

Homeland Security: Ready or Not, Here It Comes

Panel Title:
Homeland Security and Public Administration: Momentum for Change

David H. McIntyre, PhD
Director, Integrative Center for Homeland Security
and
Director, Graduate Certificate in Homeland Security
George Bush School of Government and Public Service
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas
Office: 979-862-2432
Cell: 979-862-2432
mcintyredh@tamu.edu

Paper Prepared for the
Minnowbrook III Conference
The Future of Public Administration, Public Management, and
Public Service around the World
Sponsored by The Maxwell School of Syracuse University
September 5-7, 2008
Lake Placid, New York

Version: September 3, 2008

Abstract

The development of homeland security provides an opportunity which only arises every half century or so: the opportunity to shape a new academic discipline or sub-discipline. Not everyone is comfortable with the development of homeland security for a variety of reasons, some of them very good. But the concerns it is designed to address are real, and it has already reshaped the federal government and its relationship with state, local, and private officials in many ways. Technology is accelerating this trend, and will profoundly impact the relationship between government and citizens. The range of issues touched by homeland security is exceptionally broad. To get the study right, someone needs to provide a broad overarching vision for how these diverse issues fit together, and then coordinate the resulting research. Public administration is a logical candidate for this role.

Homeland Security: Ready or Not, Here It Comes

This will not be a standard academic paper, nor is it a security analysis of homeland issues as my background might suggest. Instead this is an exhortation - a call to arms, if you will - for the academic community in general and for public administration in particular.

This exhortation is intended for the members of the public administration community who are attending the Minnowbrook III Conference to examine the future direction of their academic community -- an opportunity which arises only once every score of years. Similarly, the development of homeland security provides an opportunity which only arises every half century or so: the opportunity to shape a new academic discipline or sub-discipline. Political science saw such an opportunity with the rise of International Relations beginning in 1919. Security studies was born of a similar opportunity at the beginning of the Cold War. Public administration is the logical home for a new opportunity to coordinate the many facets of the rise of public safety and security studies. But if scholars in public administration don't hurry, they will miss this opportunity, as government and private leaders move forward without their advice, and other more narrow scholars and disciplines step in to fill the need. .

Homeland security itself, whether by this name or another, is now solidly rooted in the United States government. It involves hundreds of thousands of employees in several major federal departments, and expenditures of more than \$40 billion each year from DHS alone. It is incorporated into almost every aspect of our daily lives, from school, to workplace, to travel, to how we communicate. Its reach and impact are growing, but at the direction of operators who have a job to get done this afternoon, and leaders with a mandate for public safety and security who are already faintly suspicious of the open ended nature of scholarly discussions.

And so the impact of theory and solid scholarly research has been minimal on this new field and the day-to-day operations of government security organizations. There is still a chance for solid research to develop theories and concepts that might guide forward movement in this largest reorganization of American government in fifty years. Indeed, many public and private leaders are looking for academic guidance for their actions and support for their decision. But if those scholars with an overarching integrative approach do not step forward, learn about this new field, and begin to make solid intellectual contributions themselves, other more aggressive forces will step forward to seize the day. And if we as citizens do not learn to control homeland security, it may in the future come to control us. Because ready or not, here it comes.

In speaking and teaching around the United States, I find great confusion on the issue of why homeland security exists as a government function or as an academic endeavor. Some think it exists today only because of a dire threat from radical extremists to attack America at any moment. Others think such a threat is and has been oversold as an excuse for political maneuvering. The truth is we have entered a new era, when a variety of new challenges are impacting us all at the same time. It would have been helpful if scholars or political leaders had adequately foretold these challenges and explained them early to a public caught unawares on 911. [see Note 1] Here is the

narrative they should have crafted to explain the challenges that homeland security is designed to meet.

The fundamental domestic danger we face today is not the rise of a specific terrorist or terrorist group or ideology. Instead is the broad diffusion of knowledge, precisely at the moment that some of that knowledge has become extremely dangerous.

For example, there was a time that only a major power could develop a nuclear weapon. It took a large and wealthy nation state to support the universities that would create the large teams of scientists required for such an endeavor. It took a nation state to produce the electrical power and other resources required for a nuclear program. It took a nation state to develop the technicians and the military capability to deliver such a weapon once it was created. Today that knowledge and those resources are more broadly available; smaller powers, and even non-state actors may soon have access to nuclear weapons. A similar story is unfolding in the area of bio-security. As recently as two decades ago, the skills and technologies to weaponize dangerous pathogens resided only in a few major powers. Today, the technology to mill a substance finely enough to be used as an aerosol agent is widely available. Biotechnology and nanotechnology advances are spreading from lab to lab around the world. Knowledge has gone global. Techniques that were once available only in the Soviet bio labs can today be attempted in a first rate high school laboratory. One best-selling toy on Amazon.com last Christmas was a DNA test kit for ages 12 and up. So while the FBI pursued the Una-bomber for 17 years, it appears that one day soon, they may have to pursue the una-geneticist. This growing spread of knowledge means a rising availability of big weapons to small people, and that is changing the whole concept of domestic security. Homeland security is a direct outgrowth of this change. So Osama bin Laden were captured today, concerns over the eventual domestic use of weapons of mass destruction would not disappear. {see Note 2]

That said, it is true that we do in fact, have a dedicated enemy. Al Qaeda and other Islamic fundamentalists remain our most serious international terror concern. They have been reduced by concerted police and military actions in cooperation with others worldwide. But the 911 commission found their ideology dangerous and dangerously appealing to some parts of the world, and that has not changed.. Al Qaeda is not hiding under every bed, but the best intelligence publicly available, says it does remain dangerous and will strike again if it gets the chance. [ODNI, 2007]

Put that together with the continuing rise in the availability of WMD information, and we do have reason for continuing concern over a significant domestic attack.

In addition to the dangers posed by new technology and a dangerous, if somewhat degraded enemy, we find that our own progress has brought challenges of its own. The efficiency and effectiveness of specialization in the development of just in time production and delivery techniques have left our society more complex and more susceptible to interruptions in government, communications, and business connectivity than ever before. Hospitals that once kept a three-week supply of medical goods, now keep a three-day supply, saving on inventory, and depending on just-in-time delivery to support their patients. Supermarkets save the cost of overhead by keeping only three to four days worth of food on their shelves. Petroleum terminals may maintain only half of the inventory today that they kept on hand in the past when delivery operations were less sophisticated. Such techniques improve service and hold down costs, but leave our

society more brittle, so that a relatively local problem, like a storm or electrical outage, might cascade through our nation's critical infrastructure.

The problem, in short, is that new technology, and especially new information technology, leaves the national vulnerable in new ways. And the solutions must cross traditional boundaries of government agencies and academic disciplines.

In the wake of 9/11 and hurricane Katrina, many educational institutions did respond to student and government demand for more and better training and education in the area of homeland security prevention, protection, response and recovery. These efforts in course and curriculum development have been well documented by Dr. Dale Jones in his paper, "The Homeland Security Spectrum: Public Administration at the Core," presented at this conference. [Jones, 2008] There is no need to repeat them here. Curiously, however, much of the homeland security curriculum developed nationally remains focused on the *activities* of government and business organizations at all levels. What is noticeably missing from the study of homeland security, despite recent interest in research from the perspective of several existing academic disciplines, is any set of principles or theories for how homeland security works. Despite course offerings in homeland security in more than 400 schools and universities, homeland security training and education remain largely a matter of teaching what policies and practices are in place. The positing and testing of theories that would improve integrated administration across government and public-private organizations is largely missing.

Perhaps one reason we have not seen more interest in studying the cross disciplinary integration of the public administration of government and private organizations faced with homeland security challenges has been uncertainty among experts in existing academic disciplines of exactly what should be included in the study of homeland security. Official definitions have been little help in this regard. The term homeland defense (or homeland security) was coined in a Department of Defense report released in December of 1997. [NDP, 1997] This report by the National Defense Panel used for the first time two terms now broadly used in the popular lexicon. One was "transformation". The suggestion here was that applying new capabilities from the "information revolution" to the Department of Defense could help it leap over mere modernization of equipment and "transform" the very way it fought wars and did business. In the process of making this point, the report noted that the information revolution would support the worldwide growth of terrorism which would eventually make it to American shores. America, the authors suggested, would have to begin thinking about domestic or "homeland" security.

Unfortunately, the term was not defined in the report, and it remained undefined by any authoritative government source until the first *National Security Strategy for Homeland Security* was published in the summer of 2002. [White House, 2002] That White House document defined homeland security as "a concerted national effort to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce America's vulnerability to terrorism, and minimize the damage and recover from attacks that do occur."

The result of this definition, compounded by a government wide emphasis on "low hanging fruit" (funding issues and improvements that could be addressed rapidly) was an unfortunate over focus on the most narrow aspects of fighting terrorism to the exclusion of broader and deeper issues of homeland security. The top priorities for the

new Department of Homeland Security (DHS), as reflected in the national strategy and in the initial organization of the department were:

- Borders
- Bioterrorism (quickly changed to threats from Weapons of Mass Destruction)
- Training First Responders
- Intelligence Sharing
- Alerts (System and Response)

This focus, as demonstrated by all the Homeland Security Presidential Directives issued prior to the disaster of hurricane Katrina, was related primarily to terrorism prevention and protection. Initial curriculum development nationwide reflected these priorities which were reinforced by homeland security academic research priorities identified by the United States Northern Command, FEMA, and the tasking for the initial academic Centers of Excellence developed by DHS. [see Note 3]

However, the aftermath of Katrina demonstrated the breadth of issues involved in response and recovery of civil society on a grand scale. At about the same time, concern over pandemic flu drove a similar recognition that a huge range of government responsibilities, business concerns, and academic disciplines are involved in the field of homeland security. Most recently, a series of hearings by Senator Lieberman's committee on response and recovery to a catastrophic event have demonstrated the same point. When you look beyond defense against point attacks by individual terrorists, almost every aspect of academic teaching and research applies in some way to homeland security. What is missing is some overarching was to connect them and thus focus interdisciplinary study.

Again, Jones paper does an excellent job of summarizing the multiple academic disciplines which we now see are involved in the field of homeland security, from architecture to zoology. [Jones, 2008] Another way to understand the scope of the task involved in bringing academic and intellectual coherence to the field of homeland security is to look in some depth at the academic research tool offered online by the Integrative Center for Homeland Security at Texas A&M.

The point of this five year effort is to essentially let the field of homeland security define itself. Each day a team of graduate research assistance under the direction of faculty who teach homeland security at the graduate level, and a professional archivist who runs the team scans a broad range of online and library publications looking for reports, documents and articles that would seem to have a lasting relevance for the field. No newspaper articles, editorial comments or other lightweight material is included, but neither is the focus primarily peer-reviewed academic articles. The idea is to capture what really seems to matter to government and private officials for both the short and the long term. Examples would be high-profile academic articles, special reports by think tanks, and the products of government commissions, along with products by well established government offices, like the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Research Service. The selected documents are reduced to an abstract and posted to an online repository along with an electronic link to the article itself. The professional archivist and faculty members provide quality control on the selection and posting of the abstracts. The program is called the Taxonomy for Education and Exploration (TEX) and resides at <http://homelandsecurity.tamu.edu> .

The original intent of this program was to provide a running start for new students and even new faculty trying to come quickly up to speed across the entire breadth of homeland security issues. Decisions concerning which documents to collect are primarily professional judgments and certainly subject to bias. But with more than 9000 articles now collected and categorized, the abstracts have collected into interesting patterns around high-profile issues. Like magnetic filings shaken onto paper over a magnet, the collective summaries reveal some strong lines and some unanticipated connections between topics.

The resulting structure forms the foundation for the curriculum offered in the graduate certificate program in homeland security at the Bush school at Texas A&M. A quick review this taxonomy offers an interesting look at what subjects should be included under the broad rubric of homeland security. A key question for academicians, starting with those in public administration, is how the links between these various focus areas can be examined; operators and public / private officials will want to know how homeland security efforts in these many different areas can be managed and coordinated. The taxonomy includes:

- **Terrorism and counterterrorism**, both domestic and international with separate studies on political organizations, leaders, and individual members
- The standard set of **threats** to include chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosives, along with cyber, a separate heading for electromagnetic pulse, and a new grouping of natural disasters. This last heading is growing rapidly, reflecting the new research being done by emergency management programs. Noticeably lacking, however, is any extensive work on the subject of response and recovery to really catastrophic attacks, like nuclear or biological.
- Next is an entire heading on **critical infrastructure** with a major focus on the **National Infrastructure Protection Plan**, and individual subheadings for each of the major sectors like food, energy, transportation and continuity of government. Also included is an area that tracks progress in public-private partnerships across these various sectors. The importance of this area cannot be over emphasized. Note for example, that infrastructure issues are the primary obstacle to returning evacuees from hurricane Gustav to their homes and communities. Here then is a major area of operations and a potential area of study that barely existed seven years ago and today is critical to the administration of government and government services at all levels.
- **Government organization** holds an important place on the framework and tracking rapid changes here has proven difficult. It's not just the continuing reorganization of DHS that is so important and so difficult follow, but major changes to other government organizations as well. The FBI for example has created an entirely new field in counterterrorism. The intelligence community has changed in the number of members included and in its structure, and the Director of National Intelligence is continuing to adjust its budget and policies.

- Changes in the **Department of Defense** are so extensive that they require a separate heading on the framework. DOD has established a new four-star command, subordinate commands for each of the military services, and subordinate staffs co-located with FEMA regional headquarters. New units in both the active military and the National Guard have been created to deal with homeland security crises.
- Understanding the **planning and budgeting** process for homeland security is now as arcane and essential as understanding similar processes for DOD and the Department of State.
- A new area of homeland security and national security **law** has emerged. Early on, this area contained references only to the Patriot Act, and the act that established DHS. But issues involving civil rights, civil liberties, surveillance, and freedom of the press are growing at a rapid rate.
- **State and local** issues require their own heading and are extremely diverse. It's important to understand that while we have a federal government of enumerated powers, so that powers not designated for the federal level are reserved to the states, in fact just the opposite is true in many states. In Texas, for example, political powers not designated for county, city and local officials are in fact reserved to the state. The precise ordering of these powers is different for every state and territory, and even tribal organizations. Integration of efforts is impossible without understanding these relationships. And to complicate matters, this relationship may change according to the subject at hand, with one set of state and local officials having authority over issues like law enforcement, and an entirely different structure of officials having authority over, for example, Public Health.
- **Cyber Security** and **Emergency Management** are two well developed fields in their own right, with direct application to homeland security, so.
- While primarily large city-based businesses looked to revising their policies after 9/11, virtually every business took note of the challenges presented to the business community by hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The result has been an explosion of effort in the field of **business continuity planning (BCP)**, and continuity for the business community as a whole. (The latest business community to make major efforts in BCP is universities.) Success here frequently depends on close continuing relations with state and local officials. So public-private partnerships are issues of serious interest here as well.
- Of **special note** are major federal efforts included under the **National Preparedness Program**, which involves both government agencies and to some extent, businesses and individuals. Major subordinate issues include the **National Incident Management System (NIMS)**, and the **National Response Framework**. These three issues overlap and interact; understanding them is critical to understanding how homeland security plays out at the local level.
- Finally some issues are mentioned so frequently and prominently in TEX, that they are allocated separate files and headings. These include the **15**

national scenarios against which organization and operations are tested at every level of government. Other separate headings include **wildfires, floods, and hurricanes**. The heading of **Safe schools** has grown to the point that it certainly demands individual attention.

- Under consideration is a new category with some overlap that would look at **response and recovery from exceptionally destructive events** like the detonation of a nuclear weapon in a city. It is not surprising that special reports, like those from RAND and physicians groups, as well as testimony from Senator Lieberman's homeland security committee, have demonstrated a necessity for such a research and curriculum category. What is surprising is how thin is the research and curriculum located thus far by our archiving team. Even a cursory examination of this area on our framework would lead one to expect exactly the results we are seeing along the Gulf Coast today. The greatest challenge of hurricane response is how restart a community after the people are gone, and some of the infrastructure is destroyed. The TEX framework makes it clear that this would be a very profitable area for future study.

Over the past three years, all of these areas highlighted by the natural grouping of key summaries into the homeland security taxonomy have been rolled into the curriculum of the homeland security certificate program of the Bush School located at Texas A&M. A recent review and analysis of the framework has identified a number of additional areas where articles, publications and reports are so numerous and significant as to indicate that the area should be examined for possible inclusion in homeland security graduate curriculum. These areas include:

- **Natural Disasters**
- **National Infrastructure Protection Plan**
- **National Response Framework**
- **National Preparedness Plan**
- **Planning and Budgeting**
- **15 National Planning Scenarios**
- **Emergency Support Functions (ESFs)**
- **Business Continuity Planning**
- **Leadership, Quality Management and Assessment**
- **Catastrophic Event Response and Recovery**
- **School Safety**
- **Work Place Safety / Threat Assessment**
- **Risk Communications, Crisis Communications, Communications Systems**
- **Risk Assessment and Risk Management**
- **Intelligence, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties**
- **Resiliency**

This is hardly the only such effort to identify what curriculum should go into a homeland security academic program. NORTHCOM began a program to identify important curriculum considerations nearly 4 years ago. Today that effort is carried on by the Homeland Security and Defense Educational Consortium. The Naval Postgraduate School has worked hard to establish itself as the national liaison on curriculum issues

between universities and the departments of Homeland Security and Defense. (It also has a much larger collection of online summaries of major documents, although the framework of that collection does not appear to be aligned with curriculum development as it is at Texas A&M.) But the TEX framework does have the advantage of being undirected. That is, it is not connected to some higher project which might influence its shape. Instead, what the collective topics really tell us is the range of major issues that need to be incorporated into the overarching study of homeland security. The question is, what academic discipline might have both the visibility and a mandate to provide a home and a launching point for such a study? The obvious choice is public administration.

The opportunity to play such a formative role in the development of a new field, and actually shape the outcome of events at the national or even international level arises only infrequently. Political science had such an opportunity early in its history with the development of International Relations, Collective Security, and International Organization, all soon after the First World War. Unfortunately, it took more than 30 years for this relationship to mature to the point that research activities in the classroom were reflected as influences on actual government programs and behavior.

Similarly, Security Studies had a one-time opportunity to establish its interest in defense studies, deterrence and arms control early in their development.

Emergency Management and Public Health are two fields that have redesigned themselves, recently refining their boundaries and their focus, in order to include specific homeland security issues.

But no academic discipline has yet grabbed the totality of homeland security, and made integration of the various parts its own academic quest. As a result, the study of homeland security remains fragmented, and despite the best efforts of some in the field, real integration and progress are being made not in the hotbeds of intellectual experimentation but among the responders and other front line operators. A case in point, as previously mentioned, is the final phase of the hurricane Gustav saga. Having successfully evacuated more than 2 million people from the path of a potential category four storm, government officials are finding the return of evacuees to be a bigger challenge than their departure. The truth is that nobody really knows how to start up a town again. How do you get the right people back at the right time to establish basic infrastructure, so that large numbers of people don't return to find their homes undamaged but the living conditions unbearable?

The core of the issue is really found in the green pages of the local telephone book. The reach of city and county government in most places is remarkable. This structure, whether of a county or parish or township, reflects a remarkable array of skills and essential services that must be coordinated, from water and utilities to law enforcement and family services. To see the impact of shortages or poor planning on a community, just watch what happens when a methadone clinic closes and does not reopen when its patients return. Yet city managers and county judges are forced to figure out solutions to these challenges on the ground, because they have no real research databases, theories or recommended solutions upon which to draw.

Despite the clear need for someone to address these over arching integrated problems, academia just has not yet turned its attention to finding integrated solutions. Again, public administration is a clear candidate for this job.

This is not to suggest that intellectual work is completely lacking in the field of homeland security. In fact, a robust and diverse literature has developed over the last several years, some of it directly applicable to the challenges faced by government leaders. One case in point is an article by Andrew J. Healey, who looked at the perplexing question of whether voters reward politicians who implement mitigation techniques to prevent disasters, or prefer politicians who wait until the damage is done, and then vote large amounts of money for recovery. [Healey, 2008] His distressing conclusion is that the latter is the case: voters reward recovery, not prevention. But he does offer an interesting anomaly in a single case where an elected official was rewarded by local voters for mitigation activities. The key, it turns out, is that those activities were funded and conducted at the local level. The implication for homeland security programs is clear: in order to get people to take action to reduce costs and danger before crisis arises, both the problem and the solution must be cast in local terms.

Another recent work with direct implications for homeland security policy is *The Unthinkable* by Amanda Ripley. [Ripley, 2008] She examines the interesting question of why some people survive disasters while others with an equal chance do not. Her answer has to do with mindset and personal preparedness, which stem directly from training and education. Ripley is a journalist, not an academic scholar, but her research is impressive (most of it primary in nature) and her examples arresting. In one wonderful example she points to a major restaurant fire where employees transitioned automatically into roles similar to those of their day to day jobs. Cooks and busboys fought the fire. Management coordinated with the fire department. And table hostesses guided patrons to safety, *but only for their assigned tables!* Habits of training and mind are demonstrated to come to the fore in crisis, and the implications for homeland security training and education are compelling.

A third example of a solid academic work which could have direct impact on the field is Clare Rubin's *Emergency Management: The American Experience, 1900-2005*. [Rubin, 2007] By putting major American disasters in historical perspective, she is able to explain the direct political impact of such events, and raise some remarkably prescient warnings about policy actions, reactions, and over reactions. The work is already having a direct impact on the argument over whether to keep FEMA inside DHS or separate it out into its own cabinet level agency.

The reluctance of established scholars in an established discipline to embrace a new field, where even the definitions are not yet firmly established is understandable. The learning curve is steep, and the work required to establish expertise in this new field is significant. It will take an exceptional Dean to encourage a young scholar to pursue a field where the route to tenure is not yet clear or certain -- and an exceptional candidate to run such a risk. But the potential rewards for solid scholarship and the opportunity to make a significant impact on national thinking about homeland security are self evident. The emergence of a group of scholars who would order, focus, and apply such scholarship could be profound.

The progress of homeland security will not be delayed while we wait to decide if the field is worthy of our attention. Major forces are at work reshaping the American government and its relationship with its citizens, with or without the contribution of American scholarship. One example is in the field of the domestic intelligence, where several strong forces are colliding to rapidly reshape this issue. First, technology is

rapidly developing extraordinary capabilities. We could discuss biometrics or new systems of individual tracking and identification. But let's focus just on the technological development of cameras and sound systems.

Technology is now available to link government cameras from multiple sources with private cameras (given their permissions). And so in Great Britain, for example, it is possible to follow a person on the street by camera, follow them into and through a subway and out at a far station, and then into a private restaurant (if the restaurant cooperates). Aside from privacy concerns, which have become a hot topic in the United States, there is a developing debate over just how and why such surveillance should be used. With too few terrorists available to occupy the significant counterterrorism investments now in place, many local municipalities have begun using their surveillance systems for mundane tasks like following people electronically to see if they pick up after their dogs, and issuing citations for failure to do so. In a recent case uncovered by the BBC, local authorities followed every step a family made for several weeks, trying to prove that their children were enrolled in the wrong school system. [BBC, 2008]

By logical extension, a number of localities in the United States have found red light cameras to be a significant revenue producer. It is not much of a stretch to see how the extensive camera systems being built around the United States could be converted to such use. Do we really want is a system where counterterrorism surveillance cameras become revenue generators, watching for jaywalkers and people who water their lawns during periods of restricted water use? Or, in fact, are these legitimate law enforcement activities, where no one is being inconvenienced except for those who disobey the rules?

And this is only the tip of the iceberg. Sound technology is allowing those street cameras to be equipped with directional microphones, which can be centrally monitored. Beyond the legal concerns, is this a good idea for civil society or not? [Nilsson, 2008]

And beyond the simple question of cameras and microphones, lies the new approach called intelligence led policing. Every state and many cities have now created their own domestic intelligence fusion centers. But with no previous models to work from, and little guidance from academic research, the centers are feeling their way along, being careful not to trip over civil rights and civil liberties issues in the process. A huge amount of information is now flowing between law enforcement agencies and these new offices, and the use of specially trained people to receive and evaluate that information is surely a good idea. But how exactly this approach to intelligence will impact law enforcement culture remains to be seen. [Rollins, 2008]

The closest comparison we can draw with these new capabilities is the tactical intelligence process in the military. There, anyone in the target area is generally regarded as a potential enemy, who must prove that they are friendly to prevent being treated as a hostile. Translating that approach to domestic intelligence collection and use in what some have called the "domestic battle space" would mean assuming citizens observed on a day-to-day basis would be regarded as potentially hostile until proven friendly. How might this impact short and long term relations between police and citizens? Covert technologies are moving rapidly in this direction, and elected officials are not likely to have the time to recognize and pursue such questions on their own. Academicians with a broad vision of how government should work could make a very valuable contribution both in studying systems as they are implemented, and in educating potential users and potential subjects of such surveillance what to expect.

Interestingly, my informal surveys of faculty at several universities indicates a strong degree of student interest in the security aspects of public administration. But it is faculty, and especially faculty with an established a reputation in the field, who will decide whether to welcome this new field of study into their domain. Perhaps they would be encouraged by the idea that they have an extraordinary opportunity to influence how homeland security plays out as part of the future of the nation.

A final example: the name "homeland security," which is not fixed in stone. In fact, it emerged rather accidentally from the early DOD report previously referenced, and almost no one really likes it. An excellent candidate for replacement is the term "civil security" -- a term now used in much of Europe and encouraged by NATO schools teaching homeland security issues. The term has tested well in informal soundings of numerous audiences, as it replaces the specter of "guns gates and guards" with an interest in protecting civil society, while maintaining civil liberties and civil rights. But any single individual -- even the most senior elected official -- would have a hard time changing the name at this point because of the political baggage it carries. However, a concerted effort by members of an academic discipline, who decided to make a study of the subject their own, could very well provide enough leverage to change the name, and redirect the future of the field.

And that's my exhortation. The field of homeland security is still changing, and the role of academic guide, gatekeeper, and intellectual quality assurance inspector is still up for grabs. Others with more narrow visions are seeking that mantle of leadership. Public administration has a broad base, a broad vision, and a solid reputation that would allow it to seize the moment. Failing to do so will not slow the train of homeland security. It will simply leave the driving to someone else. Because ready or not, here it comes.

References

Note 1

Although not widely accepted or use in academia, several government commissions did actually foresee changes in the world that would bring terrorism to the shores of the United States.

NEW WORLD COMING:AMERICAN SECURITY IN THE 21ST CENTURY (also known as the Hart Rudman Commission) 3 reports, 1999, 2000, 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century. <http://www.fas.org/man/docs/nwc/>

Report of the Advisory Panel to Assess Domestic Response Capabilities for Terrorism Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction (Gilmore Commission). 5 reports, 1999, 2000,2001, 2002, 2003. Washington, DC: DOD, DOJ, DOE, HHS, FEMA, with RAND. <http://www.rand.org/nsrd/terrpanel/>

Note 2

An excellent set of short fact sheets laying out the various types of terrorist threats that might be mounted within the US is offered by the National Academy of Engineering.

Fact sheets on **Fact Sheets on Terrorist Attacks. Home:**

<http://nae.edu/NAE/pubundcom.nsf/weblinks/CGOZ-642P3W?OpenDocument>

Biological Attack: [http://nae.edu/NAE/pubundcom.nsf/weblinks/CGOZ-6C2MCR/\\$file/Biological%20Attack%2006.pdf](http://nae.edu/NAE/pubundcom.nsf/weblinks/CGOZ-6C2MCR/$file/Biological%20Attack%2006.pdf)

Chemical Attack: [http://nae.edu/NAE/pubundcom.nsf/weblinks/CGOZ-66JRHZ/\\$file/chemical%20attack%2006.pdf](http://nae.edu/NAE/pubundcom.nsf/weblinks/CGOZ-66JRHZ/$file/chemical%20attack%2006.pdf)

Nuclear Attack: [http://nae.edu/NAE/pubundcom.nsf/weblinks/CGOZ-6DZLNU/\\$file/nuclear%20attack%2006.pdf](http://nae.edu/NAE/pubundcom.nsf/weblinks/CGOZ-6DZLNU/$file/nuclear%20attack%2006.pdf)

Radiological Attack: [http://nae.edu/NAE/pubundcom.nsf/weblinks/CGOZ-646NVG/\\$file/radiological%20attack%2006.pdf](http://nae.edu/NAE/pubundcom.nsf/weblinks/CGOZ-646NVG/$file/radiological%20attack%2006.pdf)

Note 3

Unites States Northern Command began sponsoring educational conferences in 2004 and continued to do so on a semi-annual basis until these duties were subsumed completely by the independent Homeland Security and Defense Education Consortium in 2008. As the only venue within the US Government to promote collaboration on homeland security curriculum, these conference had a significant effect on developing the concepts generally accepted in homeland security curriculum today. The Naval Postgraduate School received funding to create a DHS and DOD approved masters degree in homeland security starting in 2003, and has conduced annual meetings since then, offering to distribute this curriculum for free to schools nationwide. The meetings have been successful in stimulating discussion, but universities have be slow to adopt NPS

curriculum wholesale. The FEMA Higher Education project has been promoting the development and distribution of emergency management curriculum for many years, and stepped up those efforts after 9/11, and again after Katrina. However, there is a certain tension between this FEMA asset, its customers, and those teaching the broader subject of homeland security.

British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC). 2008. The BBC has run a series of reports on this subject by different authors, available at:

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/7468430.stm>

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/7369543.stm

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/england/dorset/7343445.stm

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/england/dorset/7341179.stm

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/7230476.stm

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/england/tees/6994381.stm

Healey, Andrew J. 2008. "PREFERRING A POUND OF CURE TO AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION: VOTING, NATURAL DISASTERS, AND GOVERNMENT RESPONSE." Prepared for the 2008 Midwest Political Science Association meeting.

http://myweb.lmu.edu/ahealy/papers/healy_prevention_070808.pdf

Jones, Dale. "The Homeland Security Spectrum: Public Administration at the Core." 2008. Lake Placid, NY: Minnowbrook III Conference. Sept 6.

National Defense Panel (NDP). 1997. Transforming Defense: National Security in the 21st Century. Washington, DC: Department of Defense. December.

<http://www.dtic.mil/ndp/FullDoc2.pdf>

"National Intelligence Estimate: The Terrorist Threat to the Homeland." 2007.

Washington, DC: Office of the Director of National Intelligence, July.

Nilsson, Fredrik. 2008. "Eye on Video: Adding audio intelligence."

securityinfowatch.com . July 24. <http://www.securityinfowatch.com/online/The-Latest/Eye-on-Video--Adding-audio-intelligence/16644SIW306>

Ripley, Amanda. 2008. *The Unthinkable: Who Survives When Disaster Strikes - and Why*.

Rollins, John. 2008. "Fusion Centers: Issues and Options for Congress." Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service. Jan 18.

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/intel/RL34070.pdf>

Rubin, Claire. 2007. *Emergency Management: The American Experience, 1900-2005*. Washington, DC: Public Entity Risk Institute (www.riskinstitute.org).

White House. 2002. *The National Strategy for Homeland Security*. Washington, DC: White House.