

Bu makaleye atıfta bulunmak için;

BARBAK, A. (2017), "Security in Sustainable Development: Comparing United Nations 2030 Agenda For Sustainable Development with Millennium Declaration", Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 4(1), 6-24.

Makalenin geliş tarihi: 16.02.2017

Makalenin kabul tarihi: 05.05.2017

SECURITY IN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: COMPARING UNITED NATIONS 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT WITH MILLENNIUM DECLARATION

SÜRDÜRÜLEBİLİR KALKINMADA GÜVENLİK: BİRLEŞMİŞ MİLLETLERİN 2030 SÜRDÜRÜLEBİLİR KALKINMA GÜNDEMİ İLE BİNYIL BİLDİRGESİNİN KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI

Ahmet BARBAK

Yrd. Doç. Dr., İzmir Katip Çelebi Üniversitesi, İİBF, Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü, abarbak01@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to compare United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development with Millennium Declaration in terms of their security conceptualizations to explore changes in security thinking and policy components (goals, targets, principles, priorities etc.) over time. In doing so, it is envisaged that United Nations' expectations from member states regarding their national security policies and organizations could be revealed. Security thinking has changed since late 1980's with the introduction of sustainable development approach by the United Nations. This shift in security thinking encompasses human security and security-development nexus. Holding all member states responsible, Millennium Declaration and 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development constitute the primary and the most recent outcome documents of United Nations' sustainable development policy. Both documents have security components. This enables extracting security elements and comparing them with an analytical manner. Consequently, findings are compared and discussed in terms of public policy and organization at national level.

Keywords: *Security, Sustainable Development, Public Policy, United Nations*

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, güvenlik düşüncesi ve politika bileşenlerinde (amaçlar, hedefler, ilkeler, öncelikler vb.) zaman içerisindeki değişiklikleri keşfetmek amacıyla, Birleşmiş Milletlerin 2030 Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma Gündemi ile Binyıl Bildirgesini güvenlik kavramsallaştırmaları bağlamında karşılaştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Böylece, Birleşmiş Milletlerin ulusal güvenlik politikalarına ve örgütlenmelerine ilişkin üye devletlerden beklentilerinin ortaya çıkarılabileceği öngörülmektedir. Güvenlik düşüncesi, Birleşmiş Milletlerin sürdürülebilir kalkınma yaklaşımıyla birlikte 1980'lerin sonundan itibaren değişmiştir. Güvenlik düşüncesindeki bu değişim, insani kalkınma ve güvenlik-kalkınma bağına içermektedir. Tüm devletleri yükümlü tutan Binyıl Bildirgesi ve 2030 Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma Gündemi, Birleşmiş Milletlerin sürdürülebilir kalkınma politikasına ilişkin başlıca ve en güncel sonuç belgelerini oluşturmaktadır. Her iki belge de güvenlik bileşenlerine sahiptir. Bu, güvenlik ile ilgili bileşenlerin çıkarılmasına ve analitik bir şekilde karşılaştırılmasına imkân vermektedir. Son olarak, bulgular ulusal seviyede kamu politikası ve örgütlenmesi bağlamında karşılaştırılmakta ve tartışılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Güvenlik, Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma, Kamu Politikası, Birleşmiş Milletler*

INTRODUCTION

The world has witnessed fundamental changes since the late 20th Century as consequences of globalization. This has led to emergence of new policy domains for and responses to social and economic challenges. As globalization has increased interactions all over the world, public policy process and organization have gone through a transformation.

This transformation can be explained in terms of *globalization of public policy* by policy transfer and convergence (Evans and Davies, 1999; Dolowitz and Marsh, 2000; Drezner, 2001; Stone, 2004; Knill, 2005; Zaei, 2013) and *integration of policy domains* by policy integration (Meijers and Stead, 2004; Briassoulis, 2005). Globalization of policy refers to designing public policy process at global level and transferring common policy components to nations while integration of policy domains represents introducing thematic policies.

Sustainable development policy exemplifies this transformation and encompasses a variety of policy domains, one of which is security. Sustainable development, as a combination of policies, has paved way for paradigm shifts in both security and development. In this context, there has been a consensus within international development community on linking security and development since the late 1980s. The consensus gained prominence with

the Report of World Commission on Environment and Development (Brundtland Report) in 1987, which introduced the concept of *sustainable development* to international community.

Incorporating security into its agenda distinguishes sustainable development policy from previously introduced policies which had been designed and conducted as functional areas, such as health, education, transportation etc. In sustainable development, security has been dealt with and addressed as a primary policy component.

It may be argued that security conceptualization in Brundtland Report stands for the initial conceptual framework of security-development nexus. Security-development nexus refers to merging development and security policymaking to yield policy coherence for sustainable development. This approach has been built upon the principle that security and development are inextricably linked.

Security conceptualization in sustainable development has evolved in nearly three decades up to date. The changes in security thinking and policy priorities of sustainable development may be traced by analyzing pertinent and the latest policy documents longitudinally, which have been publicized since the beginning of 21st Century. Holding all member states responsible, Millennium Declaration and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development are the primary and the most recent outcome documents of United Nations' sustainable development policy. Both documents have security aspects. In this context, this study seeks to find answers to questions stated below:

- What are the security related causalities and terms that comprise security conceptualization of Millennium Declaration?
- What are the security related causalities and terms that comprise security conceptualization of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?
- What is the difference between security conceptualizations of Millennium Declaration and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?
- What implications for public policy and organization can be inferred from the security conceptualizations?

To answer these questions, the paper compares United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development with Millennium Declaration in terms of their security

conceptualizations. The study categorizes the security related causalities and security terms of each document. In the first step, security related causalities are extracted from both documents and security terms (security, safety, secure, peace) are determined by scanning security and its related concepts. In the second step, the rationales that causalities rely on are demonstrated in relation to their implications for public policy and organization and the contexts of security terms are exhibited. In the third step, the causalities and security terms of each document are compared in such a way that reveals the longitudinal shift in security conceptualizations. The study ends with concluding remarks.

1. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: SECURITY-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

Security-development nexus refers to a multi-policy approach emerged within international development community in the late 1980s. Evolved within UN and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC), it argues that security and development constitute the prerequisites of each other (Duffield, 2010; Hrychuk, 2009; Stern and Öjendal, 2010). In other words, minimum level of security is necessary for development and *vis-a-vis*. In this approach, both security and development understandings represent new paradigms. While development turned out to be *sustainable* instead of focusing solely on economic growth of nations, security paradigm has shifted from state-centric to human centric, that is, *human security*.

In order to explore and take a grasp of the basic argument of security-development nexus, firstly, we need to examine the Report of World Commission on Environment and Development (Brundtland Report), which announced the concept of sustainable development in 1987. Since sustainable development is a multi-faceted and an integrated policy, one may find a variety of policy issues within its agenda. Security, *inter alia*, is one of the primary components of sustainable development. And Brundtland Report criticizes *traditional* security approach which is characterized by conventional and nuclear weapons, and arms race of nations in Cold War era (United Nations, 1987).

Urging governments to leave traditional security definitions *in terms of political and military threats to national sovereignty*, Report demanded from nations to broaden their security approaches so as to encompass environmental issues at varying levels of analysis (locally, nationally, regionally, and globally) (United Nations, 1987). The introduction of sustainable development to international community pointed to insecurity as a source of

environmental and developmental degradation. According to the Report, “*peace and security bear directly upon the concept of sustainable development*”.

Pertinent causalities in Brundtland Report that have shaped security approach in sustainable development policy can be categorized as shown in Table 1. The causalities demonstrate security conceptualizations at policy level, thus indicating the initial elements and concerns of security-development nexus.

Table 1: Security Conceptualization in Brundtland Report

| Causality | Rationale | Implications for Public Policy and Organization |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Environment-national security | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment as a source of insecurity • Armed conflicts as sources of environmental problems • Nuclear weapons as sources of environmental decline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less military spending • Leaving <i>traditional</i> security <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological security • No nuclear weapons |
| Military spending-development | Military spending as a source of underdevelopment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less military spending • Disarmament |
| Food production-security | Food as a source of insecurity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More food • Better food distribution |
| Poverty-security | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poverty as a source of insecurity • Insecurity as a source of poverty | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livelihood security • Social security |
| Security-development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security as a factor of development • Insecurity as an obstacle to development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security-development linkage • More security for development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common security • Redefinition of policy priorities • Broader security assessment |

Causality between security and development represents a differentiation from that of Cold War era which centered on military means and security against outside threats to national sovereignty. Especially, some empirical findings about states in conflict proved that the probability of conflict raised as national income and its fair distribution among people deteriorated (International Peace Academy, 2004).

Security conceptualizations in sustainable development approach signaled a prospective paradigm shift in security. Putting aside state centric security conceptualizations, in 1994, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) offered a new way of security thinking (UNDP, 1994). In its 1994 Human Development Report, UNDP adopted a *multi-dimensional* security conceptualization. It was *human security*. The basic principle of human security relied on security-development linkage, broadening security conception so as to encompass *non-state* and *non-military* aspects (Paris, 2001; Krahnmann, 2008).

According to UNDP (1994: 22), “security of territory from external aggression, or as protection of national interests in foreign policy” is a *narrow* interpretation of security. As put forward by UNDP, human security has two main aspects. First, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. And second, protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life-whether in homes, in jobs or in communities.” (UNDP, 1994: 23). UNDP’s human security concept has seven dimensions (UNDP, 1994: 24-33): Economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security, political security. It is apparent that human security is comprised of a variety of policy domains which have multiple interactions amongst.

Given human security approach, security-development nexus is based on the proposition that “*there can be no development without security and no security without development*” (Duffield, 2010; World Bank, 2011; Jackson, 2015). In other words, security-development nexus presumes that *there is an interaction between the security situation and development outcomes, between the development situation and security outcomes* (Schnabel, 2012). As a result, security and development policies have been broadened to handle common issues in such a way that reinforces each other (Nikolaisen, 2011).

2. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS: SECURITY IN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

2.1. Security in Millennium Declaration

The Millennium Declaration is a resolution adopted by the General Assembly at the very beginning of 21st Century. According to it, the central challenge was *globalization and its uneven consequences for people* all over the world (United Nations, 2000). Given the Millennium Declaration, globalization can be taken as the main source of insecurity. In this context, Table 2 shows security conceptualization inferred from the text of Millennium Declaration.

Table 2: Security Conceptualization in Millennium Declaration

| Causality | Rationale | Implications for Public Policy and Organization |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Globalization-security | Insecurity is an adverse consequence of globalization. | International cooperation in security |
| UN-Security | UN must play central role as the most representative. | Global governance |
| Freedom-security | Freedom is essential for security and <i>vis-a-vis</i> . | Democratic-participatory governance |
| Rule of Law-security | Rule of law is a basis for effective security. | Compliance with international law; national law; human rights law |
| Governance-security | Governance enhances security by including non-state actors. | Public-Private-non-governmental-civil society partnerships |
| Shared responsibility-security | Shared responsibility enhances security. | Cooperation; multilateralism; policy coherence |
| Terrorism-security | Terrorism is a source of global insecurity. | Concerted action of nations |
| Disarmament-security | Disarmament creates security environment. | Arms control; no weapons of mass destruction and nuclear weapons; more transparent arms transfers; supporting regional disarmament |
| Sport-Peace | Olympics promotes peace. | Organizing/participating in Olympics. |

In Table 2, causalities indicate the priorities of sustainable development policy in terms of security. That globalization was addressed as main cause of problems, including insecurity, and the central role given to UN imply a prospective global governance structure that would be reference for national policy priorities. Freedom, rule of law, governance and shared responsibility can be described as principles for policy priorities and managing policy process, while terrorism, disarmament and sports are the policy areas that nations were supposed to engage in international cooperation regarding security issues. Overall, it may be argued that general focus of Millennium Declaration was cooperation at international level.

Having discussed the security related causalities of Millennium Declaration, which comprise its security conceptualization, we need to analyze it by security terms in order to understand its context. So, security conceptualization in Millennium Declaration can also be expressed as a categorization of security terms and pertinent concepts (see Table 3).

Table 3: Security Terms and Concepts in Millennium Declaration

| Term (Code) | Context (Concepts) |
|--------------------|---|
| Security | Cooperation between the UN and national parliaments; reforming UN Security Council; making UN more effective; shared responsibility |
| Safety | Refugees and displaced persons; drinking water; UN and associated personnel |
| Peace | Tolerance (respect for belief, culture and language; a culture of peace); shared responsibility; policy coherence; cooperation between UN and national parliaments, cooperation between UN, its agencies, the Bretton Woods Institutions, World Trade Organization and other multilateral bodies; peacekeeping and its resources; international peace |

According to Table 3, the primary concern of Millennium Declaration in terms of security is UN's itself. In other words, UN focused on reforming its structure and relationships inside and among nations in order to position itself on top of the global governance in 21st Century. Besides, UN emphasized cooperation and coherence in global policy arena, which were intended for aligning UN agencies, international financial organizations and national governments from top down in accordance with UN's policy goals and targets. It is apparent that UN sought to create an environment for prospective global governance and harmonize global arena accordingly. Rest of the concerns had to do with refugees and displaced persons, as well as drinking water, which relied on human security.

2.2. Security in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was adopted by General Assembly in September 2015 and came into effect on 1 January 2016. It will cover the next fifteen years until 2030. The Agenda is much more elaborated than Millennium Declaration with its 17 goals and 169 targets. According to the 2030 Agenda, the greatest challenge that humanity is facing today is *poverty*. In this context, we may argue that all goals and targets are expected to serve eradicating poverty. Security, as well, is a prerequisite for eliminating poverty.

Targeting an environment which is free from fear and violence, namely, human security, the Agenda argues that *there can be no sustainable development without peace and no peace without sustainable development* (United Nations, 2015). This denotation establishes a causality between peace and development. It may also be taken as a causality between peace and poverty. The 2030 Agenda uses the word of peace as a basis for security-development nexus and even goes beyond it.

This fact can be seen in security conceptualization of the 2030 Agenda. And it shows itself by security related causalities established within. Table 4 shows those causalities which comprise security conceptualization in the 2030 Agenda.

Table 4: Security Conceptualization in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

| Causality | Rationale | Implications for Public Policy and Organization |
|--|--|---|
| Extreme poverty-food security | Extreme poverty harms food security | Rural infrastructure; agricultural research; extension services; technology development; plant and livestock gene banks; ending hunger; agricultural productivity; secure and equal access to land; liberalization in trade; proper functioning of food commodity markets |
| Urban development-personal security | Personal insecurity is a problem of urbanization | Urban security policy and organization |
| Violence-security | Children must be protected against violence. | Security measures focused on protection of children |
| Terrorism-security | Terrorism is a security problem | International cooperation and capacity building for fighting terrorism |
| Peace-development | Women should have role in peace-building; self-determination of peoples should be recognized | Inclusion of women in peace-building missions; application of self-determination for conflict-affected people in a given territory |
| Social inclusion-security | Social exclusion causes insecurity | Inclusion of all people in public affairs and public decision making |
| Equality-security | Inequality causes insecurity | Equal access to justice; equality of opportunity |
| Human rights-security | Violence of human rights is a source of insecurity | Incorporating respect for human rights into public sphere |
| Rule of law-security | Rule of law enhances security | Rule of law in public security affairs |
| Good governance-security | Good governance enhances security | Good governance as an organizing principle |
| Institutions-security | Security relies on institutions | Transparency, effectiveness and accountability in security institutions |
| Illicit financial and arms flows-security | Illicit financial and arms flows cause insecurity | Eliminating illicit financial and arms flows as security policy goals |

Table 4, in general, comprises mainly social problems associated with poverty at community level except for peace, terrorism and illicit financial and arms flows. Besides, implications for public policy and organization refers to prospective policy agenda that nations are supposed to address in the next fifteen years. National security policy responses to such challenges would require new measures to eliminate *policy-practice gap* that is emphasized in the 2030 agenda as means of implementation. Then, how are the contexts of security terms organized in the discourse of 2030 Agenda? To answer, security terms and pertinent concepts in the 2030 Agenda are demonstrated below in Table 5.

Table 5: Security Terms and Concepts in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

| Term (Code) | Context (Concepts) |
|-----------------|---|
| Security | Security (General), food security, personal security |
| Safety | Migration, drinking water, food, human habitats, schools, migration and mobility, use of chemicals, cities, human settlements, medicines and vaccines, learning environments, working environments, housing and basic services, transport systems, roads, public spaces |
| Secure | Working environment, access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets, opportunities for value addition |
| Peace | Universal peace, peaceful societies, peace-building, durable peace, culture of peace |

In Table 5, the terms of “security”, “safety” and “secure” are generally at human/community level and can be related to *urbanization* process. They have to do with living conditions of people and refer to general conception of human security. And the term of peace connotes creating an environment at national and global levels which is conducive to permanent and worldwide peace.

3. DISCUSSION: COMPARING THE 2030 AGENDA WITH MILLENNIUM DECLARATION

Having analyzed and put forth the security conceptualizations in Millennium Declaration and the 2030 Agenda, both documents are compared below in terms of their security conceptualizations. Table 6 is composed of causalities and changing security concepts of sustainable development. It demonstrates changing policy priorities of sustainable development in security issues and the causalities that have guided policy process. The causalities provide policy orientation to sustainable development and indicate shifts in policy orientations over time.

Table 6: Comparing Security Conceptualizations

| | Millennium Declaration | The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development |
|-------------|---|---|
| Causalities | Globalization-security Role of UN-Security Governance-security Shared responsibility-security Freedom-security Rule of Law-security Terrorism-security Disarmament-security Sport-Peace | Extreme poverty-food security Urban development-personal security Violence-security Social inclusion-security Equality-security Terrorism-security Peace-development Human rights-security Rule of law-security Good governance-security Institutions-security Illicit financial and arms flows-security |

In Table 6, it is observed that there are more causalities in the 2030 Agenda than in Millennium Declaration. This fact may be interpreted as broadening (adding new causalities) and deepening (elaborating existing causalities) of security conceptualization in sustainable

development over time. From Table 6, first, it may be asserted that globalization was designated as the main source of insecurity in Millennium Declaration. However, extreme poverty replaces globalization in the 2030 Agenda. Emphasis on extreme poverty proves that sustainable development policy started addressing explicitly the specific policy issues arisen from globalization.

In Millennium Declaration, the focal point of the policy was re-positioning UN in global governance and re-organizing its structure and relationships accordingly. Thus, governance and shared responsibility can be described as organizing principles of global governance. But, in the 2030 Agenda, policy priorities are centered on social and economic topics, such as inequality, social exclusion and violence. This orientation relates to operationalization of sustainable development policy with regard to security issues.

The Millennium Declaration established governance-security relationship while the 2030 Agenda focuses on good governance-security. Good governance, as a more specific mode of governance in public administration, is believed to promote security by creating the conditions for transparency, accountability, rule of law, etc. Rule of law and terrorism remains across sustainable development in 21st Century as primary concerns of security. While the rule of law constitute the basis for an enhanced security environment for people, terrorism is still highlighted as a major cause of insecurity for societies.

Disarmament was addressed in Millennium Declaration as it deteriorates security conditions while illicit financial and arms flows are prioritized as security issues in the 2030 Agenda. This represents a move from state centric to non-state centric definitions of security challenges. Because illicit financial and arms flows are not associated with nations for they comprise illegal transactions.

Emerging policy priorities in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development rely on recently voiced causalities: *urban development and security, violence and security, social inclusion and security, equality and security, institutions and security*. These causalities have a *society/community based view*, taking emphasis from global level to sub-national level. In other words, security approach in the 2030 Agenda deepens so as to define security challenges and conduct policy process at micro level. But, it is not to say that global (macro) level is ignored. There seems an endeavor to connect sub-national security to global policy process.

Besides, the 2030 Agenda envisages creating institutions for providing security. This points to a new institutional approach to security. According to new institutional view (or new institutionalism), main goal of an institution is to gain legitimacy to survive in an environment comprised of many other institutions (March and Olsen, 1984; DiMaggio and Powell, 1991). Therefore, legitimate security institutions are considered to be essential for providing security conditions. In the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, a prospective “peace-development nexus” approach can be observed. A peace-development nexus would broaden the debate at global level, thus providing legitimacy of sustainable development policy with peace discourse.

Alongside the causalities mentioned so far, security terms give an idea about changing security conceptualization of sustainable development policy. Table 7 presents a comparison of security terms of Millennium Declaration and the 2030 Agenda.

Table 7: Comparing Security Terms and Related Concepts

| Term | Millennium Declaration | The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Security | Cooperation between the UN and national parliaments, reforming UN Security Council, making UN more effective, shared responsibility | Security (General), food security, personal security |
| Safety | Refugees and displaced persons, drinking water, UN and associated personnel | Migration, drinking water, food, human habitats, schools, migration and mobility, use of chemicals, cities, human settlements, medicines and vaccines, learning environments, working environments, housing and basic services, transport systems, roads, public spaces |
| Peace | Tolerance (respect for belief, culture and language; a culture of peace), shared responsibility, policy coherence, cooperation between UN and national parliaments, cooperation between UN, its agencies, the Bretton Woods Institutions, World Trade Organization and other multilateral bodies, peacekeeping and its resources, international peace | Universal peace, peaceful societies, peace-building, durable peace, culture of peace |
| Secure | - | Working environment, access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets, opportunities for value addition |

In providing security, the concept of (social) inclusion draws attention. Social inclusion refers to giving a right to say and responsibility to everyone in the society in political, social and economic affairs regardless of their differences of race, gender, class, generation and geography and providing equality of opportunity. Social inclusion also requires subordination of military and economic power to civil authority. The rationale of social inclusion is avoiding undesired events such as armed rebellion, urban rioting and the

disaffection of young people (United Nations, 2010). The rationale indicates an established causal connection between social inclusion and security in the Agenda.

According to Table 7, the term of security in Millennium Declaration emphasized restructuring UN system and offered the basic principle of international cooperation, namely, shared responsibility. On the other side, in the 2030 Agenda, the concept of security was associated with food security and personal security, which are main components of human security and take “human” as the unit of analysis in security issues.

When it comes to the safety, it is observed that the content of safety has been broadened up to date. In Millennium Declaration, safety was associated with refugees and displaced persons, drinking water, UN and associated personnel while, in the 2030 Agenda, it is composed of mainly urbanization and urban security challenges in a wider perspective.

The term of peace in Millennium Declaration was addressed mainly in terms of tolerance as well as international cooperation. On the other side, the 2030 Agenda abstains from an explicit emphasis on international cooperation and accepts a value-based approach to peace. Particularly, the targets of universal and durable peace, culture of peace and peaceful societies are indicators of emerging values in creating an environment of peace. In this context, peacebuilding is offered as a policy instrument for achieving the targets. And finally, the term of secure was not included in Millennium Declaration. But, in the 2030 Agenda, it is associated with and points to production factors and markets for stable production and consumption conditions.

Then, what implications can be inferred from those changes in terms of policy? First, it may be argued that national security policies will be formulated and implemented for *safety* concerns at urban level, thus relying more on human security. Because, changing security conceptualization indicates a shift in priorities from organizing global governance to building a security environment for eliminating challenges that threaten social, political, and economic stability. And that would mean creation of inter-sectoral policies based on public-private partnerships and multi-level governance. Since both the fragmentation of authority and privatization have increased over the past three decades and led to loss of control over policy outputs and outcomes (Christiansen and Lægreid, 2006), incorporating the security view into sectoral policies would mean a *policy tool* for political and administrative centralization regardless of human based paradigm.

Second, in the next fifteen years, a more *value-based security policy* process would appear and shape policy responses to security challenges. So, it may be asserted that security-development nexus would be operationalized mainly by security policy responses which will be formulated in accordance with those values embedded in policy process. Social inclusion, as a response to inequality which has proved to be the main cause of insecurity within societies, heads the value domain in providing security conditions to achieve sustainable development goals and targets. Since poverty has been recognized as the key indicator of social exclusion (Noya and Clarence, 2008), national policies would lean on poverty reduction in the following years. In a wider perspective, *social policy* domain will constitute the principal base of security programs at national and sub-national level.

Third, latest security approach of sustainable development policy merges internal and external security concerns of nations. This approach is likely to remove distinction between two policy domains and be embodied by high level decision making bodies and coordination mechanisms as well as inter-ministerial organizations above functional bodies at national level. Security approach of sustainable development also encourages multi-level governance for security. This requires an alignment from supra-national to sub-national level and a cooperation among them. In this type of governance, state apparatus can be defined both as a facilitator and an actor in security policies and the legitimacy of state would come from its commitment to (global) security governance. In addition to those, security approach of sustainable development brings together a variety of policy domains so as to yield policy coherence and expected results. In doing so, UN extends its engagement with nations and create more space for influencing national policies under a *thematic policy domain*, namely, sustainable development.

Fourth, it is observed that while the 2030 Agenda highlights food security and personal security as matters of security in general, it elaborates and classifies security related issues under the conceptions of safety and secure. This manner demonstrates that individuals' being safe and secure is the primary concern of policy and that pertinent issues classified under those conceptions will constitute the *policy priorities* for nations in the next fifteen years. When considered that policy priorities direct resources to issues to be resolved, it may be argued that national budgets will concentrate on mobilizing financial resources to address those issues. This argument can be tested fifteen years later from now by examining distribution of expenditures in national budgets. In order to track policy outcomes in terms of

expenditures, security related indicators may be developed at national level. Besides, as UN emphasized, domestic resources should be mobilized to finance sustainable development policies. In this context, governments may seek further financial cooperation with non-state actors in addition to tax revenues to foster security at local (urban) level.

Finally, national policies are most likely to focus on investments for infrastructure, which is considered to promote living conditions of individuals. It may be asserted that both international (official) development assistance and domestic resources will be diverted to programs for improving infrastructures, especially in developing countries. According to the 2030 Agenda, improving infrastructures would proliferate all types of interactions among individuals within and among nations and their access to utilities, public spaces, and markets, thus creating an environment for peaceful societies and durable peace as well as for developing a culture of peace.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

We are living in a world which is characterized by intense interactions and complex issues as well as integrated policy responses. As all kinds of connections proliferated and spread across borders, security, *inter alia*, has become a multifaceted issue to the extent that it could not be defined in conventional terms. So, security has been under re-conceptualization in an age that marked everybody's lives. It does not mean solely national security anymore. This may be explained as a consequence of globalization. And it is evident that an effort to explain fundamental changes since the late 20th Century cannot ignore globalization.

One of the consequences of globalization is the emergence of integrated policies at global scale. In this context, sustainable development can be described as a *global policy* which aims to combine different policy domains as a response to common issues in a globalized world. Sustainable development is also a *thematic policy* which offers a certain type of development and aims to integrate diverse policy processes. The convergence of security and development, namely, security-development nexus has evolved through sustainable development policy. Incorporating security concerns into sustainable development resulted in broadening of the scope of security while development approach extended beyond economic growth.

Introducing human security to international community, the UN complemented sustainable development approach with a comprehensive concept. Both sustainable

development and human security are thematic policy domains and they have shared policy issues. Human security constitute the conceptual framework of security-development nexus. Since three decades up to date, sustainable development policy has been adjusted to response to contemporary issues so as to address new policy challenges. So has been the security in it. The policy priorities, as well as goals and targets have been reviewed.

In 2000's, sustainable development policy produced two major documents which have security aspects. The first one was Millennium Declaration and the latter is the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Both documents have their own security conceptualizations that reflect policy components, i.e. priorities, goals and targets. The analysis demonstrates that security related causalities and policy components changed from Millennium Declaration to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

In general, the difference between Millennium Declaration and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is their points of emphasis. While Millennium Declaration put forward uneven consequences of globalization as major causes of insecurity, the 2030 Agenda stressed poverty. In order to cope with those challenges, Millennium Declaration highlighted international cooperation based on shared responsibility and placed UN at the very center and top of global governance. In the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, taking into account primary policy goal of eradicating poverty, focused on micro level issues and targets.

First, in the 2030 Agenda, the emphasis is on *urbanization*. This proves that next generation policies will be handling mainly *urban security* issues. So, national public policy processes and organizations may be expected to be designed to overcome urban security problems, especially personal security concerns. Second, it is observed that a *human or community based security approach* is leading security definitions much more than before. That means a move from inter-state security definitions to *intra-state and sub-national definitions* of security.

Additionally, traces of new institutional approach can be seen in the 2030 Agenda. According to this approach, security must be provided by legitimate institutions operating in accordance with the principles of good governance. And good governance may be described as a criterion of legitimacy for security institutions, like other public bodies. Finally, an emerging *peace-development nexus* is observed in the 2030 Agenda. A prospective peace-development nexus could both broaden the debates in security-development nexus approach and enhance legitimacy of security aspects in sustainable development policy.

As security related causalities have proliferated over time, security conceptualization of sustainable development agenda has broadened and deepened. The proliferation of those causalities, by creating new rationales, also point out prospective policy domains and responses that are likely to be developed in the next fifteen years. And that will mean enlargement of public sphere and creating more space for public intervention through new structures and functions for national public policies and organizations. Besides, the proliferation of security related causalities signifies increasing securitization in public policy and organization.

REFERENCES

- BRIASSOULIS, H. (2005), "Analysis of Policy Integration: Conceptual and Methodological Considerations", Policy Integration for Complex Policy Problems: The Example of Mediterranean Desertification, (Editor: H. BRIASSOULIS), Ashgate, Aldershot, 81-116.
- CHRISTIENSEN, T., and LÆGREID, P. (2006), The Whole-of-Government Approach-Regulation, Performance, and Public Sector Reform, Working Paper 6, Stein Rokkan Centre for Social Studies, Norway.
- DIMAGGIO, P. J, and POWELL, W. W. (1991), "Introduction", The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis, (Editor: W. W. POWELL and P. J. DIMAGGIO), The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1-37.
- DOLOWITZ, D. P., and MARSH, D. (2000), "Learning from Abroad: The Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy-Making", Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration, 13 (1), 5-24.
- DREZNER, D. W. (2001), "Globalization and Policy Convergence", International Studies Review, 3 (1), 53-78.
- DUFFIELD, M. (2010), "The Liberal Way of Development and the Development-Security Impasse: Exploring the Global Life-Chance Divide", Security Dialogue, 41 (1), 53-76.
- EVANS, M., & DAVIES, J. (1999), "Understanding Policy Transfer: A Multi-Level, Multi-Disciplinary Perspective", Public Administration, 77 (2), 361-385.
- HRYCHUK, H. (2009), "Combating the Security Development Nexus? Lessons Learned from Afghanistan", International Journal, 64 (3), 825-842.
- INTERNATIONAL PEACE ACADEMY (2004), "The Security-Development Nexus: Conflict, Peace and Development in the 21st Century", New York Seminar 2004, 3-7 May, New York.
- JACKSON, P. (2015), "Introduction: Security and Development", The Handbook of International Security and Development, (Editor: P. JACKSON), Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, 1-15.
- KNILL, C. (2005), "Introduction: Cross-National Policy Convergence: Concepts, Approaches and Explanatory Factors", Journal of European Public Policy, 12 (5), 764-774.
- KRAHMANN, E. (2008), "Security: Collective Good or Commodity?", European Journal of International Relations, 14 (3), 379-404.
- MARCH, J. G. and OLSEN, J. P. (1984), "The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life", The American Political Science Review, 78 (3), 734-749.

- MEIJERS, E., and STEAD, D. (2004), "Policy Integration: What Does It Mean and How Can It Be Achieved?: A Multi-Disciplinary Review", 2004 Berlin Conference on the Human Dimensions of Global Environmental Change: Greening of Policies-Interlinkages and Policy Integration, 3-4 December, Berlin.
- NIKOLAISEN, T. (2011), Security Sector Reform: A New Framework for Security Assistance? The Security-Development Nexus Impact on Policies Towards the South, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, Norway.
- NOYA, A., and CLARENCE, E. (2008), Improving Social Inclusion at the Local Level through the Social Economy, OECD, Paris.
- PARIS, R. (2001), "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air? ", *International Security*, 26 (2), 87-102.
- SCHNABEL, A. (2012), "The Security-Development Discourse and the Role of SSR as a Development Instrument", *Back to the Roots: Security Sector Reform and Development*, (Editors: A. SCHNABEL and V. FARR), Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, Switzerland, 29-73.
- STERN, M., and ÖJENDAL, J. (2010), "Mapping the Security-Development Nexus: Conflict, Complexity, Cacophony, Convergence? ", *Security Dialogue*, 41 (1), 5-30.
- STONE, D. (2004), "Transfer Agents and Global Networks in the Transnationalization of Policy", *Journal of European Public Policy*, 11 (3), 545-566.
- UNDP (1994), Human Development Report 1994, New York.
- UNITED NATIONS (1987), Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future, New York.
- UNITED NATIONS (2010), Analyzing and Measuring Social Inclusion in a Global Context, New York.
- UNITED NATIONS (2015), Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, New York.
- WORLD BANK (2011), World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development, Washington DC.
- ZAEI, M. E. (2013), "Globalization of National Policy-Making: An International Perspective", *Public Policy and Administration*, 13 (2), 331-340.