Volume 5 Number 2 – October 2007

Preface

Dr Ann Fitz-Gerald

National Security Frameworks: An Appropriate Platform for Improved National Planning

During recent years, a number of western donor countries have recognized the utility of, and need for, more robust and well-articulated national security frameworks. Two interesting phenomena have contributed to the awareness of such a need.

Firstly, the recognition by these countries when assisting in the design and expenditure of developmental assistance programmes that, in many states emerging from conflict, a national security 'system' of sorts becomes a priority. Such a 'security system' will not work if left to develop at municipal or provincial levels within a state, without some parallel efforts towards establishing top-level national ownership behind the security agenda. Whether such ideas become embodied within a peace agreement or within the mandate of a new or provisional government, it is essential that the core foundations for national security provide strategic guidance for the range of other national instruments responsible for implementing security policy. More recently, in a number of international assistance programmes, donor states have encouraged the development of national security frameworks as a way of guiding the evolution of other programme areas (for example in Sierra Leone, Uganda and Jamaica). Whilst such developments are encouraging, they have also served as subtle reminders

to some donor governments that there is room to adopt a similar practice in reviewing the way in which their own governments develop national security policy.

Secondly, in the wake of a broader human security agenda – and following the progress made towards adapting and expanding roles and responsibilities across governments in support of international security priorities - some analysts and senior policymakers are making more efforts to think 'strategically' about national security in order to link up these expanded areas under a more concise central policy remit. Whereas some states already in possession of a national security architecture have used existing frameworks to guide their thinking on broader issues of security, others without such frameworks rely on existing 'joined-up' or 'whole of government' processes to strategize collectively and more coherently.

Whatever the case, what becomes quintessentially important is the analytical and strategic planning process - and the division of appropriate roles and responsibilities - in managing national security. Such a structured approach to national security should not only take account of threats, which tend to be characterised by their potential short to medium term impact, but also a nation's enduring core values such as freedom and social justice and longer term vital interests. Drawing together both the short run (e.g. ongoing terrorist threats to main airports) and long run (over the planning horizon) considerations or drivers for developing a national security strategy calls for rigorous, holistic and imaginative analysis.

This special edition of the *Journal of Security Sector Management* profiles two pieces which further explore such issues. David Chuter's article entitled "From Threats to Tasks: Making and Implementing National Security" analyses the conventional 'threat-based' approaches underpinning security policy development and makes the case for such analysis to be more geared towards 'tasks' as opposed to relying on an age-old 'threatism' paradigm. He contends that a task-based approach to national security planning will channel thinking towards the way in which security policy instruments are organized to support the common interests of a state's citizens. Whilst the defence of such common interests may be related to ongoing threats, they may also be associated to areas in which a country has always possessed different strengths, healthy relationships, and such things that should only be maintained or even bolstered under a more strategic process. Whilst the paper recognizes that such ideas might be applied to broader human security 'issues', Chuter acknowledges that space limitations have narrowed the analysis to dealing only with the more traditional security partners only. These partners include the police, intelligence services and the military.

On the other hand, Erwin van Veen presents a well-structured paper based on the argument that long run national security interests must be linked to an enlarged development agenda. Like Chuter, he discusses the notion of traditional threat-based approaches to analyzing national security. However, van Veen acknowledges that – particularly in fragile states - a longer-term development agenda can contribute significantly to the root causes of state fragility. In this context, he argues that it is not the broader human security issues in these fragile states themselves that lead to

insecurities which guide the threat perceptions of western states; it is rather the privatization of public space in fragile states that offers opportunities to entrepreneurs who engage in harmful activities – the consequences of which are likely to spread globally. Van Veen concludes that, due to the non-linear and long-term nature of development aid, it may at times be in our interests to 'securitize' development. However, in the longer-term, this is unadvisable and more efforts must be made across the donor community - and within the indigenous governments themselves - to link the analysis supporting development aid to global insecurities and therefore, to the national security agendas of donor states.

We hope that you enjoy reading this special edition. In the wake of a number of current national efforts to move forward national security agendas, we feel that the publication of these pieces is highly relevant and critically timely.