What's in a Name? The Meaning of Homeland Security

JEROME H. KAHAN
jhkahan@cox.net

ABSTRACT

The modern concept of U.S. homeland security has existed since 9/11, with the formation of a cabinet-level department devoted to this issue and a refocusing of national policy and resources to deal with the dangers of terrorism and national disasters that threaten the security and well being of the nation. However, there has never been an agreed definition of the meaning of the term "homeland security."

This article discusses the evolution of homeland security and the many factors affecting development of an official definition. It demonstrates that this concept is part of the broader realm of national security and related to emergency management and homeland defense. The analysis can support homeland security curriculum development and stimulate classroom discussions. It can also be helpful to Department of Homeland Security (DHS) officials, other government officials working in this area, and nongovernmental experts and research organizations with security interests.

INTRODUCTION

The meaning of homeland security has been discussed and debated during the past decade. Notwithstanding its significance, however, there has not been an agreed definition of homeland security for making policies, conducting research, or developing curricula.

A recent report to Congress hones in on the lack of a definition for homeland security by sharply stating:

> Ten years after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, the U.S. government does not have a single definition for 'homeland security.' Currently, different strategic documents and mission statements offer varying missions that are derived from different homeland security definitions (Reese, 2012, p. 1).

The primary aim of this article is to discuss whether—and if so, why—a common meaning of homeland security ought to be developed, the difficulties in trying to do so, and how educators and students might go about developing a useful definition of this concept. Another purpose is to illuminate the overall security context in which homeland security functions.

The analysis in this article can serve as an element in developing homeland security sources of study and holding classroom discussions. With the steady growth of colleges and universities offering courses, certificates, and degrees in homeland security, this application might be of particular interest. This article can also serve as a basis for further research associated with institutions of learning or other organizations where homeland security research is being conducted. Finally, it might be helpful to government officials working in this area and nongovernmental experts and organizations with security interests.

After setting the stage with an overview of national security and a summary of the evolution of modern homeland security, this article discusses official and nongovernmental efforts to develop an agreed meaning of this concept; investigates the scope of homeland security; explores the need for a definition; and covers the role of homeland defense. It then sets out an approach for finding a suitable definition.

Overview of national security. National security is an extremely broad concept that evolves as the international environment changes and domestic circumstances dictate. Some common definitions can be found in dictionaries and reference books on the meaning of national security. Overall, however, there is no accepted definition of this term as can be seen by consulting a variety of articles, books, and other sources of which we have room to cite only a few (Davis, 2010; Watson, 2008; Department of Defense [DoD], 2010a; Romm, 1993).

In most contexts, national security as discussed includes nonmilitary as well as military elements. This view of U.S. national security was shaped in large part by the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 110–53, 2007, Section 101). Perhaps surprising to some, the DoD has officially defined national security for many decades as "a collective term encompassing both national defense and foreign relations of the United States" (DoD, 2010b).

From 1947 onwards, different presidents shaped their views of national security as a function of the differing military, political, economic, and technological environments they faced. Much material has been written on how U.S. national security transitioned from a focus on containing an expansionist USSR within a polarized East–West alliance structure and concern over a potential superpower nuclear conflict to the still-unfolding, more complex, globally oriented, post-Cold War era filled with surprising challenges and new risks. As put by R. James Woolsey during nomination hearings for Director of the Central Intelligence agency, " [i]t's as if we were fighting with dragon for some 45 years and slew the dragon and then found ourselves in a jungle full of a number of poisonous snakes" (Jehl, 1993).

It would take a number of lengthy treatises to capture all the diverse elements of national security, given differing opinions on what it takes to maintain our nation's values, keep our domestic house in order, and exert the global leadership that has

become our role in the world. As a framework for this article, however, it might be useful to summarize some of the key aspects of national security as put forth by President Obama in his National Security Strategy. In this document (Obama, 2010), the President:

- Reiterates our basic national security objectives as seeking to maintain U.S. domestic prosperity within a democratic system, while exerting global leadership and influence, supported by our military might, economic strength, governance structure, and concern over human rights and morale behavior.
- Highlights our "global campaign" against al-Qaida and associated terrorist groups, with attention to ensuring that neither terrorists nor rogue states acquire nuclear weapons.
- Affirms our strong commitment to peaceful resolution of conflicts, but recognizes the need to maintain conventional and nuclear military capabilities to protect our homeland and deter aggression, where and when our interests are at stake.
- Seeks a positive relationship with Russia built upon common interests … and a "constructive and comprehensive" relationship with China.
- Advocates a strategy of engaging with our allies and close friends throughout the world as well as diplomatic and development activities to facilitate efforts to gain political freedom and economic well-being.

The breadth of issues covered within the scope of Obama's view of U.S. national security is evident and not unusual when compared with the approach taken by virtually all Presidents, notably after the Cold War and more so after 9/11. Note how countering terrorism appears explicitly under the national security umbrella, but there are no references to the dangers of national disasters. As we will see, when characterizing homeland security as a subset of national security, the President makes quite clear that national disasters as well as terrorist threats are included.

Evolution of Homeland Security. Homeland security as we now know it did not appear until the U.S. experienced the unprecedented 9/11 terrorist attacks on its soil, although the roots of this concept can be traced at least to the civil and air defense programs of World War II (Department of Homeland Security [DHS], 2008).

*Towards all-hazards***.** After the Cold War ended, global terrorism emerged more starkly on the world scene, with the U.S. experiencing attacks on its embassies in Africa and against the USS Cole (Clinton, 1995, 1997).

The 9/11 attacks led President G.W. Bush to develop a White House Office of Homeland Security (OHS), produce a homeland security strategy, and replace OHS with a new cabinet level DHS in 2002 (DHS, 2008).

Not surprisingly, these initiatives gave prominence to the challenge of terrorism, especially if coupled with weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Recall President G. W. Bush's memorable statement, directed at rogue states as well as terrorists, "[w]e are committed to keeping the world's most dangerous weapons out of the hands of the world's most dangerous people" (2006, Section V Heading).

Congress also granted this new department responsibility for carrying out "all functions of entities transferred to the Department, by acting as a focal point regarding natural and manmade crises and emergency planning" (Public Law 107–296, Section 101(b), 2002). To keep the nation focused on the terrorist threat, these other homeland security concerns were not advertised by DHS and the White House as being an important part of homeland security policy until Hurricane Katrina reminded the nation that Mother Nature can pack a punch more catastrophic than most terrorist strikes.

With increasing emphasis over the past decade, an "all-hazards" approach to homeland security was taken. This approach is aimed at ensuring that the nation could deal not only with terrorist threats, but also with major disasters "caused by human behavior or cataclysmic megadisasters such as floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, or tsunami" as well as pandemics and cyber-attacks (Bush, 2006, Section X).

The never-ending list. When DHS was formed, the Department was given a significant array of explicitly designated *non*-homeland security responsibilities in addition to its primary homeland security missions. This was due to the large number of agencies and components transferred into the new department that had responsibilities in addition to those dealing with homeland security (Public Law 107–296, Section 101(b), 2002).

These inherited non-homeland security missions are quite extensive and include dealing with transnational criminal threats; administering and enforcing our immigration laws; ensuring that appropriate customs fees are paid; preventing successful money laundering; keeping our waterways safe; intercepting smuggling over the border of drugs, arms, humans, and illegal flora and fauna; and enforcing customs regulations (DHS, 2008; Daalder, Dester, Lindsay, Light, Litan, O'Hanlon, 2002).

A number of paths could have been followed in creating a new agency for homeland security, such as allocating non-homeland security tasks of agencies transferred to the new department to existing non-DHS agencies or forming new agencies for these functions. Given the intense pressure to form a homeland security agency, Congress and the administration chose the quickest and easiest solution. However, this path of least resistance has had the effect of diluting the main priorities of the new agency, making it difficult to determine DHS policy and budget priorities—and of course complicating the meaning of homeland security (de Rugy, 2005).

Besides the non-homeland security responsibilities inherited by DHS, a plethora of additional ideas have been put forth over the past decade about dangers the nation ought to consider as potentially endangering our security. Here are examples from a few sources (Sachs, 2003; Sarkesian, Williams & Cimbala, 2008; Bush, 2002, 2006):

- Protecting the territory of a nation, its institutions, and governance; ensuring its economic viability including available energy, its human capital, and availability of natural resources; and maintaining a safe and healthy environment.
- Preserving the quality of life globally, including sustainable development; preventing environmental degradation; eliminating global disease and hunger; controlling population growth and migration; averting global warming; and enabling access to clean food and water.

The first group highlights fundamental elements of maintaining and bettering our way of life. The second group reflects a cross-section of a growing list of globally oriented concerns that might adversely affect the U.S. Prospective threats to the nation in both groups are of relatively long-term concern, pose extremely complex political, economic, societal, and technological solutions, and entail integration of domestic and international policies and programs.

It would be a stretch to include these types of dangers in our homeland security strategy. They are not to be found in the legislation establishing DHS or in such seminal documents as the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review (QHSR). Given its very nature, homeland security needs to be a practical and operationally oriented concept, not a place to put all present and potential security, economic, societal, and environmental issues, which could be part of the extremely broad and often elusive meaning of national security, as noted above. This does not mean, however, that a definition does not need to remain flexible enough to change as a result of possible sea changes in the near term threat environment.

From the opposite perspective, these concerns can be used to support the argument that properly defining homeland security would be useful if for no other reason than to limit the boundary of what is and is not part of U.S. homeland policies and programs. On this point, one expert offers the wry observation that, if the definition of homeland security extends beyond terrorism to include "all hazards," why not include "every important hazard that threatens the nation's physical, social, and political security" (Bellavita, 2008).

In sum, in looking for a home in which to place what can only be called a never-ending list of concerns affecting the nation, it would be best to consider these as falling under the expansive and ever-widening umbrella of *national* security, without forcing them to be justified as homeland security issues.

Meaning of Homeland Security. Hosts of government documents and vast numbers of academic publications have sought to put meaning behind the homeland security concept over the past decade. We can only hit some of the highlights of an issue that itself could lead to dozens of theses and books.

Official sources. Presidential National Security Strategies in the post-Cold War era have contained explicit or sometimes implicit references to homeland security depending upon their date of issuance (Bush 1990, Clinton, 1995, 1997; Bush, 2002, 2006; Obama 2010). There are discussions of DHS's missions and some philosophy about our larger homeland security goals in each of the annual Budget-in-Brief documents prepared annually for Congress by each Secretary of Homeland Security to request the Department's next Fiscal Year's budget (DHS, 2013).

The first National Strategy for Homeland Security (NSHS), written after 9/11 but prior to the creation of DHS, is understandably focused on the terrorist threat to the nation, with no obvious homeland security definition offered (Office of Homeland Security, 2002).

The second edition issued five years later recognizes, "while we must continue to focus on the persistent and evolving terrorist threat, we also must address the full range of potential catastrophic events, including man-made and natural disasters, due to their implications for homeland security" (Homeland Security Council, 2007).

The Quadrennial Homeland Security Review (QHSR)—the most recent comprehensive expression of the nation's homeland security strategy and structure—offers an expansive view of what is encompassed within this new security area. This document characterizes homeland security as 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" (DHS, 2010b, p. vii).

To be more specific, the QHSR makes the case that terrorist threats remain the central concern of homeland security as triggered by 9/11 and affirmed by subsequent events and intelligence sources, and explicitly adds the need to guard against international cyber attacks. It also sharpens the fact that homeland security encompasses plans and actions necessary to deal with both natural and man-made major accidents—finally giving these missions the stature and importance, they deserve (DHS, 2010b). At the same time, the QHSR formally codifies within the purview of homeland security virtually all of the designated "non-homeland security" responsibilities inherited by DHS, as mentioned earlier, which makes defining homeland security even more difficult (DHS, 2010b, pp. 2–3).

In any event, by drawing on the credibility of the QHSR, the core of an official U.S. Government definition of homeland security might have been within reach a few

years ago, perhaps as part of a Presidential Directive. Nevertheless, no such definition was forthcoming.

In discussing official meanings would be remiss not to mention the definition of homeland security presented by President Obama in his National Security Strategy. This Obama definition of homeland security is one of the substantive and helpful of the various definitions encountered in examining official sources. It draws upon the QHSR issued the previous year, provides a bit of historical foundation, mentions DHS, and captures threats from both terrorists and natural disasters, and refers to the overall strength of the country (Obama, 2011, p. 15).

On the other hand, this definition would be improved if it paid more attention to what homeland security means than what the U.S. does, noted the roles of other federal agencies besides DHS such as DoD, and explained more about need for so-called whole community approach—another way of characterizing the Homeland Security Enterprise (Fugate, 2011). Additionally, consistent with the QHSR, it misleadingly keeps alive the inclusion under the definition of homeland security the many nontraditional, non-homeland security concerns inherited by DHS when formed, as mentioned earlier.

The documents mentioned above are only representative of the official documents that in one way or another address the meaning of homeland security. For example, the report to Congress on the challenges of defining homeland security includes a table showing selected documents and the essence of how they see homeland security (Reese, 2012, p. 8).

Nongovernmental sources. Academic experts across the nation have delved into the issue of the meaning of homeland security, although not to the extent expected, given the attention paid to this issue by DHS, the White House, and Congress. One insightful exception is an analytically structured approach that articulates and assesses five different generic options of the meaning of homeland security from highly focused to very broad (Bellavita, 2008).

Research using nongovernmental sources discovered a surprising number of college and university curricula, courses, and certificates on homeland security and related matters (Center for Homeland Defense and Security). As a practical matter of limited time and resources, reviewing all topics covered by these offerings was not possible. However, some courses presumably touch upon the question of definitions and it is likely that consensus among these curricula would not be found (Gordon & Bellavita, 2006).

Need for a Homeland Security Definition. Some experts question the need for a widely accepted definition of homeland security. Arguments for this viewpoint include the fact that many complex policy issues do not have one common definition and that seeking to find one is not feasible as circumstances change. From a realistic perspective, one expert makes the case that " [e]ven if people did

agree to define homeland security with a single voice," it is to be expected that different "people, organizations, and jurisdictions" will end up doing what they see based on their experiences and overall context (Bellavita, 2008, p. 9).

Is a meaning important? Although in a very different context, these are the profound lines spoken to Romeo by Juliet: "What's in a name? That which we call a rose…By any other name would smell as sweet" (Shakespeare, 1597, Act II, Scene II). However, even if assigning appropriate names is not the complete solution to complex policy issues, readers with experience in governmental and/or academic circles would attest that names can in fact be quite significant in the field of security policies and studies—particularly when applied to the relatively new and evolving field of homeland security.

The absence of an agreed definition, moreover, opens the door for all members of the Homeland Security Enterprise (HSE) to define homeland security as they see fit. The HSE encompasses DHS officials from all directorates, and components, officials from other federal agencies with homeland security responsibilities, members of relevant Congressional committees and subcommittees, State and local governments, nongovernmental entities, the private sector, interested communities, and concerned citizens (DHS, 2011).

Admittedly, detailed dimensions of homeland security are often a function of specific circumstances, but fundamental precepts tend not to change except in rare instances, such as the 9/11 incident. This suggests that establishing the meaning of homeland security can be expected to remain relatively durable over time, with a low likelihood of sea changes required to reflect major shifts in kind in security threats and vulnerabilities.

From a bureaucratically important perspective:

> Without a succinct homeland security concept, policymakers and entities with homeland security responsibilities may not successfully coordinate or focus on the highest prioritized or most necessary activities.
> Coordination is especially essential to homeland security because of the multiple federal agencies and the state and local partners with whom they interact. Coordination may be difficult if these entities do not operate with the same understanding of the homeland security concept (Reese, 2012, pp. 9–10).

Furthermore, without standards, anyone might be able to characterize any issue or concern they believe poses a "threat" to our nation as a homeland security issue, in order to gain greater policy attention or increased funding for pet programs—even if the "threat" is not clearly related to the types of dangers that can be credibly said to affect the nation's security. Such attempts to gain attention by sounding false alarms over trends that might appear over ten or 20 years can actually cause policy and budget attention to be diverted from what is taken to be threats and hazards of

national significance (John, 2003). On the other hand, these issues should be supported by research funding—some by DHS and more from other federal agencies and foundations—to pursue research on these longer-range issues until and unless they are ready place inside the homeland security framework.

Even the QHSR, which offers an expansive view of homeland security, expresses concern about not allowing this new security area, as the Bible says, to "become all things to all men" (1 Cor. 9:22, King James Version). In an interesting but not oft-cited passage, the QHSR acknowledges:

> With the establishment of homeland security, and the linking of domestic security concerns to broader national security interests and institutions, there is a temptation to view homeland security so broadly as to encompass all national security and domestic policy activities. This is not the case. Homeland security … intersects with many other functions of government. Homeland security is built upon critical law enforcement functions, but is not about preventing all crimes or administering our Nation's judicial system. It is deeply embedded in trade activities, but is neither trade nor economic policy. It requires international engagement, but is not responsible for foreign affairs … (DHS, 2010b, pp. 12–13).

One solution to the problem of defining homeland security is to disperse the elements of this concept within the broader scope of national security and forget the term "homeland security." As national security itself is not well defined, homeland security would lose its identity. DHS would surely need to be dissolved and broken apart. This might be what President Obama implies by stating, "[w]e are integrating our homeland security efforts seamlessly with other aspects of our national security approach, and strengthening our preparedness …." (Obama, 2010, p. 18).

However, such an approach can entangle homeland security programs and budgets in the endless web of issues that make up the fuzzy and busy national security bucket. This is why it would not make sense, in the extreme, for example, to eliminate the legislation that established DoD and let its elements become part of national security (Public Law 110–53, 2007). For the moment, homeland security should continue to maintain its identity and remain a demarked but flexible subset of concerns within the ever-expanding meaning of national security.

Role of the Defense Department and National Guard. Any attempts at attaching a meaning to homeland security needs to address the important role DoD plays in protecting the homeland through its homeland defense responsibilities—part of this Department's primary role of supporting the President's overall national security strategy (DoD, 2012).

Homeland defense in the U.S. has a long history, reflected in more modern times by the civil and air defense programs that took hold in WWII with priority turning to antiballistic missile defenses during the Cold War and post-Cold War periods (DHS, 2006; Kugler,1991).

Given nationwide concerns about terrorism stimulated by 9/11 and the subsequent experiences with Hurricane Katrina and other large-scale domestic disasters, greater efforts have been made during the past decade to involve DoD more closely in homeland security, working with federal, state and local agencies (Bowman, 2003).

As part of U.S. homeland defense policy, active duty forces, activated reserve force, and selected National Guard Units have high priority counterterrorist missions to destroy, disrupt, or delay terrorist attacks against U.S. military capabilities and allies abroad as well as a role to play in responding to such threats at home. DoD has created a specialized capability to respond to threats or acts of terrorism involving use of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons (Bowman, 2003).

If directed by the President or Secretary of Defense, active duty and reserve military forces can be assigned through the Northern Command (NORTHCOM) to assist U.S. civil authorities not only in the case of terrorist attacks, but also for incidence management operations in the case of major natural disasters or accidents. The Governor of a given state can activate National Guard units to help manage disasters and will maintain control over these forces.

Defense Support of Civil Authorities (DSCA) is a DoD mission parallel to, not subordinate to homeland defense, enabling military assistance to support civil authorities in responding to natural and man-made disasters, law enforcement support, special events, and other domestic activities. Such assistance can include personnel or equipment such as transportation, communications, basic needs such as food and water, and medical services (DoD, 2003). Once deployed under DSCA in response to an incident, these forces come under the command of U.S. NORTHCOM.

There are, as expected, concerns and controversies over the domestic use of military forces, especially concerning the *Posse Comitatus* Act of 1878. This venerable piece of legislation, which had the intent of restricting powers of local governments and law enforcement agencies in using federal military personnel to enforce laws, has been modified, reinterpreted, and the subject of intense legal debates over its application, caveats, and conditions in recent years (Doyle & Elsea, 2012).

Relevance to emergency management. One more issue needs to be addressed when considering the meaning of homeland security: the relationship between emergency management (EM) and homeland security. Not surprisingly, there are

many characterizations of the field of EM. One credible interpretation runs as follows:

> Emergency management seeks to promote safer, less vulnerable communities with the capacity to cope with hazards and disasters [….] Emergency management protects communities by coordinating and integrating all activities necessary to build, sustain, and improve the capability to mitigate against, prepare for, respond to, and recover from threatened or actual natural disasters, acts of terrorism, or other man-made disasters (Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], 2007, p. 1).

Effective EM policies and programs have been essential in keeping communities viable, responding to the needs of citizens facing dangers to their lives and property, and developing mutual aid agreements with nearby jurisdictions when help is needed. These locally focused efforts predate the decade's intense focus on homeland security as a national policy. At times, local situations requiring EM can raise national security issues if there is a potential terrorist connection for example.

Although experience and equipment in effective responses to local incidents are necessary as preconditions for assuming a homeland security role, these are not in themselves sufficient to prepare local personnel, programs, and policies to effectively deal with large-scale incidents that have nationwide implications. Courses, training, and exercising ought to ensure that emergency management units develop such capabilities—which should include issues such as how to cooperate with FEMA and other federal agencies that would likely be involved in large-scale response and recovery from terrorist attacks or major natural disasters or accidents. As expected, there are overlaps but clear differences in the learning objectives in EM versus HS courses (Kiltz, 2012).

Of particular interest to the emergency management community is the third QHSR mission of "ensuring disaster resilience," which addresses how FEMA needs to work within the entire HSE to ensure that the nation is "prepared to respond in ways that extend beyond the normal paradigms in which we have traditionally operated [and …] improve upon our preparedness for the next catastrophic disaster" (DHS, 2010b, pp. 59–64; Fugate, 2011).

Together with FEMA, the EM community across the nation, well before 9/11 and to this day, continues to make visible the important need for the nation to prepare for major natural and manmade disasters (Lindsay &McCarthy, 2012).

CONCLUSIONS

As suggested, the concept of national security can serve as a catchall phrase meeting military, political, environmental, economic, societal, technological, and other challenges that can adversely affect the nation as a whole if we are to

preserve our way of life at home and abroad. Academic experts working in the national security field, and even government officials, will often become ensnared in what might be called Jesuit and/or Talmudic forms of debates of the meaning and scope of this term (Lynch, 2013; Schapiro, 2011). Capturing the meaning of national security in an agreed definition can become a never-ending theoretical challenge that often brings more divergence than convergence. Homeland security, however, is a newer and narrower concept that ought to have its meaning clarified, even if this cannot be done for national security, a far broader concept of which it is a part.

While arguments can be made that a homeland security definition may not be necessary or feasible, the discussion in this article leads to the overall conclusion that an effort should be made to formulate a useful definition. What seems to be needed is a practical definition of homeland security that bounds this concept and gives it its own areas of concern—striking a balance between an overly generalized statement that has no real meaning and overly specific issues that are too narrow and ephemeral. Another balance to be struck is accounting for the fact that all stakeholders in the HSE face "diverse risks, needs, and priorities" that need to be integrated in a way that supports "our shared interests and responsibilities to collectively secure our homeland" (DHS, 2010b, pp. 12–13).

As time goes on, some broadening of the scope of homeland security might make sense—notably, if there are entirely new threats of serious near-term concern to our homeland that should be managed at the federal level and supported by the entire HSE. However, for now and the near term, a definition of homeland security should seek to limit this seemingly limitless list, pending new circumstances that would require major modification. Such a definition should not only be meaningful to all stakeholders, but malleable to accommodate necessary changes if and as this field evolves.

Before turning to a proposal for a practical and pedagogical next step, homeland security context and relationships need to be investigated.

Context and relationships. Many readers have been exposed to such questions of whether national security is subsumed within homeland security or the other way around. Other contextual questions include how homeland defense and other DoD activities fit into this picture as well as the relationship between homeland security and emergency management.

Our discussion has already enabled these questions to be answered. Most importantly, homeland security is best seen as a delimited discipline encompassed within the ever-broadening and highly generalized definition of national security. The QHSR makes this clear by stating, "…an effective strategy for homeland security forms an important component of our overarching national security strategy" (DHS, 2010b, pp. 2–3).

Figure 1 depicts the more significant relationships between homeland security and other security areas using the Venn diagram construct.

Figure 1. U.S. Security Relationships

A definitional exercise. As aptly put by homeland security experts in the field of education, "unlike medicine, law, engineering, and other professional disciplines, there is no general conceptual agreement about the range of topics that constitute 'homeland security' as a field of study" (Gordon & Bellavita, 2006, p. 1). This statement, articulated in 2006, remains true today and probably into the near future. If at least the essence of a meaning could be agreed upon, then some limits could be placed on the range of topics included in course offerings under this security area—though other related subjects could still be taught without forcing all kinds of issues under the heading of homeland security.

Rather than propose a solution for the definitional issue, this article proposes making this an exercise for students, teachers, and interested readers. The following criteria, consistent with the discussions in this article, might be useful in guiding such an effort. A good definition should:

- Articulate that homeland security has to do with necessary and feasible preparations to reduce risk to the nation and the HSE by taking steps to prevent terrorist attacks, protect against all forms of adverse incidents, and mitigate, respond to, and recover from terrorist strikes if they occur as well as impacts from major natural disasters and accidents that affect the security of the nation. Clarify that emergency management is a field that overlaps with homeland security but has its own local contexts outside this framework.
- Explain that homeland security is an operational part of national security, with certain boundaries to provide differentiation and avoid confusion. Pay careful attention to what's in and what's out of a useful homeland

security definition as well as the need to stay flexible if key changes are needed in the future.

- Avoid capricious, politically driven, or bureaucratically required introduction of the *mélange* of concerns (e.g., immigration, cross border crime, customs violations, illegal trafficking of goods and people, etc.) that could broaden the concept to the point where it can include almost any issue affecting the health and well-being of Americans and the strength of our nation. If necessary, let these concerns spill over into the many, often-murky elements contained in the burgeoning purview of national security.
- Denote the roles played by DHS as well as DoD and other agencies with homeland security responsibilities as well as all stakeholders in the HSE— that is, the whole community.
- Portray the relationships between homeland security, national security, and other security-related areas by affirming or alerting the Venn diagram in Figure 1.

In short, this article can offer officials in DHS and members of the HSE a common way of bounding the meaning of homeland security, considering it within the broader perspective of national security. The academic community can find this valuable in structuring courses and curricula in the security field.

A modest proposal. A timely and needed effort that might be undertaken by a group of academic experts with government officials involved would be to research and produce a homeland security lexicon modeled after the *Risk Lexicon* issued by DHS (DHS, 2010a). Not constructed as a dictionary, this document would contain key homeland security-related words, concepts, and phrases; provide different definitions of concepts and issues that apply to differing situations; and offer examples of use in context.

One approach is to interest the Science and Technology Division of DHS, which is responsible for the network of University Centers of Excellence, to take the lead in sponsoring such an effort (DHS, Office of University Programs). These member universities would be asked by DHS to bid on who would lead the project, with the other members of the network contributing inputs to the lexicon. Faculty as well as students in other universities and analysts in research centers involved in the field of homeland security would also participate with ideas and comments. This topic could be discussed at homeland security conferences and symposia as a means of creating interest and stimulating suggestions about substance and format.

Once all its details are discovered and discussed, whether or not this proposal is seen as "modest" is up to the reader. For not, we can only say thank you to the author of the famous satiric essay with its benign-looking title (Swift, 1729).

REFERENCES

Bellavita, C. (2008). Changing homeland security: What is homeland security? *Homeland Security Affairs, 4*(2), 10, Retrieved from http://www.homeland securityaj.org/?article=4.2.1#

Bellavita, C. (2011). A new perspective on homeland security? *Homeland Security Watch*. Retrieved from http://www.hlswatch.com/2011/12/20/a-new-perspective-on-homeland-security/

Bowman, S. (2003). Homeland security: The Department of Defense's role, CRS Report to Congress. *Congressional Research Service*. Retrieved from http://www.fas.org/man/crs/RL31615.pdf

Bush, G.H.W. (1990). *The national security strategy of the United States.* Washington: White House. Retrieved from www.bits.de/NRANEU/others/strategy.htm

Bush, G.W. (2002). *The national security strategy of the United States of America.* Washington: White House. Retrieved from www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/.../national/nss-020920.pdf

Bush, G.W. (2006). *The national security strategy of the United States of America.* Washington: White House. Retrieved from www.comw.org/qdr/fulltext/nss2006.pdf

Center for Homeland Defense and Security. *Colleges and universities offering homeland security programs*. Naval Post Graduate School and U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Retrieved from www.chds.us/?partners/institutions

Clinton, W. (1995). *National security strategy of engagement and enlargement.* The White House, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/nss/nss-95.pdf

Clinton, W. (1997). *National ecurity strategy for a new century.* The White House, Washington, DC. Retrieved from www.fas.org/man/docs/nssrpref-1299.htm

Daalder, I. H., Dester, I. M., Lindsay, J. M., Light, P. C., Litan, R. E., O'Hanlon, M. E. (2002). *Assessing the department of homeland security*. Brookings Institution, Brookings Press: Washington D.C.

Davis, Robert T. (Ed.) (2010). *U.S. Foreign Policy and National Security: Chronology and Index for the 20th Century*. Praeger Security International Series. Retrieved from http://books.google.co.in/books?id=gsM1JiXAMJEC

Department of Defense (2003). Military *Support to Civil Authorities (MSCA)* (Department of Defense Directive 3025.01).

Department of Defense (2010a). *US NATO Military Terminology Group* (Pentagon, Washington, D.C.: Joint Chiefs of Staff, p. 361). Retrieved from http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/new_pubs/jp1_02.pdf. September 2010

Department of Defense (2010b). *Dictionary of military and associated terms*. Washington, D.C.

Department of Defense (2012). *Sustaining U.S. global leadership*: *Priorities for a 21st century defense* (Washington, D.C). Retrieved from: www.defense.gov/news/Defense_Strategic_Guidance.pdf

Department of Homeland Security (2006). *Civil defense and homeland security: A Short history of national preparedness efforts* (National Preparedness Task Force). Retrieved from www.iaem.com/about/.../DHSCivilDefense-HSShortHistory.pdf

Department of Homeland Security (2008). *A brief documentary history of the department of homeland security: 2001–2008* (History Office, Washington D.C). Retrieved from www.hsdl.org/?view&did=37027

Department of Homeland Security (2010a). *DHS risk lexicon* (Risk Steering Committee). Washington D.C. Retrieved from www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/dhs-risk-lexicon-2010.pdf

Department of Homeland Security (2010b). *Quadrennial homeland security report: A strategic framework for a secure America* (Washington D.C.). Retrieved from www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/qhsr_report.pdf

Department of Homeland Security (2011). *Strengthening the homeland security enterprise: Implementing 9/11 commission recommendation* (Progress report 2011). Retrieved from www.dhomeland security.gov/implementing-911-commission-recommendations

Department of Homeland Security (2013). *Budgets-in-brief: Fiscal years FY 2003 to FY 2013 2004–2013* (Washington D.C). Retrieved from www.dhs.gov/dhs-budget

Department of Homeland Security, Division of Science and Technology, Office of University Programs. Retrieved from http://www.hsuniversityprograms.org/

de Rugy, V. (2005). What does homeland security spending buy? *American Enterprise Institute* AEI Working Paper #107.

Doyle, C. & Elsea, J. (2012)**.** *The posse comitatus act and related matters*. Congressional Research Service, Washington D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (2007). *Principles of emergency management* (Emergency Management Higher Education Project). Retrieved from http://www.iaem.com/publications/documents/PrinciplesofEmergency Management.pdf

Fugate, C. (2011). Catastrophic preparedness: How ready is FEMA for the next big disaster? *Testimony of Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Before U.S, Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, Washington, DC.*

Gordon, E. & Bellavita, C. (2006). Changing homeland security: Teaching the core. *Homeland Security Affairs*, *2*(1), 1–19. Retrieved from www.hsaj.org/?download&mode=dl&h&w...2

Homeland Security Council (2007). *National strategy for homeland security* (The White House, Washington, D.C.). Retrieved from www.hsdl.org/?view&did=479633

Jehl, D. (1993, February 3). C.I.A. nominee wary of budget cuts. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/1993/02/03/us/cia-nominee-wary-of-budget-cuts.html

John, P. (2003). Is there life after policy streams, advocacy coalitions, and punctuations: Using evolutionary theory to explain policy change? *The Policy*

Studies Journal, 31(4), 481–498, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing. Retrieved from http://scholar.google.com/citations?user=YOXZY2EAAAAJ&hl=en&oi=sra

Kiltz, L. (2012). The benefits and challenges of integrating emergency management and homeland security into a new program. *Journal of Homeland Security Education, 1*(2), 6–28. Retrieved from http://www.journalhse.org/v1i2-kiltz.html

Kugler, R. L. (1991). *U.S. national military strategy and force posture for the post-communist era* (RAND Paper, P-7756)*.* RAND Corporation: Santa Monica, CA.

Lindsay, B. R. & McCarthy, F. X. (2012). *Stafford act declarations 1953–2011: Trends and analyses, and implications for congress*. Retrieved from www.crs.gov

Lute, J. H. (2011). *21st annual review of the field of national security* (American Bar Association). Retrieved from http://nationalsecuritylawbrief.com/wp-content/uploads/2011_ABAConferenceNationalSecurity.pdf

Lynch, P. (2013).The best training for public life: reconciling traditions: Jesuit rhetoric and ignatian pedagogy. *Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education*, *43*(5). Retrieved from http://epublications.marquette.edu/conversations/vol43/iss1/5

Maxwell, B. (2004). *Homeland security: A documentary history.* Washington D.C: CQ Press.

Obama, B. (2010). *National security strategy* (Office of the President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.). Retrieved from www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/.../national_security_strategy.pdf

Obama, B. (2011). *Presidential policy directive /ppd-8: National preparedness* (The White House, Washington, D.C.). Retrieved from www.dhs.gov/presidential-policy-directive-8-national-preparedness

Office of Homeland Security. (2002). N*ational strategy for homeland security*. (The White House, Washington, D.C.). Retrieved from www.ncs.gov/library/policy_docs/nat_strat_hls.pdf

Public Law 107–296 (2002). *Department of homeland security*. Retrieved from www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/hr_5005_enr.pdf

Public Law 110–53 (2007). National Security Act of 1947 as amended. Retrieved from intelligence.senate.gov/nsaact1947.pdf

Reese, S., & Library of Congress. (2012). *Defining homeland security: Analysis and congressional considerations*, 7–5700. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service.

Romm, J. J. (1993). *Defining national security: the nonmilitary aspects* (Council on Foreign Relations). Pew Project on America's Task in a Changed World (Pew Project Series). Retrieved from http://books.google.co.in/books?id=shxDOnuVcyYC

Rabbi S. (n.d.). *COLlive.com — Chabad Lubavitch Community News Service* (Talmud Debates). Retrieved from http://www.collive.com/show_news.rtx...on-talmud-debates

Sachs, S. (2003). The Changing Definition of Security. *International Relations, Michaelmas Term.* Oxford, UK: Merton College.

Sarkesian, S. C., Williams, J. A., & Cimbala, S. J. (2008). *US national security: Policymakers, processes & politics (4th ed.).* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Shakespeare, W. (1597). *Romeo and Juliet, Act II, Scene II*. The Oxford Shakespeare (1914 edition).

Swift, J. (1729). *A modest proposal for preventing the children of poor people from being a burden to their parents or country, and for making them beneficial to the publick.* (Pamphlet).

Watson, C.A. (2008). *U.S. national security: a reference handbook.* Contemporary world issues (2 Rev. ed.). ABC-CLIO. Retrieved from http://books.google.co.in/books?id=KnlIR4YO2vsC