Integrated Security Thinking: How Is It Done?
Dispatch no. 3 (10)

FOI's project SÄKER is developing new solutions to some of the dilemmas that decision-makers grapple with. These briefs highlight those insights. One of the questions addressed by the study is to what extent other organisations are working with similar approaches to the study of integrated security. This brief is one of a series that explains the concept of integrated security, as it has been developed by an interdisciplinary team of scientists at FOI, the Swedish Defence Research Agency.

Introduction

Which key actors are working on integrated security? Some forty organisations work on security-related research issues. More precisely, two categories of organisations have a holistic view on security.

One category included nine organisations that refer to a concept of integrated security that resembles FOI's. An essential difference, however, is that those organisations do not emphasise the role that the integration of technologically-based techniques can play in working for integrated security. A second category is made up of five organisations that have an approach that is highly congruent with FOI's, but which is not labelled as comprehensive security per se.

Neither of the two categories coincides exactly with FOI's approach, which appears to be unique in its particular configuration of integrated security. It is broad not only conceptually but also when it comes to its disciplinary inclusiveness. It strongly highlights technical capabilities and practical aspects, as integral to seeing integrated security as an applied concept, which is sought after and created, as a desired condition. This in turn makes it action-oriented and methodological in its concern.

One of the conditions established for the search for similar organisational approaches was that we must stick to a precise terminology. In other words, the search was based on the degree of conformity to the term "comprehensive security". Since that approach produced such scant results, the search was widened one level by scanning for those organisations whose approach to security studies resembled FOI's but that differed in name. Despite the argument that theoretical stringency is breached by accepting the use of other denotative terms, the second category of five organisations could then be derived.

The organisations in the second category are described in some detail below, especially the methodological aspects of their approaches. Because this is the result of a desk study (and some personal contact), the descriptions are qualitatively subjective and highly impressionistic.

To recap, the organisations in the following list discuss and, even more importantly, apply broad definitions of security that resemble FOI's notion of integrated security, but without using the same term for it. They integrate numerous kinds of approaches; include both direct use of sophisticated technologies for primary data gathering; and rely heavily on social science methods. Even though they do not apply conceptual stringency in their discussion of diverse security perspectives, their overall approaches are most comparable to FOI's.

- CIA/CISSM (University of Maryland, USA)

- CISSM, Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland (USA)

- RAND Corporation (USA)

- The Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, CCAPS (Climate Change and African Political Stability), University of Texas at Austin (USA)

- SEI, Stockholm Environment Institute (Sweden)

The CIA/CISSM is not discussed further here, since the actual content is covered by the CISSM stand-alone item. The point of including it was to show that even if the CIA does not itself directly engage in integrated security approaches, it does engage others to work with it on its behalf.

CISSM, Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland

The CISSM's broad approach studies how threats posed by advanced technologies (e.g. nuclear material accounting, pathogens, space weapons) impact on civil conflict, moral issues, governance, regulatory systems and policy, and how

society can respond to emerging challenges such as climate change, geoengineering and cybersecurity. Apart from the usual range of scientific and policy studies, they are deeply engaged in various kinds of outreach at different societal levels. They organise, for example, specialised courses, gaming exercises, citizen involvement workshops, exchanges of experts between Russia and the USA, community debate forums, and so on. In sum, their niche is human security's "high ground", bringing usually elite and high-tech issues to the citizen level, and vice versa.

RAND Corporation

RAND's work does not need introduction. With regard to our present topic, a key difference between RAND and the other three organisations highlighted is that RAND can be typified as a "study-generating machine", that is, it produces studies on demand, on just about any topic. Because RAND seems to have done, or be able to do, studies on "almost everything", its work is difficult to characterise in any specific way. In that sense, it is difficult to say that it has any particular approach, other than that it has almost anything one might be looking for. On the other hand, its Internet presentation provides little opportunity for interaction, something which the remaining two organisations in this brief excel at.

The Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, CCAPS (Climate Change and African Political Stability), University of Texas at Austin

As its website says so succinctly, "CCAPS is funded by the U.S. Department of Defense's Minerva Initiative, a university-based, social science research program focused on areas of strategic importance to national security policy." Just that statement alone is revealing: the 5 million USD Minerva grant vouches for just how importantly climate change is being factored into US security considerations, both locally and abroad. The explicit interdisciplinary nature of the CCAPS approach is also confirmed by the fact that, even though one side of its research works with remote sensing, geographical information systems (GIS) and other forms of physical data gathering, the Minerva funding is for social science research. That dimension is covered by CCAPS' focus on the question of how the interaction and intersection of climate change, conflict, governance and aid affect African and international security. CCAPS works to correlate and validate remote data with on-the-ground local and social intelligence. A unique feature of CCAPS' website is its presentation of "dashboards" that provide the visitor with direct access to user-friendly manuals, entry points and examples of how to use the results of its studies, and, by adding one's own data, contribute to the

sophistication of CCAPS' own data. The CCAPS approach is highly developed, useful and even admirable.

SEI, Stockholm Environment Institute

While the other three organisations profiled here begin with security and include the environment, climate change and human dimensions in order to broaden their approach, the opposite can be said of SEI. It begins with a concern for environmental and ecological questions and broadens its approach to addressing them by including the security dimension. In that way, it is also the most comprehensive and expert in the extra-security, that is, environmental and human, dimensions of a broadened approach. It has an extremely wide range of topics, even to the point where it can appear scattered and diffuse. It applies methods such as participatory, community and stakeholder involvement, action research, co-design, and inter- and trans-disciplinary work, and combines a vast palette of technological, sociological, medical, geographical and humanities methodologies in its comprehensive studies.

FOI
Swedish Defence Research Agency
SE-164 90 Stockholm

Phone: +46 8 5550 3000
Fax: +46 8 5550 3100
www.foi.se