

approaches to the study of human security are vitally important to researchers and policy-makers. It is through statistical models and data gathered that we have become aware of relationships between various factors in international relations (e.g. the Correlates Of War database made it possible to develop the notion of the "Democratic Peace"). As there is already a Human Development Report, what is needed is an annual mapping of violence resulting from conflict or criminal activity, as proposed in the Human Security Report. It is extremely unfortunate that there is a real dearth of official and reliable data for the construction of robust econometric models. Human security is a concept with various interdependent components; measuring methodologies must therefore try to encompass objective and individual psychological factors. Mack argued that there must be greater collaboration between the research and policy communities. To that end, researchers must consciously make their work more accessible and comprehensible to the policy community (e.g. less technical jargon, executive summaries of longer research articles).

Taylor Owen, also of the University of British Columbia, reviewed a selection of methodologies used to measure human security. He stated that measurement indexes adopting the broader definition of human security tend to face several problems including: a) the availability of data; b) the accessibility of data; c) the robustness of data; d) aggregating data from different sources; and e) assigning weight to numerous variables. Models that fall into this category include: a) the Murray/King model, which looks at generalized poverty; b) the Bajpai model, which measures the human security capacity of the individual; and c) the Global Environmental Change and Human Security Project (GECHS) model, which measures a spectrum of environmental, institutional, social, and economic factors. Models using a narrower definition of human security (e.g. the Human Security Report) are more feasibly implemented, but the spectrum of issues that they can focus on is constrained. One option is to expand the Human Security Report, which currently measures human security in terms of violent deaths per 100,000 -- both from conflict and criminal activity -- to include regional deaths from disease and disasters.

Jean Daudelin, of the North South Institute, argued that for someone engaged in local-level humanitarian or development work, meta-indexes like the Human Security Report or the Human Development Index, which focus on national aggregate levels, have little relevance to many of the issues at hand. Disaggregating data to a sub-national level is the key to constructing meaningful human security indexes. Traditional methodologies focusing solely on national level data miss the variation and diversity of human security experiences within a region. Two key questions of utmost importance have not yet been asked: a) what use do we have for human security indexes? b) what variables do we want to compare in human security indexes and why do we want to compare these variables? (i.e. countries may rank better but compared to whom?) Daudelin argued that with the poor quality of data available, there is a distinct possibility that there will be the illusion of knowledge rather than the actual production of knowledge. This illusionary knowledge may be looked upon to provide universal answers based on faulty generalizations, which in turn could contribute to bad policy.

In the presentations and ensuing discussion several key issues and challenges were aired. Among these were problems of definition and conceptualization, for example, whether the characteristics of human security have a universal foundation and whether the poverty and violence strains of human security can be reconciled while retaining conceptual clarity and succinctness. At the