) Approach	The MBN Approach is "a strategy of prioritizing primary requirements to ensure that the *basic needs for survival, security from physical harm*, and *enabling needs of the individual, family and community* are attended to."	1. **Survival** (food, nutrition, health, clothing needs) 2. **Security** (shelter, peace and order, public safety, and income and livelihood) 3. **Enabling needs** (basic education and literacy, people's participation in CD, family care, and psychosocial care)	1. Infant mortality rate 2. Child mortality rate 3. Prevalence of moderate and severe underweight 4. Prevalence of acute and chronic malnutrition 5. Prevalence of micronutrient deficiencies **Security** 1. With owned/owner-like possession of housing units 2. With housing unit (roof and outer walls) made of strong materials 3. With family head who is gainfully employed 4. With at least a family member 18 years old and over who is gainfully employed **Enabling Needs** 1. With Children 6-12 years old who are in elementary school 2. With Children 13-16 years old who are in high school 3. With working children 5-17 years old 4. With at least one family member involved in people's organization, non-government organization and/or cooperative		Developed by the Department of Social Work and Development, National Statistics Office, and the National Economic Development Authority

Quality of Life Index ([QLI] Action for Economic Reforms)	It purposes to be an "alternative measure of poverty and human capability" at the provincial level.	1. Capability to be well-nourished 2. Capability for healthy reproduction 3. Capability to be educated and knowledgeable	Component indicators 1. Under-five nutrition (Nutrition Index) 2. Attended births 3. Elementary cohort survival rate (Education Index)	Both the nutrition and education data are actual recorded values and currently available from the existing Philippine Statistical System. These values are then used as 1/3 of the QLI. The attended births indicator, on the other hand, is derived from the data on deliveries recorded by the Department of Health. The simple average of the three composite indices is then computed to obtain the QLI.	
Governance for Local Development (GOFORDEV) Index[4]	"…objective measure of how well local development needs are met and provided for and the level of people's participation and consultation in local public affairs." (www.tag.org.ph)	Participation/Consultation Public services provision Public service needs	The index is composed of three sub-indices: 1. **Development Needs Index** to measure the provision of basic social services based on assessment of LG's constituency. It consists of five component indicators. 2. **Development Orientation Index** to measure "local government's actual performance" in prioritizing the delivery of basic social services based on local government expenditures. It has only one indicator. 3. **Participatory Development Index**, which "measures the degree of people's direct participation in decision-making process…" as well as "the degree of public consultations" (Capuno 2000).		Municipality as the unit of analysis

---

[4] See Capuno (2000) for more detailed discussion of the GOFORDEV Index.

Other governance indicators		Indicators include those relating to socioeconomic development particularly on delivery of social services, transparency and accountability, and participation. These indicators		

Source:

Cabilo, Zuraida Mae D. and Mara Yasmin S.P. Baviera. 2007. "Defining and Debating Human Security: A Review of Literature." Draft.

Figure 1. Human Security Framework

CSOs
(academe, NGOs, POs, vigilant citizenry)

transnational actors

transnational actors

transnational actors

Critical, Pervasive and Urgent Threats:
Physical, Psychosocial
Economic, Ecological
Cultural, Political

Focusing on:
Sense of belongingness in the community, land ownership, development rights, peace, natural disasters

State
(national government – executive and legislative,

Business
(conscientious business groups)