

SECURITY AND MINORITIES: BUILDING A HUMAN SECURITY INDEX FOR MINORITY ISSUES

Andrea Carlà¹

Eurac Research, Institute for Minority Rights, Italy

Abstract: Security has become a recurring theme when addressing minority issues. Though minorities are often perceived as raising security concerns, the fundamental task is to ask 'security for whom?' and reflect on what in society really needs to be secured. Addressing this question, this paper analyses minority issues in terms of 'human security', putting people at the heart of security practices. Human security regards the need to guarantee the well-being of individuals, providing 'freedom from fear,' 'freedom from want' and 'human dignity,' and responding to people's needs in dealing with sources of domestic and global threats. I argue that a human security approach provides several insights to better deal with minority concerns, adding to the traditional goal of recognizing civil, political and cultural rights, a more comprehensive, holistic understanding of the needs and challenges faced by members of minorities. It addresses minority rights and protection in the full context of their lives, broadening the arenas of action in which one can (and should) intervene. However, human security is a vague term that is not clearly operationalized. In this light, the paper aims at developing an innovative human security index that applies specifically to cultural diversity issues and majority-minority relations and allows to measure the degree of human security provided to minorities.

Keywords: human security; minorities; index; minority rights and protection

Introduction

Since it was presented in the 1994 UNDP Human Development Report, the concept of human security has received several attentions, being applied to a variety of themes, such as violent conflicts, migration, health, and digital technologies. Human security focuses on the need to guarantee the well-being of individuals, as summarized in the slogan 'freedom from fear,' 'freedom from want' and 'human dignity.' Though with different understanding, various countries have mainstreamed it in their foreign policy agenda and several international institutions have embraced a human security paradigm. Meanwhile, today security has become a "core value" of modern society (Daase, 2010). In the past decades, it has evolved in a key concept affecting the political agenda and shaping government actions in several policy areas, including accommodation of diversity and migration and minority issues. In this regard, attention is often given to the way minorities are perceived as linked to state's security and as raising security concerns.

Combining these two trends, this contribution examines minority issues from a 'human security' perspective. My starting point is that rather than seen minorities as bringing

¹ Contact address: andrea.carla@eurac.edu

insecurities, it is necessary to reflect on who and what in society really needs to be secured; namely, the key question is 'whose security?' (Cui and Li, 2011: 145). Answering this question, the concept of human security put people, with their identity, culture and well-being, at the heart of security practices, making it the core referent object, namely what needs to be protected.

As I have argued elsewhere, a human security perspective improves our understanding of how to deal with minorities' issues and govern their diversity, "adding to the traditional goal of recognizing civil, political and cultural rights, a more comprehensive, holistic understanding of the needs and challenges faced by members of minorities" (Carlà, 2022: 270). It addresses minorities' rights and protection in the full context of their lives, broadening the arenas of action in which one can (and should) intervene. However, human security is a vague term that is not clearly operationalized. In this light, my main goal in this paper is to develop an innovative human security index that applies specifically to cultural diversity issues and majority-minority relations and allows to measure the degree of human security provided to minorities.

Social indexes and their indicators are defined as a "direct and valid statistical measure which monitors levels and changes over time in a fundamental social concern" (cit. in Triandafyllidou and the ACCEPT PLURALISM Project, 2013: 5). In the last decades, social indexes have gained importance and many indexes were developed. Indeed, indexes present various advantages since they summarize complex issues in simpler way, they represent a starting point for public debate, and they are easy to update (Triandafyllidou and the ACCEPT PLURALISM Project, 2013: 7). Through their indicators it is possible to describe and clarify social outcomes, evaluate the result of policies, monitor progress and exchange information more effectively. Indexes facilitate research and analysis and are useful tools to adjust and plan policies and acquire new perspectives, helping policy makers to decide on, communicate and evaluate their actions and to set their targets (Huddleston, Niessen and Dag Tjaden, 2013). Along these lines, I stress the importance of developing a Human Security Index for Minorities in order to mainstream a human security perspective in the protection of minorities.

The following pages are organized as follow: after introducing the concept of human security, I present some examples of how it has been so far applied to the field of minority studies and discuss the added value of using a human security perspective in addressing minority issues and thinking about minority protection. Next, I argue for the need of a Human Security Index for Minorities and explore existing indexes on human security or dealing with minority issues. Finally, I set some thoughts for the development of a Human Security Index for Minorities, providing a draft of such an index.

Human security and minorities²

After the end of the Cold War, there emerge the need to expand a traditional understanding of security, which had so far focused on the state as referent object (i.e., what needs to be protected) and its territorial integrity and sovereignty. In 1994, the UN Development Program elaborated the notion of "human security," which focuses on the individual as its referent object and aim at protecting its wellbeing and freedom. Human security "means, first, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression.

² This section builds on Carlà, 2022.

And second, it means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the pattern of daily life" (UNDP, 1994: 23). Since 1994 the concept further developed through several theoretical contributions and institutional efforts. In 2012, the UN General Assembly elaborated a common understanding of human security as "the right of people to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair. All individuals, in particular those facing vulnerability, are entitled to freedom from fear and freedom from want with an equal opportunity to enjoy all their rights and fully develop their human potential" (UN, 2012).

As pointed out by Gomez, Gasper and Mine (2016: 113) human security is "a people-centred, comprehensive, context-specific and prevention-oriented approach". Critically, human security combines the need to protect from a broad range of threats with the goal of empowering people and communities, enabling them to make informed choices and fend for themselves, by for example providing education and information and encouraging local leadership (Commission on Human security, 2003; Human Security Unit, n.d.). Moreover, human security complements the concept of human rights, by helping to clarify the rights and needs at stake in specific contexts and empowering right-holders (Commission on Human security, 2003; Human Security Unit, n.d.; Gilder, 2021). It also strengthens human development, bringing attention on downturns and downside risks (Commission on Human security, 2003; Gomez, Gasper and Mine, 2016).

In the original UNDP formulation, the concept of human security foresaw seven main categories, though later theorizations of the concept point out how these different aspects are not exhaustive and are interconnected (Commission on Human security, 2003; Gasper and Gomez, 2015; Gomez, Des Gasper and Mine, 2016). However, the original categories continue at times to be used and they are: economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political (UNDP, 1994: 25).

Various scholars, as well international organizations, have used the concept of human security vis-à-vis issues surrounding minorities, especially vulnerable groups, like migrants and indigenous communities. For example, international migration has been considered among main human security challenges and connected to development problems. From a human security perspective migration "should be looked at comprehensively, taking into account the political, civil, security, economic and social dimensions affecting people's decision to move," rather than focusing on restrictive policies, and it is a vital tool to protect and provide security and empower people (Commission on Human security, 2003: 45). Furthermore, human security provides an "holistic anthropological orientation" to issues of migrant integration that goes "beyond the notion of migrant integration as purely meaning migrants fitting into pre-existing societal structures," and stresses structural barriers and discrimination (Gasper and Sinatti, 2016: 2, 4, 14). Similarly, scholars point out how a human security approach provides new insights to understand challenges and vulnerabilities faced by indigenous people, like process of modernization and demographic pressure, and foster inclusion of indigenous voices and policies tailored to indigenous needs (Hossain and Petreței, 2016). Along these lines, human security perspective can broaden the concept of hate speech against minorities, like Kurds in Turkey, and ethnic violence and terrorism (Onbaşı, 2015; Clarke, 2008).

Particularly relevant for minority issues is the human security category of community security, which regards protection from discrimination, unfair practices, and "against the breakdown of communities, as a result of loss of traditional relationships and values, and

from sectarian and ethnic violence" (Caballero-Anthony, 2015: 55). The UNDP (2009) has enlarged the notion of community security, combining it with the pursue of social cohesion and inclusion, tolerance, respect for diversity, and common feeling of belonging. In this context, Caballero-Anthony (2015) has analysed the failure in obtaining community security for Muslim minorities in the Philippines and the Rohingya in Myanmar.

It should be noted that community security overlaps with the idea of societal security and cultural security. The former is used in regard to identities of groups (rather than individuals) to refer to "sustainability, within acceptable conditions for evolution, of traditional patterns of language, culture and religious and national identity and custom" (Buzan, 1991: 19). Societal security provides a meaningful analytical tool to explain ethnic violence and tensions (Roe, 2004). As developed by Jalal (2015: 13) cultural security refers to "the freedom to re-negotiate both individual and collective identities," combining the individual and group dimensions of analysis. Various measures have been identified to tackle community/societal/cultural security threats, such as human and minority rights, power-sharing, or other confidence-building measures, access to citizenship and criminal prosecution of perpetrators of ethnic violence (See e.g.: Roe, 2005; UNDP, 1994; Commission on Human Security, 2003).

This brief excursus show how human security provides relevant insights to better understand minority issues, since it focuses on the whole of people's life (Des Gasper and Sinatti, 2016). It provides a more comprehensive perspective on challenges addressed by minorities and their needs and, in this way, broadens "the arenas of actions in which it is necessary to intervene", identifying a range of insecurities that might not be covered by minority rights and promoting ownership and potential to enjoy rights (Carlà, 2022: 278). Furthermore, a human security lens includes the need to empower minorities, which minority regulations often miss (Nancheva, 2017: 17). Finally, from a human security framework the idea of common shared security is promoted, i.e., the security of one part (the majority) is unlikely on the basis of insecurities of the other parties (minorities), breaking in this way the contraposition between the state/majority and minorities (Carlà, 2022).

Thus, a human security perspective offers a more complex picture of the minority landscape than that usually offered by scholarships on minority protection and migrant integration which tend to focus on individual and group rights, access to core institutions, and social relations (Marko, 2019; Heckmann and Schnapper, 2009). Similarly, a human security perspective goes beyond the specific goals of ending violence, political stability, justice, and overcoming ethnic divisions pursued by scholars working on institutional design for divided societies (Taylor, 2009; McCulloch and McGarry, 2017).

Towards a Human Security Index for Minorities: insights from existing indexes

If addressing minority protection from a human security perspective provides several advantages, human security, however, remains a vague term that is not clearly operationalized and thus difficult to apply. Indeed, because of its use in the international arena, where some countries have institutionalized it in their foreign policy, it has become "a divisive term with various interpretations" (Nagy, 2013: 76). Indeed, some countries like Canada and Scandinavian countries have adopted a narrower approach which focuses on the "freedom from fear" dimension and military and police aspects of crime and physical violence, stressing the protection from harmful disruption of everyday life as well as the possibility of

the collective use of force by the international community to provide human security. In this regard, it is seen as a tool of the West to impose its human right agenda and liberal policies, replicating hegemonic relations and form of dominance (Aradau, 2015). Instead, many non-Western countries, in particular in Asia, like Japan, adopt a more comprehensive perspective and focus on the "freedom from want" dimension, e.g., chronic threats to human well-being, such as hunger and diseases and development issues. China developed an understanding of human security that focuses on the collective humankind rather than the individual human being and sees the state as guarantor of human security (see Breslin, 2015). Along these lines, the USA are criticized for reflecting in their foreign policy a negative human security approach that is state-centric (Menon, 2007).

Thus, there is not an established understanding of human security, which range from minimalist definitions to broader understandings that include several aspects (Menon, 2007). The concept is seen as poorly defined and as suffering for conceptual integrity (Liotta and Owen, 2006). In particular, its broadener understanding, though more appealing, is seen as too expansive, vague, and all-embracing, and thus difficult to measure, not helpful in policy development, and leading to analytical confusion (Owen, 2008; Gasper, 2014). At times it has been considered an inconsistent slogan (King and Christopher J. L. Murray, 2001-02).

Regardless of these issues, I argue for the possibility to operationalize the concept of human security in order to use it in practice as a tool to analyse the security of minorities and their members. In particular, I suggest the development of a Human Security Index for Minorities that could be applied specifically to minority issues. I am aware that measuring social phenomena and elaborating indexes is a difficult task. Indeed, the definition and choice of indexes and their indicators are context specific and based on subjective value judgement of what is considered good for the society. Thus, the use of indexes is "always open to question and criticism" (Triandafyllidou and the ACCEPT PLURALISM Project, 2013: 6).

In particular, it is especially problematic to measure human security and develop criteria that allow judging the level of individual security. Indeed, some have argued that the lack of agreement on the concept makes impossible to develop an index (see Hastings, 2013). On a more practical level, as pointed out by Homolar (2015), it is hard to unpack the concept of human security into clear indicators. Owen (2008) has raised problems of data availability, certainty, integrity and aggregation and contradictions between subjective and objective measurements. According to Hastings (2011; 2013) data might contain intentional or unwitting bias and it is difficult to develop data that are comparable among countries.

However, measuring human security, in general, and for minorities in particular, is paramount. Indeed, as said by Lord Kelvin, "if you cannot measure it, you cannot improve it" (cit. in Hastings, 2013: 67). Building on Owen, I argue that an index can help assess the situations, wellbeing and vulnerabilities of minority communities and their members, revealing unknown insecurities, areas of neglect, gaps in services and resources and between legal and policy instruments and reality on the ground. Furthermore, it provides accessible information and evidence of causalities among multiple insecurities and trends useful for policymaking, strategizing actions, defining priorities, setting standards and developing warning systems. Finally, it fosters political debate and public awareness about minority needs, generating knowledge and encouraging further research (Owen, 2008; see also Human Security Unit, n.d.).

There exist several indexes that could provide relevant insights for developing a Human Security Index for Minorities. First of all, there are various indexes that referring to various dimensions of human security, can be used as performance metric of human security (Homolar, 2015). These are: the Fragile State Index, the Freedom in the World and especially the Human Development Index. The first index assesses state capacity, including level of democracy, quality of healthcare provision, degree of political participation, and, of particular relevance, the ability of state to provide for its population, concerning food and health security. Freedom in the World register the de facto status of political and civil liberties, though it presents several methodological problems. The Human Development Index addresses various dimensions of human security by developing along three lines: long and healthy life, access to knowledge and decent standard of living; though it does not address cultural differences. However, Homolar (2015) points out that these three indexes foster a narrow understanding of human security and reinforce state' role in providing security.

Moreover, various indexes have been developed to measure human security in general, though a comprehensive index to assess how the notion of human security has been translated in concrete actions is missing. Such indexes differentiate because they use different conceptions of human security and thereby emphasize distinct aspects. For example, using a narrow conception of human security, the Human Security Report focuses on freedom from violence looking at deaths caused by state-based and non-state armed conflicts and political violence (Minitlas of Human Security, n.d.).³ Owen (2002) has proposed a broader index that will include data on deaths from diseases and natural disasters. The Human Security Audit developed by Kanti Bajpai considers instead data on the growth and decline of potential threats, from violent crime to diseases and natural disasters as well as the estimated capacity of individual and governments to deal with them, through for example specific existing policies (see Menon, 2007). Reflecting a more comprehensive understanding of human security, in their index, King and Murray focuses on developmental aspects, referring to the numbers of years of life in the future that could be spent outside a state of generalized poverty, which occurs when a person falls below a specific threshold in key domains of well-being (King and Murray, 2001-02).⁴ These domains are defined as those aspects that are important enough for individuals to fight over or put their lives or property at risks, and include income, health, education, political freedom and democracy. Focusing on environmental issues, the Index of Human Security of the Global Environmental Change and Security Project, looks at environmental and social conditions in four domains (social, environmental, economic and institutional), such as arable land and real GDP per capita. However, as pointed out by Owen (2008) in this index it is difficult to distinguish between development and security issues. A specific index has been developed for South Asia, which focuses on two main dimensions (economic development and military security) and consider various forms of deprivation (socio-economic, politico-cultural, health and environmental) and safety from violence and conflict (see Bhardwaj, 2013).

Particularly relevant is the work of Hastings, who defines human security as "the attainment of physical, mental, and spiritual peace/security of individuals and communities"

³ It also considers data on human rights abuses, looking for example at score on the Political Terror Scale, number of refugees and internally displaced persons and the World Bank Political Stability Index.

⁴ Their index includes three measurements: "Years of Individual Human Security"; "Individual Human security," and "The Population Years of Human Security."

in local and global context (Hastings, 2011). His Human Security Index has three components and includes an Economic Fabric, which considers financial resources, including protection from financial catastrophe; Environmental Fabric Index, which considers risks of environmental disasters, environmentally healthy living conditions, and environmental sustainability and governance; and a Social Fabric index, which combines education, information empowerment, food security, governance, health, peacefulness and, relevant from a minority perspective, diversity. However, as recognized by the author the theme of diversity is lacking and there are not many data on human security issues from ethnic, religious and other such perspectives (Hastings, 2013). Furthermore, according to Homolar (2015), Hasting's index contains conceptual and methodological problems. Finally, the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security has developed a Human Security Needs, Vulnerabilities and Capacity Matrix, to map and identify threats to communities, and a Human Security Impact Assessment, to analyse programs dealing with human insecurities, referring to the original seven categories of human security: economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political (Human Security Unit, n.d.).

Despite their limits, these indexes provide various useful hints and guidelines to develop a Human security Index for Minorities. Moreover, I have so far brought works on human security and human security indexes in the field of minority studies. However, minority scholars and practitioners have long discussed, studied and developed several indexes and indicators to assess measures and policies towards different types of minorities and levels of protection, integration and/or social cohesion provided to them and their members in various countries. Looking at these indexes provides further insights and perspectives useful to develop a Human Security Index for Minorities. Indeed, they aim at capturing and measuring several aspects that intersect with human security concerns of minorities, like the provision of various political, socio and cultural rights, issues of discrimination and social inclusion. Among the indexes I considered the most (though several more exist), there are: the Multiculturalism Policy Index, the Accept Pluralism Tolerance Indicators, the UK Home Office Indicators of Integration Framework, the MIPEX - Migrant Integration Policy Index, the EU Indicators of Immigrant Integration (Zaragoza+ Indicators), the Social Cohesion Radar, the Indicators for Assessing the Impact of the FCNM in its State Parties.⁵

Most of these indexes focus on issues regarding issues of minority integration. However, they vary notably, addressing different aspects and different groups of minorities and having different mission and goals. Some indexes focus on policies, legislation and practices, whereas others consider their outcomes and the state of the society vis-à-vis minorities. Some indexes aim at comparing countries' performance in regards to integration, tolerance and social cohesion; some foster debates and identify trends in selected countries; and others are designed to assess the implementation of international standards for minority protection (Eurac Research, Åland Islands Peace Institute and University of Heidelberg, 2020). In some cases, indicators regard only recent migrant minorities, in other cases they include national minorities and long-standing communities. Furthermore, it should be noted that quantitative type of data prevails in these indexes and not all the indexes have been applied to provide data across countries and/or time.

⁵ For an overview of these, and other indexes see Eurac Research, Åland Islands Peace Institute and University of Heidelberg, 2020.

For example, the MIPEX, which is one of the most cited index on integration, provides a picture to evaluate and compare governments' actions to promote civic and social integration of migrants (Solano and Huddleston, 2020). It uses a point system to measure policies and legislation in various policy areas (i.e., labour market mobility, family reunion, education, political participation, permanent residence, access to nationality, anti-discrimination and health), like migrants' access to public sector, citizenship practices, and teacher training to reflect diversity. Instead, the Multiculturalism Policy Index foresees three sets of indicators to monitor the development of multicultural policies for migrants, national minorities and indigenous people in Western democracies (Queen's University, n.d.). It looks at the adoption of policies such as the recognition of self-government rights, official language status and affirmative action. The policies are evaluated with a scoring system (yes, partially, no) based on a variety of sources, such as policy document, legislation, and academic research.

The Accept Pluralism Tolerance Indicators foresee a set of qualitative indicators to assess the overall level of intolerance/tolerance/acceptance of diversity of minority and migrant groups in a country (see Triandafyllidou and the ACCEPT PLURALISM Project, 2013). It addresses policies and legislations as well as social practices, focusing on the two areas of education and school life, and politics and public life. The presence or absence of specific features in a country's policies and practices (such as minority dress code for teachers, racist violence in public life, the existence of legislation that punishes racist discourse, and provisions for minority candidates at the party level) are translated into assessment of Low, Medium and High. The index is a tool for monitoring and self-assessment as well for policy development. The Indicators for Assessing the Impact of the FCNM in its State Parties aim at measuring countries' performance considering both legislative and policy developments, the field of judiciary and governments' practices and discourses, and foreseeing the use of official and non-official sources, such as expert judgements, public media and reports (Malloy et al., 2009).

Switching the focus from laws and policies to the state of the society and status and conditions of minorities, the Zaragoza+ Indicators use mainly quantitative data to measure and show similarities and differences among countries regarding migrants' social integration outcome in four areas (employment, education, social inclusion, active citizenship and welcoming society). Among its indicators are: employment rate, highest educational attainment, income and overcrowding. In regard to the welcoming society area, it has been proposed to include in the indicators subjective measurements to capture discrimination and people's attitudes, such as public perception of ethnic discrimination and attitude towards political leaders with ethnic minority background. It should be noted that the Zaragoza+ Indicators are based on international data sources, considered more reliable and comparable since they do not present differences in data collection method and definitions (see Huddleston, Niessen and Dag Tjaden, 2013). Like the Zaragoza+ Indicators, but designed specifically for the UK, the UK Home Office Indicators of Integration Framework, address in a holistic way various aspects of integration, focusing on newcomers. It provides to policy makers and officers and practitioners a guidance and tools to monitor, evaluate and identify key integration measures and inform the planning of integration actions (Ndofo-Tah et al., 2019). The indicators are structured around 14 domains organized in four headings: markers and means (work, housing, education, health and social care, leisure), social connections (social bonds, social bridges and social links/connections with institutions), facilitators

(language and communication, culture, digital skills, safety, stability), and foundation (rights and responsibilities). In each domain, in addition to various quantitative output indicators that measure changes in people's life, the UK Home Office Indicators of Integration Framework presents as well good practices and appropriate policies and identifies specific datasets. Among its indicators there are: percentage of people employed at a level appropriate to skills; perceptions of barriers to employment opportunities; mortality rate from causes considered preventable; implementation of laws protecting against hate crime; percentage of people reporting having friends from different background, trust in the police, feeling fearful, hate crimes, or experiences of racial, cultural harassment.

Finally, the Social Cohesion Radar addresses a more specific aspect related to minority issues, focusing on the state of social cohesion among different groups of people and showing how it changes. Using quantitative data collected in international surveys for other research purpose, it measures social cohesion along three domains, identifying in each three dimensions of analysis: social relations (social networks, trust in people, acceptance of diversity), connectedness (identification, trust in institutions and perception of fairness), and focus on the common good (solidarity and helpfulness, respect for social rules and civic participation) (see Dragolov et al., 2013). For each dimension scores are calculated, which are then combined into a single score of an overall index of cohesion.

All the indexes presented so far capture various aspects that are relevant for measuring the level of human security vis-à-vis minorities. Thus, they can serve as the basis for the development of a Human Security Index for Minorities.

The Human Security Index for Minorities: a draft

Building on the works presented in the previous section, I now discuss some thoughts for the development of a Human security Index for Minorities and present a draft of such an index. First of all, it should be clarified that building an index means to first disaggregate a concept in distinct categories, selecting a set of domains in which it unfolds; second, for each domain construct indicators and, third, identify universal standards and threshold values (King and Murray, 2001-02). Indicators act as a proxy for the domain and, as pointed out by Anthony Atkinson (cit. in Dragolov et al., 2013: 9), they should identify the essence of problems and be robust, comparable across countries, prone to revision, and responsive to policy changes. In such endeavour, many existing indexes are constructed with a bottom-up approach, based on the type of data that are available. Instead, following Hasting (2011), I aim at balancing "top-down conceptualizing and bottom-up collection of ideas, data and formulation approaches."

Second, it is necessary a clear definition of what we mean with human security for minorities in order to clarify what are the actual risks and what to measure. In my understanding, the concept *addresses the minority status of individuals, guaranteeing their material and immaterial wellbeing, development and rights in light of their ethno-cultural features, and protecting them by and empower them towards chronic threats and sudden disruption in the patterns of their daily life*. I adopt a broad understanding of human security, because I believe that it is its comprehensiveness the added value of the concept, and a narrower definition, which for example focuses only on "the freedom from fear" dimension, might defeat its advantages. Thus, my understanding of human security for minorities includes the three

main slogans of human security (freedom from want, fear and to live in dignity) and regards security, developmental and right issues.

With the term minorities, I refer to both old and new minorities. The term “old minorities” refers to “communities whose members have a language, culture and/or religion distinct from that of the rest of the population, and who became minorities as a consequence of a re-drawing of international borders in which their area changed from the sovereignty of one country to another or who for various reasons did not achieve statehood of their own but came to be part of a larger country or several countries.” The term “new minorities” refers to “groups formed by the decision of individuals and families to leave their original homeland and emigrate to another country, generally for economic and sometimes also for political reasons,” including thus “migrants and refugees and their descendants who live, on a more than transitional basis, in a country different from that of their origin” (Medda-Windischer and Carlà, 2015). The index will thus collect and combine information on both types of minorities.

Third, it should be clarified what type of data will be collected by the index. Following Owen, the data will be both quantitative and qualitative in nature with a spatial dimension. Regarding the specific content, the data and indicators have three main features: 1) they should reflect both the protection and empowerment dimension of human security; 2) they aim at capturing both level of human security of minority members as well as gaps they suffer in comparison to the majority; 3) they present both output variables, namely where minority members stand, and input variables, e.g., information of specific laws, policies, measures and political practices and discourses. Output variable indicators include statistics, which allow to make concise judgements as well as perceptions and attitudes by majority and minorities. As in the Accept Pluralism Tolerance Indicators, input variables could be expressed in the form of Low, Medium and High scores: Low indicates that relevant legislation/policies/measures/government practices and discourses are missing; Medium means that legislation/policies/measures/political practices and discourses exist but are not comprehensive and present significant flaws; High regards the presence of comprehensive legislation/policies/measures/political practices and discourses.

Space, rather than a specific minority, is used as the common denominator for the data, i.e., the data are not collected directly by single minorities, but in regards to a specific geographical area. This choice reflects the need to avoid as much as possible incapsulating people in a specific group and deal with the question of who belongs to a minority, respecting individuals’ right to choose their identities and express multiple sets of belonging. This does not exclude that within each area it is then possible to point out differences in the data concerning different minorities.

Concerning the spatial dimension, many indexes tend to collect data at the national level. However, there are some examples and attempts to collect data at the subnational level, which provides more meaningful representations and allow to capture specificities of regional context (Owen, 2003; Hastings, 2011). In this regard, it should be noted that within a country there might be differences in ways a minority is treated. For example, in Italy, the Ladin-speaking minority of the province of South Tyrol enjoys a much higher system of cultural rights and minority protection than those Ladins that reside in other Italian regions. Similarly, Muslims who live in the contested area of the erstwhile Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir might experience a different degree of human security from Muslims that live in

other parts of India. Along these lines the index should be applied to specific sub-national areas where minority members live.

I build on the original seven categories of human security (economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political) to identify the domains in which desegregate and measure the concept of human security. Such categories provide useful guidelines, though they are not exhaustive not exclusive and the various human security issues are strongly interconnected. Moreover, I am aware that other domains could be identified and used to organize and present the data; thereby I do not exclude that they might be modify in the future. The categories thereby should not be considered as limiting the dimensions of security, but as simply indicating the domains in which security issues could unfold and interact. In this regard, the index aims specifically at capturing how human security issues of the community security category intersects with the others. Thus, each domain and their indicators are redefined in light of this intersection:

- Community security is relabelled as cultural security and refers to freedom of cultural identities and cultural dignity and intercommunity peace, protecting and empowering in regards to identity based discrimination, oppressive practices, and tensions. It combines the recognition and acceptance of cultural diversity with the importance given to good majority-minority relations and issues of social cohesion.
- Economic security means freedom from poverty and assured equal access to basic income and resources for members of minorities through employment, education or social safety nets in light of culturally-driven economic practices in order to provide growth and capacities to deal with economic downturns.
- Environmental security means safety for minority members from natural disasters, environmental degradation, and resources depletion and minority involvement and empowerment vis-à-vis environmental concerns.
- Food security is expanded to include people's basic need for shelter. Relabelled food and home security, it regards freedom from hunger, famine and housing instability and equal physical and economic access to basic food and accommodation for members of minorities though assets, employment or income in light of their cultural life-style and economic systems.
- Health security means physical, mental and social well-being and freedom from curable diseases and illness via equal access to healthcare and health services and regimes.
- Personal security refers to physical, mental, and social safety of minority members from identity-based violence, abuses, and crime.
- Political security address insecurities in the sphere of politics and refers to freedom from political or state repression and abuses and equal access to political decision-making processes and political engagement for minorities and their members and political perspectives.

These domains form the building block of the concept of Human Security for Minorities. Though it is possible to make comparison across geographical areas based on

results in one domain, data from one domain alone do not provide a comprehensive picture of human security, which requires relying on all the domains. For each of these domains specific indicators to measure the related level of security are identified. The indicators were chosen based on the existing indexes on human security and on minority integration and protection analysed before. I analysed all their indicators and select those that were more plausible to capture human security concerns and related existing obstacle and dynamics between and within majority/minority groups. For each domain and type of variable (output and input) I followed the general rule to limit the number of indicators to no more than 11 in order to have a compact and concise set that is easily manageable (Dragolov et al., 2013: 22; Eurac Research, Åland Islands Peace Institute and University of Heidelberg, 2020). In case of similar indicators, I opted for the indicator that appear easier to be measured across different context. The following Table 1 present the provisional list of indicators.

Table 1: Human Security Index for Minorities: domains and indicators

Domain	Output indicator	Input indicator (Low/Medium/High)
Cultural security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minority population growth rate - Use of minority language growth rate - % of people who will welcome people from different background in their neighbourhood - % of people reporting having friends from different background - % of people reporting identity-based discrimination - % majority/minority trust in people - % of people reporting area is good place for minorities - % of people reporting sense of belonging to area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Arrangements to provide and guarantee citizenship and/or legal status - Institutional recognition of minorities and diversity - Use of minority language in public spaces - Presence of minority culture in public space - Education in minority language - Integration minority culture in school curricula and school life - Anti-discrimination arrangements - Arrangements fostering majority/minority identification as individual choice - absence of arrangements requiring membership/group identification - Arrangements to promote social cohesion in diversity - Political discourses to promote diversity and cohesion

<p>Economic security</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Majority/minorities income - % majority/minorities employment at level appropriate to skills - % majority/minorities employment across diverse economic sectors - % enterprise activities owned by minorities - % majority/minority public employment - % of people reporting economic discrimination/discrimination in the labour market - Majority/minorities literacy rate/years of schooling - % majority/minorities completing vocational training - % of people reporting sense of equity in access social services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inclusion of minority cultural practices in economic policies - Arrangements for minority business - Measures to tackle discrimination in the labour market - Affirmative action in public employment - Measures to support minority education and training - Equal access to social and welfare services - Training health and social workers on needs of minorities
<p>Environmental security</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Air pollution in minority areas - Majority/minority access to clean water - Lost of biodiversity in minority areas - Soil degradation in minority areas - % of majority/minority affected by natural disasters - Recycling rate in minority areas - Sewage treatment rate in minority areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Measures to engage minority members with environmental issues - Consultative bodies on environmental issues involving minority members - Equal access to early warning and response mechanisms for environmental hazards
<p>Food and home security</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % majority/minority household budget for food - % majority/minority undernourished - Majority/minority children underweight-ed for age - % majority/minority homeless - % majority/minority living in assured tenancy conditions - % majority/minority living in overcrowded housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Equal access to water and land resources - Arrangements to sustain minority practices in food production - Recognition of land rights - Measures to provide equal access to accommodation and tackle housing discrimination - Recognition of minority housing practices

<p>Health security</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Majority/minorities life expectancy - Majority/minorities mortality rate from causes considered preventable - Majority/minority psychiatric admissions - % majority/minority with health care coverage - % majority/minority doctors/employed in health sector - % majority/minority reporting trust in health care - % majority/minorities reporting happiness and life satisfaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Equal access to health services - Health services in minority language - Health literacy in minority language - Considerations of minority cultural needs and traditions in health practices - Training health workers on needs of minorities
<p>Personal security</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identity-based armed conflicts - Identity-based violent actions - % of people reporting identity-based harassment - Majority/minority deaths for violence/criminal activities - Majority/minority suicide rate - % majority/minority reporting trust in the police - % majority/minority reporting trust in justice system - % majority/minority reporting feeling fearful/ insecure - Crimes against majority/minority members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training law enforcement and judicial officers on needs of minorities - Arrangements for minority presence in law enforcement bodies and judiciary - Arrangements against identity-based hate crimes - Arrangements against identity based intolerant discourses
<p>Political security</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Majority/minority voting turnout - Majority/minority legislators in local and national councils - Majority/minority members in local and national governments - Minority members in political parties - Minority political leaders in prison - % Minority senior public officials and managers - Number of minority associations - Number of minority media - Electoral share of anti-minority parties - % majority/minority reporting trust in politicians - Public attitudes towards political leaders with minority background 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guarantee of active and passive voting rights for minorities - Self-government rights/arrangements - Arrangements for minority representation in politics - Arrangements for minority presence in media

The data for the index can be collected directly using official and non-official sources or relying on existing data-sets. Whenever possible international data sets should be used, since they allow for comparison across geographical areas. Alternatively, different sources could be used, though the data might not be entirely comparable. In order to address this problem, broad trends, rather than small differences should be highlighted (Anna Triandafyllidou and the ACCEPT PLURALISM Project, 2013: 7). Moreover, data collection might present gaps in space and time. In this context, the problems of integrity and bias that are intrinsic especially in the qualitative data, could be compensated by relying on the knowledge of local experts and researchers, including NGOs' members. Furthermore, indirect proxy can be used in absence of direct data (Hastings, 2013). However, it is necessary to be aware of possible flaws and bias and some degree of subjectivity should be accepted (Owen, 2003; 2008; Eurac Research, Åland Islands Peace Institute and University of Heidelberg, 2020).

To conclude, two aspects should be clarified. First, the index is understood as a flexible instrument that can be adapted to specific contexts. Moreover, it is not designed to give a definitive assessment, but as a diagnostic tool that provide a picture that considers the level of human security provided to minorities, and its development. In this regard, at this stage, the index does not foresee to calculate a score for each dimension and an overall human security score. The main goal of the index is to provide information on the human security situation of minority members within a specific geographical context, rather than developing ranking and comparison of countries/regions and status of minorities, though comparative insights are feasible. Second, though the index focuses on the state of minorities, it addresses indirectly the human security of the majority. Indeed, since human security is commonly shared, security for minority members translate in general security for all those who live in areas inhabited by the minority.

Conclusions

In this contribution I proposed the development of a Human Security Index for Minorities. Indeed, minority and security issues have long been interconnected, and using a human security approach might provide several advantages when addressing minorities, providing a more comprehensive and holistic understanding of their needs and challenges, and thereby complementing various existing scholarship and research on minority issues. It is thus paramount to studies minorities and measures and policy solutions to deal with them from a human security perspective, addressing the level of human security they enjoy. Thereby, building on existing indexes on human security or regarding minority issues, I elaborated a preliminary draft of a Human Security Index for Minorities. In the future, the task will be to test the index in practice, applying to specific areas where minorities live.

References

- Aradau C. (2015) "Security as universality" in: T. Balzacq (ed.), *Contesting Security*. London: Routledge.
- Bhardwaj S. K. (2013) "Abdur Rob Khan and A.K.M. Abdus Sabut, Human security index for South Asia, Asian" in: *Ethnicity*. Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 404-406.

- Breslin S. (2015) "Debating Human Security in China: Towards Discursive Power?" in: *Journal of Contemporary Asia*. Vol. 45, No. 2, pp. 243-265.
- Buzan B. (1991). *People, States and Fear*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Caballero-Anthony M. (2015). "Community security: human security at 21" in: *Contemporary politics*. Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 53-69.
- Carlà A. (2022) "Minority Protection from a Human Security Perspective" in: A. Banerjee (ed.), *Women Security & Governance*. Delhi: Interdisciplinary Institute of Human Security & Governance.
- Clarke M. (2008) "China's 'War on Terror' in Xinjiang: Human Security and the Causes of Violent Uighur Separatism" in: *Terrorism and Political Violence*. Vol. 20, pp. 271-301.
- Commission on Human security (2003) *Human Security Now*.
- Cui S. Li J. (2011) "(De)securitizing frontier security in China: Beyond the positive and negative debate" in: *CC*. Vol. 46, No. 2.
- Daase C. (2010) "National, Societal and Human Security: On the Transformation of Political Language" in: *Historical Social Research*. Vol. 35, No. 4, pp. 22-37.
- Dragolov G. Ignác Z. Lorenz J. Delhey J. and Boehnke K. (2013) *Social Cohesion Radar*. BertelsmannStiftung.
- Eurac Research, Åland Islands Peace Institute and University of Heidelberg (2020) *Mapping Integration Indicators*.
- Gasper D. (2014) "Human Security Analysis as a Framework for Value-Oriented Governance – the example of climate change."
- Gasper D. Sinatti G. (2016) "Investigating migration within a human security framework" in: *Revista de Migración y Desarrollo*. Vol. 27.
- Gasper D. Gomez O. A. (2015) "Human security thinking in practice: 'personal security', 'citizen security' and comprehensive mappings" in: *Contemporary politics*.
- Gilder A. (2021) "Using Human Security to Harness Human Rights in the Post-COVID World." *Völkerrechtsblog*. The 20th April 2022. <https://voelkerrechtsblog.org/using-human-security-to-harness-human-rights-in-the-post-covid-world/>.
- Gomez O. A. Gasper D. and Mine Y. (2016) "Moving Development and Security Narratives a Step Further: Human security and in the Human Development Reports" in: *The Journal of Development Studies*. Vol. 52, No. 1.
- Hastings D. A. (2011) "The Human Security Index: An Update and a New Release." humanSecurityIndex.org;

- Hastings D. A. (2013) "The Human Security Index: Pursuing enriched characterization of development" in: *Development*. Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 66-78.
- Heckmann F. Schnapper D. (2009) "Introduction". In F. Heckmann and D. Schnapper (eds.) *The integration of Immigrants in European Societies. National Differences and Trends of Convergence*. Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.
- Homolar A. (2015) "Human security benchmarks: Governing human wellbeing at a distance" in: *Review of International Studies* Vol. 41, pp. 843-863.
- Hossain K. Petrétei A. (2016) *Understanding the Many Faces of Human Security. Perspectives of Northern Indigenous Peoples*. Leiden: Brill.
- Human Security Unit (n.d.) *Human Security in Theory and Practice. An Overview of the Human Security Concept and the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security*.
- Huddleston T. Niessen J. and Tjaden J. D. (2013) *Using EU Indicators of Immigrants Integration*. European Commission.
- Jalal T. (2015) "The Displacement of Minorities in Syria and Iraq: Implications for Human Security" in: *UNU-GCM Policy Report 02/09*.
- King G. Murray C. J. L. (2001-02). "Rethinking Human security" in: *Political Science Quarterly*. Vol. 116, No. 4.
- Liotta P. H. Owen T. (2006) "Why Human Security" in: *The Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*. Winter/Spring
- Malloy T. Medda-Windischer R. Lantschner E. Marko J. (2009) *Indicators for Assessing the Impact of the FCNM in its state parties*. Eurac Research.
- Marko J. (ed.) (2019). *Human and Minority Rights Protection by Multiple Diversity Governance History, Law, Ideology and Politics in European Perspective*. Routledge
- McCulloch A. McGarry J. (eds.) (2017) *Power-Sharing Empirical and Normative Challenges*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Medda-Windischer R. Carlà A. (2015) "Introduction" in: R. Medda-Windischer and A. Carlà, *Migration and autonomous Territories*. Brill
- Menon, S. (2007) "Human Security: Concept and Practice." MPRA
- *Miniatlas of Human Security*. n.d.
- Nagy S. R. (2013) "Building a Human Security-based Framework for the Protection of Migrants in Northeast Asia" in: *International Studies Review*. Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 59-82.
- Nancheva N. 2017. "Securitization reversed: does Europeanization improve minority/

- majority relations?" in: *Südosteuropa*. Vol. 65, No. 1, pp. 10–34.
- Ndofor-Tah C. Strang A. Philmore J. Morrice L. Michale L. Wood P. Simmons J. (2019) Home Office Indicators of Integration framework 2019.
- Onbaşı F. G. (2015) "Social Media and the Kurdish Issue in Turkey: Hate Speech, Free Speech and Human Security" in: *Turkish Studies*. Vol. 16, No. 1.
- Owen T. (2002) "Body Count: Rationale and Methodology for Measuring Human Security" in: *Human Security Bulletin*. Vol. 1, No. 3.
- Owen T. (2003) "Measuring Human Security: Overcoming the Paradox" in: *Human security Bulletin*. Vol. 2, No. 3.
- Owen T. (2008) "Measuring Human Security" In: P.H. Liotta et al. (eds) *Environmental Change and Human Security*, pp. 35-64. Springer.
- Queen's University (n.d.) "Multiculturalism Policies in Contemporary Democracies." The 12th May 2022. <https://www.queensu.ca/mcp/Roe>
- Roe P. (2004) "Securitization and Minority Rights: Conditions of Desecuritization" in: *Security Dialogue*. Vol. 35, No. 3.
- Roe P. (2005) *Ethnic violence and the societal security dilemma*. Oxfordshire: Routledge.
- Solano G. Huddleston T. (2020) *Migrant Integration Policy Index 2020*.
- Taylor R. (ed.) (2009) *Consociational Theory: McGarry and O'Leary and the Northern Ireland Conflict*. Routledge.
- Triandafyllidou A. The ACCEPT PLURALISM Project (2013) *Tolerance, Pluralism and Social Cohesion. The Accept Pluralism Tolerance Indicators Toolkit*. European University Institute.
- UN (United Nations) (2012) Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly on 10 September 2012. A/RES/66/290. New York.
- UNDP (1994) *Human development report*.
- UNDP (2009) *Community Security and Social Cohesion: Towards a UNDP approach*. New York.