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**Abstract**

This study aims topropose*urban security divide* as a descriptive concept to analyzesecurity gapsat urban areas,arising from varying levels of access to public security services and/orineffective provision of public security.In this context, the ultimate aim of urban security policies should be to narrow security gaps as much as possible so as to eliminate inequalities.In an urban area, which includes the city and its surrounding areas such as towns and suburbs, security divide may exist between those living at different urban spaces, between socioeconomic groups, and between communities etc.Issues of urban security has come to forefront in the last three decades within United Nations (UN) sustainable development agenda due to rapid and/or unplanned urbanization, increasing poverty andinequalities, migration, organized crime and terrorism, thus leading to deterioration of social cohesion and human security conditions. While the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development interrelates security and sustainable development in general, the Goal 11 of it dedicates a particular focus on making cities and human settlements safer. European Forum for Urban Security (EFUS)also renewed its commitment to urban security in 2017,emphasizing the co-production of urban security policies and interdependency between security, democracy and sustainable development. Drawing upon pertinent literature and documents, the study first describes urban security divideand develops a conceptual framework for it to analyze urban security gaps. The study proceeds withmethodological discussion of urban security divide as an analytical tool and puts some conclusions for researchers.
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**KENTSEL ALANLARDA GÜVENLİK AÇIKLARININ ANALİZ EDİLMESİ: “KENTSEL GÜVENLİK BÖLÜNMESİ” İÇİN KAVRAMSAL ÇERÇEVE**

**Öz**

Bu çalışma, kentsel alanlarda kamu güvenliği hizmetlerine farklı erişim seviyeleri ve/veya etkili olmayan kamu güvenliği hizmeti sunumu nedeniyle ortaya çıkan güvenlik boşluklarının analiz edilmesi için betimleyici bir kavram olarak *kentsel güvenlik bölünmesi* kavramını önermeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışma açısından, kentsel güvenlik politikalarının nihai amacı eşitsizlikleri ortadan kaldırmak için güvenlik açıklarını mümkün olduğunda daraltmak olmalıdır. Şehir merkezini ve onu çevreleyen banliyöler ve kasabalar gibi alanları içeren bir kentsel alanda farklı kentsel mekanlarda yaşayanlar, farklı sosyoekonomik gruplar, topluluklar ve benzerleri arasında güvenlik bölünmesi varolabilir. Kentsel güvenlik meseleleri, hızlı ve/veya plansız kentleşme, artan yoksulluk ve eşitsizlikler, göç, organize suç ve terörizm gibi toplumsal dayanışmanın ve insani güvenlik koşullarının bozulmasına yol açan nedenlerle son otuz yılda Birleşmiş Milletlerin sürdürülebilir kalkınma gündeminde öne çıkmıştır. BM’nin 2030 Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma Gündemi genel olarak güvenlik ile kalkınmayı birbirleriyle ilişkilendirirken Gündemin Amaç No. 11’i şehirlerin ve insan yerleşimlerinin daha emniyetli hale getirilmesine özel olarak odanlanmaktadır. Avrupa Kentsel Güvenlik Forumu da, 2017 yılında kentsel güvenlik politikalarının birlikte üretimine ve güvenlik, demokrasi ve sürdürülebilir kalkınma arasındaki karşılıklı bağımlılığa vurgu yaparak kentsel güvenliğe yönelik taahhütünü yenilemiştir. Bu çalışma öncelikle, *kentsel güvenlik bölünmesi* kavramını tanımlamakta ve güvenlik açıklarının analizedilmesi için bir ona ait bir kavramsal çerçeve geliştirmektedir. Daha sonra, çalışma analitik bir araç olarak kentsel güvenlik bölünmesi kavramını yöntem bilimsel olarak tartışmakta ve araştırmacılar için sonuçlara yer vermektedir.

**AnahtarKelimeler:** Kentsel Güvenlik Bölünmesi, Güvenlik Eşitsizlikleri, Güvenlik Sektörü Yönetişimi, Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma, Kavramsal Çerçeve.

**1. Introduction**

Urban security concerns have come to forefront since the late 1980s as the adverse effects of globalization, such as unplanned urbanization, irregular migration, poverty and unequal distribution of wealth, organized crime and terrorism have undermined daily lives of ordinary people at urban areas, thus leading to deterioration of social fabric (Erwards and Hughes, 2013). The United Nations (UN) and the European Union (EU) have prioritized urban security to tackle issues of social cohesion and human security.Pointing to stringent impacts of urbanization on security and establishing a causal relationship between urbanization and insecurities, some scholars callit*urbanization of security*, emphasizing reciprocal implications of security and urbanization on each other (Coward, 2009) or *securitization of the city*to indicate militarization of urban spaces (Muggah and Savage, 2012). Besides, the emerging concept of *urban fragility* handles cities as the new centers of insecurities, such as warfare, insurgency, homicide, drug trafficking, organized crime and gang violence (Independent Commission on Multilateralism, 2015).

The Goal 11 of UN’s 2030 Agenda, which interrelates security and sustainable development dedicates a particular focus on making cities and human settlements safer (United Nations, 2015). Particularly, UN-HABITAT has assumed a major role with its Safer Cities Programme. European Forum for Urban Security (EFUS) also recently renewed its commitment to urban security, emphasizing the co-production of urban security policies and interdependency between security, democracy and sustainable development (EFUS, 2018). Some policy centers,like Folke Bernadotte Academy (FBA) and Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) have begun to address urban securitywithin the broader context of security sector governance and reform (Altpeter, 2016; DCAF, 2017).For instance, DCAF initiated a research project titled “SSR for Safer Cities” in 2017. It is evident that an emerging theme of *urban* in security sector reform agenda will broaden pertinent literature and policy in the next decades.

To date, urban insecurity has been addressed within the broader context of *urban dilemma*, which refers to paradoxical or adverse effects of urbanization (Muggah, 2012). In line with this, DCAF argues that *high rates of urban violence reflect a failure to address the challenges of urbanization* (Lamb, 2018). Recent efforts to handle urban security have emphasized resilience, context-driven responses and crime prevention.Proactive approaches to urban security have prioritized risk management and local governance in order to attain sustainable urbanization (UN-HABITAT, 2007; EFUS 2018). An attempt is underway around policy circles to re-consider urban governance for prevention of violenceby focusing on root causes of conflict and ensuring resilience (Oosterveld*et al*., 2018). However, monitoring the state of urban security based on sound indicatorsremains to be addressed.

This study assumes that security is unequally distributed among people and spaces due to constrained access to and/or ineffective provision of public security, arising from, for instance, lack of security demand, social exclusion, flawed urban planning, and underestimation of people’s security concerns. In addition to that, it argues that the state of security in a given time or at urban spaceis an outcome of complex interactionsamong security actors, contributing factors, and governance structures. The study aims to propose *urban security divide* as a descriptive concept to analyze security gaps at urban areas. For the purposes of the study, urban security divide would provide a prospective tool for security sector governance and reform. Drawing upon pertinent literature and documents, the study introduces urban security divide anddevelops a conceptual framework for analysis and policy.

**2. Urban Security**

In the last three decades, soaring population, insufficient physical infrastructure, unplanned human settlements, unfair distribution of income, and social unresthave undermined cities’ capacities to provide effective services,thus leading to increase in crime rates, extremism, and terrorism (Bugliarello, 2003; Lemieux, 2016). Urban security approach has been developed through sustainable development agenda as a response to thosechallenges. It refers to security against crime, living in a resilient city, safety in public facilities and spaces, social cohesion, andprevention of crime and violence in urban settings(Edwards and Hughes, 2013; Frevel, 2013; Tulumello, 2017).In short, a multifaceted issue, urban security combines physical security and social policy at urban level.

Urban securityhinges upon the basic premise that security should be dealt with locally. Itfundamentally argues that security policies should address people’s needs instead of focusing solely on priorities of public institutions (Edwards *et al*, 2013; Menichelli, 2015).As Recasens*et al* (2013) put it, urban security has three aspects of crime and disorder prevention, well-being of citizens, and physical quality of urban areas. According to Tulumello (2017), urban security is a *right*, a *policy goal*, and a *social demand* and cannot be handled in isolation from *urban planning* because it constitutes an integral preventive part of it.Accordingly, research reveals that physical layout of neighborhoods affects residents’ safety, while technology plays an important role in effective provision of public security (Armao, 2016).

Contemporary urban security approach adopted*crime prevention* and focused on consequences of *social injustice* on human security (Edwards *et al*, 2013; Haubrich and Wehrhahn, 2015). Therefore, the causal relationship between social injustice and urban security has begun to shape public policy responses. Especially social prevention and interdependencybetween social policy and urban security has been emphasized to tackle urban security issues.Evidence-base, multi-layered governance, involvement of municipalities, active citizen participation, public-private partnership, and cooperation among cities are considered as the building blocksof recent urban security policies (Bugliarello, 2005; Frevel, 2013; Recasens*et al*, 2013; Menichelli, 2015; Virta and Branders, 2016).

Bugliarello (2005) asserts that urban security relies on the trade-off between insurance and protection. In other words, urban security should find a right balance between being responsive to immediate threats and being ready for future risks, embracing the lenses of*crime prevention*. As Tulumello (2017) put it, crime prevention policies are shaped by two complementary paradigms, *social prevention* and *situational prevention*. According to social prevention approach, social justice and well-being are key elements of crime prevention. On the other hand, the situational paradigmpoints to individual responsibility and seeks toreducechances of committinga crime. The crime prevention policies essentially embrace both social and situational modes of prevention. But these responses heavily rely on local context and require tailored approaches.

Urban security has also been addressed in terms of *fragility*, the term once used for categorizing the states having weak institutional capacity to provide basic public services, such as security, justice, health and education (OECD, 2018).Applying fragility concept to urban security, scholarscharacterize a*fragile city*by being vulnerable to social, economic or environmental shocks, instability, disability or unwillingness of governance structures to respond, lack of infrastructure and access to public services, violence and poverty, where insecurity is among the exacerbating factors (Muggah and Savage, 2012; Muggah, 2014; Altpeter, 2016). As Independent Commission on Multilateralism (2015) pointed out, urban fragility has a spatial dimension, which refers to consequences of varied socioeconomic and political conditionsof urban dwellers. According to this report,“*security, development, and governance capacity may not be uniformly distributed*”, the fact which also inspired this study to develop anoverarching,descriptive concept of urban security divide.

In 2018, DCAF launched a research project titled *SSR for Safer Cities* within the broader context of UN’s 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Sustainable Development Goal 11: Making Cities and Human Settlements Inclusive, Safe, Resilient, and Sustainable). The initial phase of the project included three case studies of urban security that have been conducted at Bogotá (Colombia), Cape Town (South Africa), and General Santos City (Philippines). The study of Bogotá case aimed to examine the causesand consequences of urban violence, crime and violence against women, security in public spaces, citizens’ perception of the police, the judiciary and the state (Godoy *et al*., 2018), while, in the case of Cape Town, the study sought to explore the relationship between sustainable development efforts and safety, with a particular focus on high rates of violent crime, gender equality, and institutional capacity (Lamb, 2018). The study of the case of General Santos City, which aimed to identify entry points to promote safety, investigated the contribution of security sector at local level (Aguja, 2018).

Literature review and document analysis demonstrate that analyses of security gaps and resulting security inequalities in cities remain to be addressed. Prevalent urban security understanding seems to be focused on crime prevention, social injustice, and social cohesion. Here, it is argued that analyzing security gaps at urban areas and developing a representative conception for analysis, that is urban security divide, is highly needed for both urban security research and policy, not to mention its potential contribution to evidence-base and crime prevention.

**3. Analyzing Unequal Distribution of Security at Urban Spaces: Urban Security Divide**

For the purposes of this study, in its broadest sense, the term *urban security divide (USeD)* refers to divergence or gaps in security conditions at urban areas. In other words, the study contends that *unequaldistribution of security* at urban spaces can be studied within the conceptual framework of USeD.This study acknowledges that there cannot be an absolute equity between people’s security conditions at urban spaces. However, it is built upon the basic assumption that overall security of a city will worsen as the urban security divide or the unequal distribution of security increases. What causes security gaps at urban areas? How can we analyze unequal distribution of security at urban areas usinga single representative concept? How can we eliminate or reduce unequal distribution of security? The first two questions, which inspired this study and the introduction ofUSeD, are essentially descriptive while the third onerequires a normative take.

Recent approaches to security tend to deal with root causes (human security) orintergenerational effects (sustainable security) of insecurity and fragility, focusing on risks and threats (Barbak, 2018).Yet we have sufficient evidence to argue that there isalso a need to ponder unequal distribution of security at urban areas. Approaching (urban) security in terms of inequality remains to be addressed both in literature and policy. To fill this gap, this studyproposes urban security divide as an analytical concept to investigateconstituents and root causes of unequal distribution of security at urban areas.As it can be understood from arguments above, the study assumes that the state, indispensable provider of security, is inherently public and the security, the existential component of modern statehood, is a public good that should be distributed equally among people and spaces to promote human development.

Inequality has been one of the primary concerns of globalization era. It has been used virtually in economic terms, particularly to define unfair distribution of incomeamong individuals. Sustainable development agenda broadened its usages to identify constraints on people’s access to basic public services, such as clean water, healthcare, housing, and education (United Nations, 2015). Similarly, people also have varying levels of security at urban areas due to limited access (demand) or provision (supply).For instance, private security services, which provide additional security layers for people, properties and spaces with different capacities of protection from alarm systems to closed circuit monitoring and private security personnel, are not widely affordable by all urban residents. Also, regardless of their levels of development, all countries face urban security challenges with varying types and degrees of urgency. Here, the proposed concept of USeDhas utilityfor each country.

In some cases, it is observed that law enforcement agencies cannot perform their tasks efficiently and effectively because of limited resources, corruption, and lack of professionalization or politicization (Aguja, 2018; Lamb, 2018; Godoy *et al*., 2018; Oosterveld*et al*., 2018).Evidence confirms that violentconflicts deteriorate human security conditions and grow security gaps at urban spaces.Many people cannot utilize security services or are forced to live in unsafe conditions just because they cannot afford housing andfind a decent job, or they just become disadvantaged by their disabilitiesand vulnerabilities (Call and Stanley, 2001; World Bank, 2011; Oosterveld*et al*., 2018). Some people may notdevelop permanent relations within their societies and pursue daily lives in routine due to social exclusion, challenges to theiridentity (language, religion, ethnicity, age, gender etc.) or mental disorders, and consequently suffer from existential anxiety (Bhalla and Lapeyre, 1999; Layte*et al*., 2010; European Commission, 2010; World Bank, 2011; Oosterveld*et al*., 2018).

According to UN-HABITAT (2007: 235), emerging agendaof urban security urgeseffective urban planning, design and governance, community-based approaches, focusing on most vulnerable groups to reduce risk of crime, and enhancing social capital by developing the ability of individuals and communities to cope with crime and violence.This localized, bottom-up and linked (to urban planning) view to urban security first necessitates understanding how and to what extent security inequalities occur at urban spaces. Because, as also argued by this study, unequal distribution of security would eventually give rise to subsequent inequalitiesin related domains, such as social, economic, environmental, political or so on, thus creating a viciouscircle of insecurity. Also taking into account these likely interplays, this study holds that USeD will contribute to evolving understanding of urban security in breaking the cycle that produce insecurities. It will serve as a policy tool by enhancing the capacity of urban dwellers and law enforcement institutions to generate useful knowledge for urban security policy by examining the state of human security incities systematically and comprehensively.

In theory and practice, a causal relationship between security and equality can beeasily observed, which assumes that security and equality constitute their mutual preconditions in that insecurity deepens inequality while inequality exacerbates insecurities(Hurrell and Woods, 1999; World Bank, 2011; Oosterveld*et al*., 2018; World Bank, 2018: 109-130). It should be noted that urban settings are so complex that it is difficult to reveal contributing factors to security gaps and their interrelations definitely (Altpeter, 2016). On the other hand, this fact also inspires searching for a conceptual framework that will help researchers examine security inequalitiesbased onmore systematic, holistic and comprehensive thinking. Drawing upon literature review anddocument analysis, Table 1 introduces the proposed conceptual framework of USeD, which comprise interdependent variables that should be taken into account in the analysis.

Table 1:Conceptual Framework for Urban Security Divide

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Dimension | Concern/Research Question | Variables/Factors (Selected) |
| Demography | How do the security conditions differ among people depending on their demographic features? | Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Religion, Marital Status, Disadvantaged Groups, Livelihood, Educationetc. |
| Spatial | How do the security conditions differ among urban spaces? | Physical Structure, Location, Proximity to Insecure Spaces, Limited Access to Public Spaces, Environmental Degradation etc. |
| Socio-Economic | How do the security conditions differ among people depending on their socio-economic conditions? | Speed of Urbanization, Social Cohesion and Solidarity, Income Distribution, Poverty, Migration, Access to Basic Needs and Services etc. |
| Physical Threats | How do the security conditions differ among people depending on physical threats they face? | Organized Crime, Terrorism, Gun Violence, Gangs, Armed Conflict, Domestic Violence and Abuse, Homicide Rates, Robbery etc. |
| Public Security Governance | How do the security conditions differ among people depending on the quality of public security governance? | Number of the Units in Service, Right Financing, Effective Allocation and Distribution of Resources, Professionalization, Institutional Capacity, Impunity, Citizen Participation, Involvement of Municipalities, Rule of Law etc. |
| Public Policy | How do the public policies affect security conditions at urban spaces? | Firearm Controls, Urban Development and Planning, Technology, Addiction, Migration, Taxation, Social Policy, Public Service Delivery;Inclusion, Responsiveness, Accountability, Participationetc. |

For analytical gains, each dimension of USeD can be studied independently in order to indicate a specific field of security gap, such as spatial divide, provisional divide, or socio-economic divide. However, this study suggests an aggregated analysis of USeD, taking into account the interdependent nature of these dimensions.The variables to be included in the analysis may change depending on the dimension that is being studied, the purpose and the scope of the research, the research paradigm and so on. Above all, the study contends that the categorization and integration of USeD dimensions based on a systematic and holistic mode of examination have utmost importance for both research and policy. Especially, the utility of USeD will demonstrate itself at the intersection of social policy, urban planning, and public safety and security.

Here, it should be noted that USeD does not intend to problematize varying security practices of security agencies in order to respond to people’s particular security needs, especially those of disadvantages and vulnerable groups. It assumes that these practices are among constituents of existing security conditions and should be included in the analysis. Varied security conditions may stem from further security needs or enhanced security practices of security agencies based on threat evaluations or risk assessments. They may also arise from inconvenient physical settings that undermine security conditions. Urban security divide would not essentially exclude those but will encompass consequences of these types of purposeful actions.

USeD will serve to human security since it will collect individuals’ data. Instead of beginning from national security priorities but not ignoring them, it represents a bottom-up approach to security policymaking. It is likely to complement national security policies and programs with micro-level data obtained from sub-national levels. It is this quality that makes USeD a bridge between existential feature of security (being the underlying reason and a fundamental function of the modern state) and peoples’ security needs at urban level.

**3.1. Urban Security Divide: ATool for Urban Security Research**

Research involves finding out the truth about phenomena under examination, investigating reality, advancing present knowledge as well as challenging previous assumptions and/or theories in a systematic way. Research has several purposes, such as to categorize, describe or explain. Sometimes it aims to evaluate, compare or correlate; to predict or control (Walliman, 2011).Accordingly, research design relies on the nature of the problem and the purpose of the research. It may be historical, descriptive or correlative. It may also be comparative, experimental or evaluative.Simulation, action, ethnological, feminist, and cultural designs are other types of research. One may use a combination of research designs and methods.

Urban security dividehas analytical value in that it has been developed as a descriptive tool to analyze security gaps (or security inequalities) at urban areas. It will be useful for both qualitative and quantitative research designs. In this context, data needed for analysis can be collected from various sources, such as geographical information systems, crime statistics, interviews with individuals, urban planning documents etc.In order to further develop research, each component of USeD can be weighed so as to collect and analyze quantitative data. In other words, USeD can be quantified to benefit from measurement and statistics.

One may develop an *index* for USeD (*Urban Security Divide Index-USeDI*) in order to monitor state of urban security gaps. This attempt would require optimization of its interdependent dimensions. Additionally, more dimensions may be incorporated into conceptual framework. For that reason, the conceptual framework of USeD is open to improvement depending on advanced research.The USeD would inherently allow for making use of mixed methods in data collection and analysis.USeD is also a useful tool for multidisciplinary research in that it would contain a variety of scientific fields, such as public administration, political science, psychology, sociology, urban studiesand engineering.

A single descriptive concept, USeD will enable researchers to analyze security gaps arising from unequal distribution of security in urban areas, revealing also the root causes of security divergence. Furthermore, USeDis useful for longitudinal and comparative research. By utilizing the concept of USeD, both inter-city and intra-city studies can be conducted comparatively. Especially, USeD can be employed to make comparative evaluations between different time periods. It should be noted that comparative studies will also help researchers visualize security gaps and create USeD maps.

**3.2. Urban Security Divide: An Evidence-Based Policy Tool**

Public policy refers to governmental decision to achieve specific public goals and provides with a framework for government, which is shaped through a public decision-making process. It is enforced by public institutions in accordance with the laws, regulations, and budgets etc. (Cochran and Malone, 2014: 3).Evidence-based policy focuses on informing the policy process and is based on rational analysis. It holds that policy decisions should be informed by research evidence in order to solve problems and to produce better outcomes. It aims to bridge the gap between research and policyin practice (Sutcliffe and Court, 2005).

For the purposes of this study, the ultimate aim of urban security policy should be to eliminate or to reduce security inequalities. In this context, USeD has the potential to contribute to policymaking. Introducing chances of comprehensive and systematic analysis of security inequalities, USeD will produce available input for both urban security policy process and law enforcement institutions that are responsible for urban security. Research findings will provide needed data and information about the state of unequal distribution of security and enhance evidence-based policy.

Modes of policy analysis, be they qualitative or quantitative, are also applicable to USeD. The primary concern of policy analysis will relate to how present policies cause or eliminate security inequalities. Or one may ask whether policies broaden the security gaps or not. So, the terms introduced in this study, such as security inequality, security gap, security divergence or eventually USeD can be used as a conditionality, a criterion, or a measure to inform public policies. For instance, given the existential nature of security, how the use of private security services affects security gaps between urban spaces may be one of the issues to be dealt with by policymakers in order to increase effectiveness of public security provision.

USeD is not a risk-oriented concept. It deals with actual security threats that individuals, groups and communities suffer from. Nevertheless, it does not mean that USeD ignores risk management. It aims to help law enforcement institutions forecast future threats based on evidence and generate information for risk management. Hence, it is also a useful tool for crime prevention by supplying timely information about security threats. Additionally, USeD will essentially draw upon existing data sources and principles, norms, and values of security sector governance. The analysis for USeDcould be conducted either using conceptual framework of security sector governance and reform or principles of good governance. So, it is a concept that can be easily integrated to prevalent approaches, policies, and programs pertinent to security by drawing conclusions from previous studies.

**4. Concluding Remarks**

Urban security has become a priority in security policies since the late 1980s. Its association with sustainable development, which aims to make human settlements safer for human development, revolves around the root causes of insecurity at urban spaces. However, security also requires to be handled in terms of inequality. In other words, unequal distribution of security at urban areas should be examined based on a comprehensive conceptual framework for analysis. This study introduces USeDas a descriptive tool for both urban security research and policy. Here, USeD is a single representative concept that refers to gaps or unequal distribution of security at urban areas.USeD will contribute to both research and policy in several ways.

Foremost, it will provide with a systematic, integrated and holistic view to urban security. Apart from the recent approaches focusing on the root causes of insecurity, it aims to deal with security in terms of inequality. Given that security is a public good, individuals should have the right to security equally. This makes security a crucial phenomenon that should be tackled within the context of inequality,no matter which actors, be they public or private, join the provision of security.The USeDcan also be studied with sustainable development to operationalize security-development nexus. In doing so, USeD can be incorporated into regional development policies so as to monitor implicationsof unequal distribution of security on urban planning and development.

The UN’s human security approach may provide an appropriate framework for evaluating urban security gaps. This will enable researchers to integrate urban security and human security. The dimensions of human security can also be used so as to provide a conceptual framework for USeD. Each dimension of human security can be either analyzed in terms of divide separately or by using an aggregated methodology. Analyzing security divide at urban spaces in this way will help researchers address human security issues at urban scale and benefit from an integrated approach. In this context, the USeD needs to be integrated with national security policies because, as this study asserts, urban security and national security are mutually reinforcing.

TheUSeD can be easily incorporated into the conceptions of crime prevention, urban fragility and urban resiliency. Here, it is argued that USeD should be minimized, optimized or balancedto prevent crime, decrease urban fragility, while increasing urban resiliency. In other words, the USeDwill have the capacity to inform pertinent policies by providing a depiction of unequal distribution of security (indicator) and a factor that affects crime prevention, fragility, andresiliency.To sum up, the USeD can function in research process both as an indicator and a factor, while, in the policy process, it will serve as a policy goal or objective. In the USeD methodology, the shared assumption of research and policy is that minimizing, optimizing or balancing of the unequal distribution of security will contribute to better security. Accordingly, refined fromarguments above, Table 2 introduces theproposed functional framework of the USeD.

Table 2: Functional Framework of Urban Security Divide

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Concept | Research | Policy | Assumption |
| Process | Function | Process | Function | Minimizing, optimizing or balancing the USeD will contribute to national security, human security, urban security, crime prevention, decreasing fragility, and increasing resiliency. |
| National Security | Description, Exploration, and Explanation of the Unequal Distribution of Security at Urban Spaces (USeD) | Indicator/Factor of the Quality of the (Good) Governance | Minimization/Optimization/Balancing of the Unequal Distribution of Security at Urban Spaces (USeD) | Policy Goal/Objective |
| Human Security | Indicator/Factor of the State of Human Security |
| Urban Security | Indicator/Factor of the State of Urban Security |
| Crime Prevention | Factor of Crime Prevention |
| Fragility | Factor of Fragility |
| Resiliency | Factor of Resiliency |

As can be seen from Table 2, within the context of the USeD research, a variety of causal relations and assumptions can be examined or tested. It is apparent that further research will improve conceptual (see Table 1) and functional frameworks of the USeD. Today, policymakers need evidence-base inputs more than ever to produce scientifically informed responses to complex societal problems. In this context, the USeDis suggested to combine urban security research and policy, link national and urban levels, encourage multidisciplinary studies, and focus on people’s security needs by simply addressing urban security in terms of inequality.
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