A Culture of Preparedness: Fostering Prevention and Values

Alexander Siedschlag

Alexander Siedschlag

A Culture of Preparedness: Fostering Prevention and Values

This chapter reviews the United States' homeland security approach to national preparedness, defined as a prepared whole community across the nation, important elements of which include the prevention effort and the protection of values. The latter, values, are mainly defined as the ingredients of the "American Way of Life" but demonstrate the relevance of values to preparedness and prevention in a way also relevant from the point of view of other countries and cultures: The "sentimentalization of local differences" is not helpful in an era where prevention policies around the world are presented with similar challenges.[1] The chapter concludes in a discussion of important cultural factors to bear in mind when devising policies and strategies to enhance preparedness and foster prevention.

Security as a value proposition

First of all, the role of values in security is not new to the homeland security era. Early security studies scholars such as Arnold Wolfers had already concluded that (national) security was a symbol leaving too much room for confusion to serve as a guiding principle for political advice or scientific analysis. Wolfers suggested that, as a first step in developing an analytical concept of the term, security should be considered, "in an objective sense, […] the absence of threats to acquired values, [and] in a subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked."[2] After the Cold War, with human and societal security concerns ranking at par with, if not sometimes surpassing national defense posture,

---

[1] Harold Lasswell, Politics: Who Get What, When, How? (Cleveland, OH/New York: Meridian Books, 1958), 162.

[2] Arnold Wolfers, "'National Security' as an Ambiguous Symbol," Political Science Quarterly 67 (1952): 481-502 (485).

Barry Buzan and other scholars continued to frame security as a normative practice, namely defending values in "the pursuit of freedom from threat" and strife for "the ability of states and societies to maintain their independent identity and their functional integrity against forces of change, which they see as hostile."[3]

Such a definition still is important in today's homeland security era since it points out the need for a balanced comprehensive threat assessment that among other things involves a broad community of stakeholders, including citizens' perspectives. Prevention defined as defending values and the nation's heritage is an important ingredient of homeland security as seen by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and reflected in the "Homeland Security Vision" put forward in the 2014 Quadrennial Homeland Security Review:

> *"A homeland that is safe, secure, and resilient against terrorism and other hazards, where American interests, aspirations, and way of life can thrive."*[4]

Prevention in an all-hazards and whole-community context

While prevention is the first segment of the national preparedness cycle of prevent – protect – mitigate – respond – recover as defined in the National Preparedness Goal,[5] U.S. homeland security policy and strategy recognize that in an era of advanced persistent threat in the global environment and of increasing domestic threats from mass shootings and violent radicalization, homeland security is located at the "intersection of evolving threats and hazards with traditional governmental and civic responsibilities for civil defense, emergency response, law enforcement, customs, border patrol, and immigration."[6] Hence comprehensive and consistent prevention is not possible, but the priority must be forward-looking risk

---

[3] Barry Buzan," New Patterns of Global Security in the Twenty-first Century." International Affairs, 67 (1991): 432-433.

[4] U.S. Department of Homeland Security, The 2014 Quadrennial Homeland Security Review (Washington, D.C., June 2014), 14, http://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/2014-qhsr-final-508.pdf.

[5] U.S. Department of Homeland Security, National Preparedness Goal, 1st ed., September 2011, http://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1828-25045-9470/national_preparedness_goal_2011.pdf.

[6] U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Report: A Strategic Framework for a Secure Homeland (Washington, D.C., 2010), viii, https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/2010-qhsr-report.pdf.

management in a dynamic all-hazards context that defines homeland security's evolving mission space and drives the underlying requirement for comprehensive threat assessment and response.

However, an all-hazards approach to prevention (and preparedness overall) does not mean to address all and any hazards that might emerge. As policies and strategies in the U.S. – and also in the EU – have pointed out, in order to be effective (and affordable), homeland security needs to be selective, focusing on "the greatest risks" to security,[7] or on those that are responsive to prevailing strategies and available technological tools.[8] For the U.S., the National Preparedness Goal formulated this approach as follows:

"A secure and resilient Nation with the capabilities required across the whole community to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from the threats and hazards that pose the greatest risk."[9]

The whole community, as defined in the 2010 Quadrennial Homeland Security Review is the fabric of the Homeland Security Enterprise (HSE) that

"refers to the collective efforts and shared responsibilities of Federal, State, local, tribal, territorial, nongovernmental, and private-sector partners – as well as individuals, families, and communities – to maintain critical homeland security capabilities. It connotes a broad-based community with a common interest in the safety and well-being of America and American society."[10]

If the risk-informed as well as whole community-based approach to prioritization is followed consistently, we may see practices as well as political and institutional designations change over time

---

[7] Presidential Policy Directive 8 (PPD-8), National Preparedness, March 30, 2011, https://fas.org/irp/offdocs/ppd/ppd-8.pdf; U.S. Department of Homeland Security, National Preparedness Goal, 2nd ed. ([Washington, D.C.,] September 2015), https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/1443799615171-2aae90be-55041740f97e8532fc680d40/National_Preparedness_Goal_2nd_Edition.pdf.

[8] European Security Research and Innovation Forum (ESRIF), ESRIF Final Report (Brussels, 2009), http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/security/files/esrif_final_report_en.pdf.

[9] Presidential Policy Directive 8 (PPD-8), National Preparedness, March 30, 2011, http://www.dhs.gov/presidential-policy-directive-8-national-preparedness; U.S. Department of Homeland Security, National Preparedness Goal.

[10] U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Report, 12.

because those are not only risk-informed but also culturally determined:[11] A security community is rooted in "shared identities, values, and meanings."[12]

Security is neither implementation of the obvious nor ontological, but an ongoing controversy. A focus on prevention among other things means to actively address how security needs to be balanced with other values, such as liberty and freedom, but also accountability and freedom of discussion. Lack of critical thinking in homeland security can lead to self-serving policies and loss of public trust, following a lack of whole-community preparedness and prevention, and finally to mass casualties.[13]

As laid out in the National Prevention Framework, actions of prevention specifically are

"what the whole community – from community members to senior leaders in government – should do upon the discovery of intelligence or information regarding an imminent threat to the homeland in order to thwart an initial or follow-on terrorist attack."[14]

This requires a certain civic culture with an active role of the public in the prevention mission:

"There are times when the general public needs to be informed about a potential threat not only to take potential action to protect themselves and their loved ones, but also to be another set of eyes and ears for those governmental agencies attempting to prevent the threat from coming to fruition. Prevention would come in the form of either stopping the potential perpetrator (via arrest or other means) or making it so the intended targets are no longer vulnerable to the planned action."[15]

---

[11] Robert Wuthnow, Be Very Afraid: The Cultural Response to Terror, Pandemics, Environmental Devastation, Nuclear Annihilation, and Other Threats (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

[12] Emanuel Adler and Michael Barne: Security Communities (Cambridge/UK: Cambridge UP, 1998).

[13] James Ramsay and Linda Kiltz, "Introduction," 1-3 in Critical Issues in Homeland Security. A Casebook, ed. James D. Ramsay and Linda Kiltz (Boulder, CO: Westview, 2014), 2.

[14] U.S. Department of Homeland Security, National Prevention Framework, 2nd ed. (Washington, D.C., June 2016), i, https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/1466017209279-83b72d5959787995794c0874095500b1/National_Prevention_Framework2nd.pdf.

[15] William J. Ryan, "The Role of Intelligence in Homeland Security," 91-104 in Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Homeland and Civil Security: A Research-Based Introduction, ed. Alexander Siedschlag (New York: Peter Lang, 2015), 96-97.

Americans themselves nevertheless are split as to if that model works in practice. For example, a Bloomberg Poll conducted right after the terrorist attacks in Paris in November 2015 found that 48 percent of Americans surveyed were mostly confident that the U.S. had done enough to protect its homeland against similar attacks, while 46 percent were mostly not confident, and 6 percent not sure.[16] These results are similar to a Pew Research Center poll conducted after the Boston Marathon bombings in April 2013, where 45 percent said there is not much more the government can do to prevent such terrorist acts, and 48 percent believed the government could do more to thwart them.[17]

The emerging homeland security consensus

While the U.S. public is split, there is an emerging consensus among scholars that homeland security is focused on a comprehensive approach, driven by a value-based vision that includes a multi-phase, multi-capability framework with an emphasis on preparedness and the purpose of achieving a resilient nation in an all-hazards perspective; facilitating lawful flow of people, goods, and information across borders; and a whole-of community approach in which homeland security becomes a collective societal responsibility and is regarded as the common creation of a public good.[18] The emerging consensus also includes the view that homeland security is not only about safeguarding borders, infrastructures, and societies, but also about securing values and way of life. Hence, security needs to be weighed against other values, such as liberty and freedom but also accountability and freedom of discussion.

Since the foundation of the American nation, finding and maintaining the balance between security and liberty has been a cultural marker. As George Washington noted is his Letter of Transmission of the people of the United States' Constitution to the President of Congress in 1787, striking the right balance between security

---

[16] Bloomberg, Bloomberg Poll, November 2015 (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, 2015).

[17] Pew Research Center, "Most Expect 'Occasional Acts of Terrorism' in the Future. Six-in-Ten Say Post-9/11 Steps Have Made Country Safer," 2013, http://www.people-press.org/2013/04/23/most-expect-occasional-acts-of-terrorism-in-the-future.

[18] This consensus is summarized in Mike Bourne, Understanding Security (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), Chapter 4: "The Sovereign State and Internal Security" (71-92).

and liberty is a cultural accomplishment, since a written constitution itself cannot set a perennial standard for a republic and democracy to maintain equilibrium between the two guiding values of security and liberty. As Washington pointed out, a balance can only be found on a case by case basis, depending on circumstances and societal objectives:

> *"It is obviously impracticable in the Federal Government of these States to secure all rights of independent sovereignty to each, and yet provide for the interest and safety of all. Individuals entering into society must give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest. The magnitude of the sacrifice must depend as well on situation and circumstance, as on the object to be obtained. It is at all times difficult to draw with precision the line between those rights which must be surrendered, and those which may be preserved; and, on the present occasion, this difficulty was increased by a difference among the several States as to their situation, extent, habits, and particular interests."*[19]

Homeland security strategy in the United States, and elsewhere,[20] recognizes this by acknowledging that there is no perfect state of security in democratic society because then, there would be no liberty and no freedom. U.S. homeland security strategy further acknowledges that the beacon to reconcile providing national security with securing civil liberty is the concept of security as the preservation of a society's commonly acquired values,

---

[19] George Washington, "Letter from the Federal Convention President to the President of Congress, Transmitting the Constitution," September 17, 1787, http://www.constitutionfacts.com/us-constitution-amendments/letter-of-transmittal.

[20] For homeland security as a transnational policy area also exerted by other countries than the United States, see Anja Dalgaard-Nielsen and Daniel S. Hamilton, eds., Transatlantic Homeland Security: Protecting Society in the Age of Catastrophic Terrorism (London et al: Routledge, 2006); Giorgio Franceschetti and Marina Grossi, eds., Homeland Security: Threats, Countermeasures, and Privacy Issues (Norwood, MA: Artech House, 2011); Nadav Morag, Comparative Homeland Security: Global Lessons, 2nd ed. (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2018); Christian Kaunert, Sarah Leonard, and Patryk Pawlak, eds., European Homeland Security: A European Strategy in the Making? (New York: Routledge, 2012); Gert Vermeulen and Wendy De Bondt, Justice, Home Affairs and Security: European and International Institutional and Policy Development (Antwerpen: Maklu, 2015); Alexander Siedschlag and Andrea Jerković, "Foresighting Needs for Secure Societies '2035': Scenario-Based Approaches to Futuristic European Union Policies as a Comprehensive Security Provider," 33-84 in Security Risks: Assessment, Management and Current Challenges, ed. Milica Bosković (New York: NOVA Science, 2017).

that is, the "American Way of Life" as referenced in the "Homeland Security Vision."[21]

Prevention – the prevalence of culture

As the emphasis on the "American Way of Life" illustrates, culture aspects are a main ingredient of the homeland security approach to preparedness and prevention. At the same time, since homeland security is a whole-community enterprise, it cannot be its purpose to create a single normatively laden security culture. As an all hazards-based, whole community-focused effort, homeland security also is becoming increasingly integrated with human security goals: security as human/societal growth that transcends prevention and protection and includes freedom from fear, freedom from want, new security domains, etc.[22] Concurrently, a lot of the prevention effort in homeland security has become technology focused.[23] However, this involves a series of challenges for the value basis of the homeland security enterprise, such as the following:

- More robust infrastructure for capturing, storing, processing, and visualizing very large social media datasets and its implications for fundamental citizens' rights, freedom of expression and data privacy issues;
- Need of development of technology for privacy and trusted data by design along with security-enhancing technology;
- User-driven shifts in use of technology, and related changes in ethical acceptability of that technology;
- Risk of oversophisticated technology that does not respond well to security gaps and/or citizens' needs;
- Assessment of security technology opportunities/possibilities vs. citizens' needs

---

[21] As noted above, the "homeland security vision" is "[a] homeland that is safe, secure, and resilient against terrorism and other hazards, where American interests, aspirations, and way of life can thrive." See U.S. Department of Homeland Security, The 2014 Quadrennial Homeland Security Review, 14.

[22] Laura Neack, National, International, and Human Security: A Comparative Introduction, 2nd ed. (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017).

[23] See John G. Voeller, ed., Wiley Handbook of Science and Technology for Homeland Security (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2010); Ryan K. Baggett, Chad S. Foster, and Brian K. Simpkins, eds., Homeland Security Technologies for the 21st Century (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2017).

- Security economics (e.g., unintended consequences of "smart" and effects-based approaches);
- Creation of different levels of security in society, following different availability of access to and affordability of technology; and
- Need to provide norms and standards beyond security technology frameworks.

Hence it is important to bear in mind that there is more than a societal dimension to security: the societal creation of security. There are no effective technological solutions without acceptance and public participation. We must consider significant social, cultural, ethical, legal, and political aspects of security from the very beginning. Security is a collective good which in the first place relates to citizens and society, and their needs and requirements:

"A preventative security culture is based on systemic approaches to managing a complex environment, supported by scenario foresight studies and methodologies to increase situational awareness, such as intelligence analysis, information sharing, and risk communication. With the evolution of the advanced persistent threat environment, as probably best represented by the cyber dimension, it will be important to maintain a democratic culture of threat prevention, rested on the balance between security and informational self-determination and liberty. This also includes nations' mutual awareness of and respect for often culture-specific efforts to produce and spread domestic security standards."[24]

Therefore, security must to relate to citizens in an inclusive way, integrating their perspectives into security policy cycles. Not only a comprehensive approach that unifies efforts will be needed in future preparedness efforts, but also a holistic approach that comprises technology, society, culture and change.

---

[24] Andrea Jerković, "Homeland Security Cultures to Foster a Resilient Nation while Securing the 'Blessings of Liberty'," 297-316 in Alexander Siedschlag and Andrea Jerković, eds., Homeland Security Cultures: Enhancing Values while Fostering Resilience (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2018), 310-311.

Content

II. Lectures and Documents from the 14th Annual International Forum

III. Annex