



THE “GLOBAL” HOMELAND: International Perspectives on Counterterrorism and Homeland Security

By Professor Bert Tussing

INTRODUCTION

Given the immediacy in both time and space of the terrorist threat, it is easy to become overly focused on the issue as regards only the United States and the U.S. homeland. Yet, we are not in this alone. Other nations, international organizations such as NATO and the European Union, and transnational law enforcement agencies such as Europol and Interpol are deeply committed to the counterterror effort. Seeing the Global War on Terror from their perspective provides both greater insight and greater opportunities for crushing the enemies of civilized peoples throughout the world.

A venue towards a better understanding of international perspectives on issues of domestic security and counterterrorism was recently held in London, at a Homeland Security Conference sponsored by the SMi group. Held from 23-24 February, the forum featured presentations depicting perspectives ranging from the private sector; through local, national and international law enforcement agencies; to disparate national governmental efforts; on through regional and international alliances. Functional issues including port security, stemming the flow of terrorist financing, defense against chemical, biological and radiological attacks and more were presented by subject matter experts from six different countries, the European Union, and NATO.

NATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

National viewpoints were presented by the UK, the US, and Norway. The Right Honorable Bruce George, Chairman of the Defence Select Committee, House of Commons, began the conference with “Homeland Security Defence within the UK,” an analysis of the current developments in policy and doctrine within the UK. Mr. David Veness, OBE QPM, the Assistant Commissioner for Specialist Operations, London Metropolitan Police Service, delivered “Counter Terrorist Operations Within the UK,” a presentation on their initiatives to combat terrorism. He opined that that the challenge for the world community is to be as flexible in our global response as is the global threat. Finally, Mr. Roger Cumming, Director of the British National Infrastructure Security Coordination Centre, presented an assessment of protection initiatives in the private sector for the cyber-element of critical infrastructure.

Aspects of the national viewpoint of the United States were presented by Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, the Honorable Paul McHale; and Mr. Karl Wycoff, Deputy Coordinator for the Department of State Office of the Coordinator for Counter Terrorism. Mr. McHale spoke on new initiatives being undertaken by the U.S. Department of Defense in “Conducting the Global War on Terrorism,” which stressed the two-sided aspect of DoD’s domestic security mission (Defense and Civil Support), the fact that domestic defense must begin as far as possible from our nation’s shores, and the importance, therefore, of the Global War on Terror in and out of Iraq and Afghanistan. Mr. Wycoff

described the role that diplomacy plays as one element of national power to be utilized against terrorism. Additionally, Supervisory Special Agent Frank Battle, Chief of the FBI Counter Terrorism Division's Operational Response Section, reviewed the FBI's involvement in homeland security operations in his presentation, "Neutralizing National Security Threats in the U.S."

The Norwegian viewpoint, "Current Initiatives in the Area of Critical Infrastructure Protection in Norway," was put forward by Mr. Jan Erik Larsen, Director General of the Norwegian National Security Authority. Mr. Larsen noted that Norway's prestigious Defense Research Establishment (Forsvarets forskningsinstitutt--FFI) will be conducting a series of studies surrounding infrastructure protection under the cognizance of the Norwegian National Security Authority, which reports to both the Minister of Defense and the Minister of Justice, for military and civil sector considerations, respectively.

NATO AND THE EUROPEAN UNION

Strategies from both NATO and the European Union's were presented at the forum. A NATO perspective was provided by Dr. Deniz Beten, Head of the Threats and Challenges Section of the Public Diplomacy Division of NATO, in her presentation, "Prevention of and Responses to Threats of Social Disruption." Dr. Beten was clear in her message that NATO is no longer just a political and military forum, but has evolved to address a broader "security" mission across more of an "interagency" perspective, and thereby better empowering a collective response. "The European Union's Attempts to Improve Homeland Security Among its Member States," was offered by Dr. Gustav Lindstrom, a research fellow with the European Union (EU) Institute for Security Studies, who noted that the multidimensional nature of the threat requires a multi-pronged approach from the EU. This multifaceted requirement will necessarily include sharing responsibilities in monitoring a complex and pervasive threat; a free information exchange regarding that threat; and establishing an open environment in which to develop cooperative initiatives.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Several presentations dealt with responding to terror through law enforcement efforts, both nationally and internationally. Mr. Willie Deridder, Executive Director for the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol) provided a perspective on "Interpol's Efforts in countering the Global Threat of Terrorism," explaining how the Global War on Terrorism was being addressed by the organization's 181 member countries. In the presentation "Europol and Homeland Security in Europe," Mariano Simancas, Deputy Director of Europol, offered a presentation on that agency's assessment of the current European threat. He explained that Europol has four mandates in this arena: Combating Terrorism; Halting the Trafficking of Nuclear/Radioactive Substances; Stemming the Flow of Arms, Ammunition, and Explosives; and Monitoring Racism and Xenophobia. Mr. Simancas emphasized that all four of these mandates are integral components of Europol's battle against terrorism. He closed with a warning over the development of a pronounced "anti-globalist" movement in many parts of Europe, which, while not yet categorized as terrorist, shows ominous inclinations in that direction.

Two presentations were offered dealing with the financial aspects of the struggle against terrorism: "The Commercial Sector's Role in Combating Terrorism," presented by Mr. Bob Upton, head of Lloyds of London Money Laundering Prevention and Monitoring; and "Fighting the Financial War on Terrorism," presented by Detective Chief Inspector Steve Ratcliffe of the Metropolitan Police Service National Terrorist Financial Investigation Unit. These presentations framed the role of the commercial financial sector in these efforts as encompassing a "social, moral and ethical imperative." Moreover, they showed the clear effectiveness of the sector's efforts in these regards, noting (for instance) that 80-90% of the information leading to the 9-11 hijackers came to authorities by way of financial investigations.

MARITIME SECURITY

Measures surrounding international diplomacy and transnational law enforcement were examined in three presentations dealing with maritime security at the forum. Mr. Chris Trelawny, Senior Technical Officer of the Maritime Security Section of the International Maritime Organization (IMO), presented an assessment of new threats to the shipping industry, which the IMO believes are tied closely to the growing problem of piracy on the open seas. In response, the IMO has developed special measures to enhance maritime security through the medium of the International Ship and Port Facility Security Code (ISPS Code), which contains requirements for governments, port authorities, and shipping companies. This Code epitomizes new attitudes toward shared responsibility between the public and private sector in the Maritime Domain.

In his presentation, “The United States Coast Guard’s Role in Homeland Security,” Vice Admiral James Hull, Commander of the Coast Guard Atlantic Area, described the capabilities and responsibilities of the Coast Guard surrounding port security and protection of the homeland. The Admiral commented on the paramount importance of international partnerships in Maritime Security endeavors, hearkening again to the role of the IMO, the importance of the ISPS Code, and other issues designed to make the maritime regime more secure while facilitating the free flow of commerce around the world.

The third presentation “Securing a Nation’s Borders” (which also dealt with customs and land border issues), was given by Mr. Douglas Browning, the Deputy Commissioner for the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security. Mr. Browning addressed the vital importance of developing and sustaining border protection initiatives. He continued a theme heard throughout the two-day symposium that emphasized the critical role of information and intelligence exchange in protecting our shared borders. Mr. Browning showcased a host of new national and international initiatives that have already contributed to greater security along our coasts and borders, including the Trade Act of 2002 (which provided for advance “tracking” of inbound and outbound cargo information); the Bio-Terrorism Act (requiring advanced notice for imported food shipments); the Passenger Name Record (PNR) data gathering initiative (for airline passengers traveling to the U.S.); and the U.S. VISIT (Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology) program, a bio-metrics initiative used to register and track visitors in the U.S.

CONCLUSION

Every speaker, in every presentation stressed the need for cooperation between nations, non-governmental agencies, and between the public and private sectors. Again and again, the message conveyed was that terrorism was a global problem that required a global response. Equal unanimity was stressed over the need to break down artificial barriers that exist to information exchange between all of these entities, and especially between law enforcement and the intelligence agencies. The Right Honorable Mr. George reflected these imperatives succinctly, calling for a seamless integration between warfighting and domestic defense, and saying, “Terrorism cannot be compartmented, as governments tend to do.”

The symposium reinforced the fact that outstanding police work is and will continue to be vital to the counterterrorism effort worldwide. Beyond the critical importance of intelligence, the forum reiterated the criticality of this work being coordinated between national and international law enforcement entities to the greatest degree possible. Likewise, integrating efforts to track and cripple terrorists through their financial lifelines will be a crucial element of any strategy against this transnational threat.

As Assistant Secretary of Defense McHale noted, it is vital that domestic defense begin as far as possible from the homeland; but this can only be effectively accomplished through cooperation *between* the homelands. This underscores the necessity of creating and retaining the initiative among our friends and

allies, and taking the fight to the enemy. The alternative, to wait passively until the threat materializes on Wall Street, or Downing Street, or the Champs d'Elysées, is to wait too long.

The message that we can and will eventually defeat this threat to civilization must get out. At the global level, diplomacy must be employed to build the international political will necessary for a sustained counterterrorism effort. It is perhaps at the local level, however, that effective leadership conveyed through public information may pay the greatest dividends; for it is the members of the public who are the real "first responders." Therefore, public support must be built by crafting a carefully balanced message that breeds neither complacency nor debilitating fear.

This publication and other Center for Strategic Leadership publications can be found online at:
<http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usacsl/index.asp>.

The views expressed in this paper are those of the participants and do not necessarily reflect official policy or position of the United States Army War College, the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, or any other Department or Agency within the U.S. Government. Further, these views do not reflect uniform agreement among exercise participants. This report is cleared for public release; distribution is unlimited.

