Developing a Transatlantic Understanding in Homeland Security Academic Education Provision: The Emergence of a new Academic Discipline?

Craig McLean[1], Donald Wallace, Sarah Soppitt, William Parrish, Daniel Silander, Adele Irving.

Paper to be presented to the ISA Annual Convention, 16 March 2011.

Abstract

At the dawn of the 21st century it is widely recognised that transnational terrorism can pose a major challenge to the security of nation-state. To manage this challenge, multi-agency collective efforts, beyond those at the domestic level, are needed. Though since 2001 there has been an invigoration of national security efforts, any multinational security efforts will be successful only if there is a shared understanding of the domestic and multilateral institutional architectures, both existing and needed, to combat terrorism and respond to man-made or natural catastrophic events The academic communities on both sides of the Atlantic have taken notice of the need for academic research and instruction in a Homeland Security (HS) based curriculum, but have responded differently to how this might best be achieved. US universities have largely developed entire HS academic programmes, but this has not been replicated in the European Union. Building upon a paper delivered at the 2010 ISA annual convention, this paper will examine the data that has been generated for a research project funded by the EU/US Atlantis Programme. This project analyses HS education provision in the US and EU, and will compare curricular coverage of comparative and international issues in homeland security.

[1] Correspondence to the author: Craig McLean, Department of Social Sciences, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 8ST, United Kingdom. Tel: +44 191 243 7530. Email: craig.mclean@unn.ac.uk

"The question is", said Alice, "whether you can *make words mean so many different things" (Carroll 1997 [1865]: 237).*

Introduction

Experts believe that greater US-European cooperation in the field of Homeland Security (HS) is necessary in order to guarantee better security on both sides of the Atlantic. Yet, the HS structures on both sides of the Atlantic differ in significant respects. The terrorist attacks on the US in 2001 and the subsequent attacks on European countries such as the UK and Spain prompted both sides of the Atlantic to reinvigorate their respective efforts to ensure homeland security and combat terrorism, however, with differing approaches. The US embarked on a wholesale reorganisation of its domestic security and border protection institutions. By contrast European countries largely preferred to work within their existing institutional architectures to combat terrorism and respond to other security challenges and disasters, both natural and man-made (Archick *et al*. 2006). In response to the 7/7 bombings, the UK created an Office for Security and Counter Terrorism within its Home Office (2009). Furthermore, perceptions may differ on the scope of the danger of terrorism and on appropriate counter-measures. For the HS student, practitioner, and policymaker, it is necessary to develop a transatlantic understanding of the cooperative arrangements that have been institutionalised, whilst simultaneously being aware of significant structural differences.

Joint efforts in developing the capacity of HS expertise for counterterrorism efforts, will necessarily call upon academic programs to assist in the understanding and analysing of the nature of the problem, the measures needed to manage it and the establishment of such measures in a legitimate international framework. Stakeholders recognise the need to develop HS expertise through academic programs (Napolitano 2011). And, according to Larrabee and Lindley-French (2008: 34), there is also a pressing need on both sides of the Atlantic to close the gap between the 'intelligence and security services and academia' to get more ideas and external analysis into the process of challenging terrorist organisations. An examination of HS academic education is an appropriate means for ultimately enhancing the functions of the HS apparatus. Academia has traditionally served as a forum for public debate and decision. Academia should provide the role of critical examination of HS issues with its research capabilities. HS practitioners and policymakers require the knowledge and abilities to confront HS threats that are of a characteristically multinational nature, and require a multinational effort to successfully confront them. Considering the contributions extending along the continuum of academia up through the doctoral level, a nation's universities constitute a formidable resource in both basic and applied research areas.

This paper sets out to understand the development of HS-related programmes in the US and EU. We begin by offering some context into this research undertaking; why we have concerned ourselves with this subject. We then move on to discuss how various American institutions have sought to define and contextualise HS-related themes through the process of benchmarking. Building upon the work of others, we present our own interpretation of what benchmarks might be used to examine HS. Our paper then turns to address methodological considerations that had to be taken into account during the course of our research. Thereafter we turn to the actual data and begin to compare HS provision on each side of the Atlantic. Although there are few similarities between the programmes, we offer some tentative hypotheses to explain why the Europeans have appeared to be so unwilling to embrace this emerging educational discipline. We posit that this might be due to how acts of terrorism have been comparatively part of the political scene for many years in the EU compared to the US; that the US and EU governments have responded in different ways to the attacks of 9/11 (with the former creating a new set of institutions to deal with HS threats – unlike EU Member States); and the impact of diverging academic trends. Although these are tentative hypotheses, they do appear to offer some insight into why HS education has

started to bloom in the US whilst simultaneously remaining in the doldrums within the EU.

Context

This paper updates our initial research presented to the ISA Annual Convention in New Orleans, 2010. At this previous ISA Convention, we presented our initial tentative research findings on Homeland Security (HS) related higher education (HE) provision within the US and European Union (with the research focusing upon provision taught in English. This particular paper was made possible by research support granted by the US Government and European Commission in the form of the EU-US Atlantis Programme[2]. This research sought – and seeks – to understand how American and European higher educational establishments have reacted to what might be perceived as a common concern; that of securing the homeland.

Any realignment of academic programs needs to be comprehended, however, in the context of institutional changes to the machinery of government that have been enacted subsequent to the 9/11 attacks. For example, the only sign within the EU of institutional reforms taken of any similarity to the US approach was the UK response to the 7/7 bombings; the UK created an Office for Security and Counter Terrorism within its Home Office (Home Office 2009). In most other cases counterterrorism has been embedded into pre-existing emergency management efforts as part of a broader approach to pool resources (human and financial) in terms of crisis management. As argued in a CRS Report for the US Congress, published in July 2006, on the theme of European Approaches to Homeland Security and Counterterrorism: 'While the United States has embarked on a wholesale reorganisation of its domestic security and border protection institutions, European countries have largely preferred to work within their existing institutional architectures to combat terrorism and respond to other security challenges and disasters, both natural and man-made' (Archick *et al*. 2006). From the beginning, therefore, it was apparent that serious differences existed between the US and various EU Member States on how best to understand the HS threat.

To paraphrase our previous research, the earlier paper sought to outline some of the difficulties and peculiarities surrounding English language Homeland Security provision within both the USA and the European Union. First, the paper argued that there are both broad and narrow definitions of HS. While the concept of Homeland Security has been commonly used since 9-11 within the US, this has been more or less absent in the European debate. Up until Hurricane Katrina hitting the Gulf coast, the US primarily approached HS threats as man-made. Meanwhile, the European side has had a broader approach to HS related security concerns. Second, the paper outlined some of the institutional responses that have been made in light of the 9/11 attacks. These have been considerable in the United States, where an entirely new Department of Homeland Security has been created, bringing together federal agencies that had roles and responsibilities related to HS, rather than being part of multiple departments. Yet, within the EU where Member State governments have preferred to tackle HS questions within existing institutional frameworks. Third, noting the debate that has taken place within the academic literature between McCreight (2009) and Klitz (2009), the paper argued how HS and HS-related higher education is characterised by respectively narrow and broad interpretations. Fourth, the paper subsequently examined existing HS educational provision within the US and EU and showed that mirroring the wider institutional changes within the US, HS educational provision within America has mushroomed with more than 100 US educational institutions

[2] The contents of this paper were developed under an EU-U.S. Atlantis grant (P116J090056) from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, (FIPSE), U.S. Department of Education and the European Union's Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (156478-UK-2009-USAPOM). The authors would therefore like to thank the EU/US Atlantis Programme for the financial support which made this research possible. However, the content of this paper does not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education or the European Union, and any endorsement by the Federal Government or EU should not be assumed.

offering more than 200 HS-related post-baccalaureate degree programmes. And mirroring the comparatively limited institutional responses within Europe where few, if any, HS government departments have emerged, there is correspondingly comparatively limited HS-related educational provision. Fifth and finally, the paper outlined how (moving past actual programme titles) HS provision within the US and EU might be more systematically compared by constructing an analytical framework based upon HS "benchmarks".

This paper aims to compare HS-related academic programmes taught in the US and EU. With a comprehensive set of HS-related programmes now identified, we will now examine how benchmarks for common HS-related programmes have been – and might be – developed. But before doing so, it is necessary to outline the major themes that have emerged from our research and the methodological obstacles that we had to overcome.

Benchmarking

Any examination or assessment of Homeland Security quickly demonstrates that, by definition(s) alone, we are dealing with a very dynamic, complex, and broad subject area. There has been considerable debate within the academic community since the passage in the US of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 regarding issues on whether HS constitutes a profession, or whether a framework of academic disciplines can be agreed upon within homeland security academic programmes; whether the field of homeland security is too broad to be addressed within a single degree; and what career opportunities exist for recipients of a "homeland security" degree (NRC 2005). The fact remains that following the events of 9-11, the professions and the academic areas that constitute homeland security have been subjected to some re-examination.

Since the attacks of 9-11 a series of significant events and policy decisions were made within US federal, state, and local governments, non-governmental organisations, and private industry. Of significant importance was the signing of the National Homeland Security Strategy by President Bush in 2002, as it was this document that provided the foundation for the Homeland Security Act passed by the US Congress in the fall of 2002. These two documents helped to restructure the US government and identified the necessity for both change and engagement by state and local governments and, of equal importance, private industry. This is clearly evident in the homeland security definition contained in the National Homeland Security Strategy of 2002:

> A concerted national effort to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce the vulnerability of the United States to terrorism, and minimize the damage and assist in the recovery from terrorist attacks (NSHS 2002: 2).

Perhaps the real and timely value of the National Homeland Security Strategy and Homeland Security Act of 2002 was the delineation of clearly defined "critical mission areas". Those mission areas have become significant in how federal and national governments have restructured themselves, how state and local governments have implemented new strategies to comply with appropriate mission areas, and the response by private industry in addressing those mission areas applicable to their industries. The six critical mission areas are:

- Intelligence and Warning
- Border and Transportation Security
- Domestic Counterterrorism
- Protecting Critical Infrastructure and Key Assets
- Defending Against Catastrophic Threats
- Emergency Preparedness and Response

These mission areas have and continue to be applied in the framework of many academic Homeland Security or Homeland Security-related programmes. Equally important to the academic implications within these mission areas are the career fields represented in each one. The dramatic changes in policy and reorganisation of government structures in HS have also led to an important review within higher education as developing a means to enlarge the body of skills and knowledge for the discipline. Based on the reality of an expanding and enduring professional career field, it has become quite apparent why there has been such growth at all levels of the academic community in the expansion of existing academic programmes with a nexus to Homeland Security and the creation of new programmes with a multitude of titles that are related to one or more of the previously stated "critical mission areas".

The Debate

As government agencies, both at the federal and state levels, moved forward in implementing policy and strategies of Homeland Security, debates began within the academic community as to whether there were a need for academic degrees in HS and, if there were, what role would higher education play in addressing the academic issues associated with this new discipline. During this time period, the Homeland Security and Defense Education Consortium (HSDEC Association) was being established. As HSDECA became more established within the academic community, the Department of Homeland Security and other partnering agencies began to focus on accreditation and the role it could play in serving as a leading accreditation organisation for Homeland Security and homeland defence education programmes (although accreditation has been criticised in some circles for perceived restrictions on innovations). The idea of accreditation can be useful and necessary within academia. The challenge for conducting accreditation for newly developed disciplines lies in the collective agreement in what is required within a homeland security type programme. This raised an obvious question: what should the core competencies be?

In response HSDECA has developed a list of core competencies, which have been incorporated into their developing accreditation programme. These core competencies are:

- Intelligence
- Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources
- Law and Policy
- Strategic Planning
- Emergency Management Terrorism
- Risk Analysis
- Strategic Communication

In addition to the core competencies, HSEDCA has identified programme outcomes, which define the professional field of Homeland Security. HSEDCA has identified the following outcomes that graduates of degree programmes must demonstrate (DGO 2009: 9-10):

- An ability to apply homeland security or defense concepts in a capstone experience: thesis, graduate research project or comprehensive exam
- The ability to apply techniques, skills or tools common to either the social or physical science disciplines necessary for conducting research or systematic investigations
- An understanding of professional ethics and how they apply in the field of homeland security or defense
- An ability to apply knowledge of mathematics and science
- An ability to work collaboratively
- A recognition of transnational and global application of homeland security or defense issues, strategies and operations
- An ability to design, conduct, and analyze exercises applicable to the disciplines of homeland security or defense

- An ability to identify, describe and critically evaluate applicable homeland security or defense technologies
- Knowledge of contemporary, or emergent threats, challenges or issues

HSDECA's core competencies and the Critical Mission Areas previously addressed do appear to demonstrate some close similarities. This should not be surprising as a number of HSDECA members engaged in the accreditation process have had experience in the federal government in either the Department of Defense or Department of Homeland Security. Their expertise in understanding the application of strategic documents and national policy into an academic setting is very useful and may be some of the logic behind the established core competencies.

In November of 2007, the U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense (ASD) for Homeland Defense issued a memorandum that addressed the importance for a national security workforce to meet the needs of the nation following the 9-11 attacks and the new policies and procedures that had been implemented over the following six years. The memorandum addressed educational and professional development requirements that would provide knowledge and expertise in preparing the U.S. to prevent and respond to catastrophic events, either manmade or natural. Following a workshop that brought together a variety of professionals, the ASD for Homeland Defense included their findings for "competencies" in educational and professional development programmes. The competencies were:

- Ethics
- Collaboration
- Communication
- Creative and Critical Thinking
- Cultural Awareness
- Strategic Leadership
- Management and Planning Skills
- Adaptability
- Crisis Management
- Critical Expertise
- Science/Technology Expertise
- Risk Management

Methodological considerations

The linguistic problems of conducting international comparative research are well-known. As van Deth (1998, 6) reminds us, '[t]he first problem encountered in international comparative research is the translation of terms and concepts. Even seemingly straightforward translations of single words provide complications due to different cultural meanings of the words.' Furthermore, 'even an agreed exchange currency of words does not always capture the full richness of a concept or its relations to other concepts in the foreign language; i.e. there may be a loss of "cultural relationship" in translation' (Roberts 1972, 25). The potential dangers of cross-lingual research identified by van Deth and Roberts are even more manifest when one considers the multiplicity of languages found within the European Union. Very few citizens – let alone researchers – have the ability to utilise all of the EU's official languages with any degree of fluency. For these reasons, the research team decided only to examine those HS programmes that were provided in *English*. This has reduced the area of study considerably although it must be stressed that this does not necessarily mean that the researchers confined themselves only to the two Member States where English is largely spoken (the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland. On the contrary, a number of EU Member States offer educational programmes taught in English, for example, within Sweden, Denmark and The Netherlands. Nevertheless, it must be recognised that the size and the scope of the European side of the project is limited to an extent not found within the

US, where the overwhelming majority (if not all) of the programmes are taught in English. However, there must be recognition that, if there is to be a significant "partnering" between EU institutions of higher education and their counterparts in the US, then priority will have to be given (at least initially) to EU institutions that provide instruction in English.

The EU data collection for the project was carried out in two stages. The initial data search was undertaken in March 2010. The aim of the search was to identify all undergraduate and postgraduate HS programmes being delivered in English, within the universities of the US and EU. The selected methodological approach for the course search was to identify/compile a comprehensive list of universities in each country in question and then access the website of each identified university. The most comprehensive list for each country was generally found on the "Ranking Web of World Universities" website (http://www.webometrics.info/index.html). Operating since 2004, the Ranking Web contains details of more than 20,000 Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) worldwide. The website lists universities "by country" and provides a hyperlink to the university homepages. The university lists included on the website for each country were, however, then cross-referenced with information on other educational websites, such as *Prospects* (www.prospects.ac.uk), in order to verify the accuracy of the Ranking Web content. The websites of the identified universities were then accessed and searched for any references to HS. All courses which focus on HS and are taught in English were recorded on a spreadsheet which had been developed by the research team. At the end of this stage of data collection, only 3 HS courses (courses which included the term "Homeland Security" in the course title or programme description) were identified in the EU. This was in stark contrast to the US. The search did identify, however, a number of programmes across the EU which included (national) security-related modules (even though the term "Homeland Security" did not appear in the course title or programme description). This confirmed the team's initial suspicions that the term "Homeland Security" remains largely absent in European debate and that European states generally adopt a broader understanding of HS-related security concerns. As such, whilst European programmes may not use the term HS specifically, the research team believed that European programmes may in fact be addressing similar issues to those in US.

For the US data the PhD and master's level programs examined were identified through websites that have collected those institutions providing higher education in homeland security. These were the CHDS University and Agency Partnership Initiative (https://www.chds.us/?partners/institutions), FEMA Emergency Management Institute, Colleges, Universities and Institutions Offering Emergency Management Courses http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/edu/collegelist/ and the ASIS International Academic Programs Council (http://www.asisonline.org/education/universityPrograms/traditionalprograms.pdf). For this analysis, those programs providing a PhD – or master's-level degree in homeland security or a concentration in homeland security for a master's level degree – were considered to be nominally homeland security degrees. Thus, degrees that carried the label "homeland security" in their title; security studies, terrorism studies, or intelligence, emergency planning/management, disaster management were included. Post-baccalaureate certificate programs were not included for this analysis.

In light of this, the data collection exercise was repeated in April 2010. Due to the relative paucity of HS programmes within the European Union, the search criteria was broadened to include additional terms commonly used in US HS programmes; namely, "international security", "security studies", "terrorism", "crime scene investigation", "emergency planning" and "disaster management". In order to maintain focus on the security of states and due to the resource-intensive nature of the exercise, a number of caveats were applied to the search criteria. For example:

- The term “security” was limited to issues of national security, in line with common understandings of the concept of Homeland Security. Courses/modules, therefore, focusing on IT security, organisational security and fraud, for example, were not recorded on the spreadsheet.
- The terms “crime and criminal justice” were limited to issues such as international policing and terrorism. All courses/modules, therefore, focusing on low level crime and forensic science, for example, were not recorded on the spreadsheet.
- The term “disaster management” was limited to issues such as conflict aversion/management and dealing with terrorist threats. All courses/modules, therefore, focusing on natural disasters, for example, were not recorded on the spreadsheet as this would have made the research unwieldy. A separate project examining this important area would help to bring conceptual and theoretical insight. Unfortunately, this particular strand of “disaster management” lies beyond the remit of the present research.

In addition to widening the search criteria, the methodological approach to this second programme search also changed. The approach adopted in stage one presented the research team with a number of challenges. First, the accuracy of the list of universities compiled for each EU member state was potentially questionable – relying on the validity of a number of web-based datasets. More critical, however, was that many of the university websites of non-English speaking countries did not fully translate into English. Whilst many university homepages translated into English, this was not the case when the research team accessed deeper levels of the websites. In non-English speaking Member States, therefore, the research team was unable to decipher whether or not some of the universities did, in fact, teach security-related programmes in English. The methodological approach used for the second stage of data collection, therefore, relied upon inputting the new search terms into online course databases or “academic portals” which prospective English students may use to identify undergraduate and postgraduate opportunities, both at home and abroad. The most comprehensive databases identified, and subsequently searched, included: *UCAS* (www.ucas.ac.uk), *Masters Portal* (www.mastersportal.eu), *Prospects* (www.prospects.ac.uk), and European databases linked to the prospects website and *Study in Europe* (www.studyineurope.eu). Adopting this methodology overcame the problem of translation as all search results yielded were provided in English. However, the research team was unable to identify a single, fully comprehensive, up-to-date, EU-wide course database or fully comprehensive country-specific course databases in English. As a result, the rigour of the research findings arguably remains subject to question.

Nonetheless, whilst the second course search did not highlight any additional HS-specific programmes or modules, it did uncover some 340 security-related programmes or modules being delivered, in English, in universities within EU member states. Further analysis of these programmes resulted in the production of a list of some 146 EU-based programmes which concerned themselves with Homeland Security-related issues. These programmes were aimed at undergraduates and postgraduates. Meanwhile, over 100 American HS-related programmes were identified. The US programmes listed below encompass those HS programmes at Masters and PhD levels, of which there are 98. It must be stressed at this stage that our research is still ongoing, and we are still working through our dataset; hence, we must treat as provisional any conclusions that we reach up to this point.

The dataset is presented in four tables. The first of these tables represent an analysis of the HS benchmarks discovered in our programme analysis. Table 1 lists these as *percentages*, whereas table 2 presents these figures in *absolute numbers*. Given the relative paucity of European HS-related programmes, we resolved to examine the actual content of the European programmes and then to attempt to compare these to the US Homeland Security programmes. We endeavoured to examine exactly *what* the Europeans were teaching if not Homeland Security as defined in the US. For example, despite there being a lack of EU-

based Homeland Security programmes, the researchers speculated as to whether, in fact, the Europeans might actually be teaching in the same areas as their US counterparts, but giving their degrees other names than "Homeland Security". The results are somewhat surprising and are presented in tables 3 and 4. The former outlines this content of EU and US programmes in terms of *percentages*, whereas the latter presents this data in terms of *absolute numbers.*

The data

Table 1: HS analysis of programmes in percentages

Core Content/ Content Areas (Six Critical Mission Areas of Homeland Security)[3]	% Programmes listing under goals/ objectives		% Programmes listing as core courses/ modules		% Programmes listing as elective course/ modules	
	US	**EU**	**US**	**EU**	**US**	**EU**
Intelligence and warning	20.4	4.1	16.3	2.1	14.3	0
Border and transportation security	5.1	0	3.1	0	10.2	0
Domestic counterterrorism (incl. terrorism)	20.4	29.4	28.6	4.8	22.4	3.4
Protecting critical infrastructure/ key assets	7.1	0	13.3	0	10.2	0
Defending against catastrophic threats	6.1	0	3.1	0	9.2	0
Emergency response and preparedness	21.4	0	19.4	0	17.3	0
Abilities (Asst Sec Defense stated abilities within homeland defense)						
Ethics	6.1	0	16.3	2.7	11.2	0
Collaboration	16.3	0	4.1	0	8.2	0
Communication	6.1	0	10.2	0	9.2	0
Creative, critical thinking, adaptability	11.2	0	0	0	0	0
Cultural awareness	4.1	0	4.1	0	10.2	0
Strategic leadership/ leadership	8.2	0	12.2	0	7.1	0
Management/ planning skills	25.5	0	24.5	0	18.4	0
Crisis management	5.1	0	4.1	0	2	0
Scientific/ technological expertise	6.1	0	7.1	0	9.2	0
Risk management	3.1	2.7	5.1	0	3.1	0
HSDECA core competencies[4]						
Intelligence	20.4	4.1	16.3	2.1	14.3	0
Law and policy	18.4	10.3	23.5	16.4	14.3	17.9
Emergency management	15.3	0	17.3	0	11.2	0
Risk analysis	10.2	2.7	12.2	0	13.3	0
Critical infrastructure and key resources	7.1	0	13.3	0	10.2	0
Strategic planning	8.2	0	20.4	0	10.2	0
Terrorism	20.4	29.4	28.6	4.8	22.4	1.4
Strategic communications	1	0	4.1	0	2	0

[3] Data refers to US Masters and PhD programmes only, but all EU HS-related programmes
[4] Data refers to US Masters and PhD programmes only, but all EU HS-related programmes

Analysis of the programme offerings within the US and EU demonstrates that there is a relative lack of comparability in terms of HS benchmarks (see table 1). In terms of US universities listing the various benchmarks under "core content", the highest scoring themes were *emergency response and preparedness*, *intelligence and warning*, and *domestic counterterrorism (including terrorism)*. These areas were not replicated within the EU, where the highest scoring theme was *domestic counterterrorism (including terrorism)*.

Table 2: HS analysis of programmes in absolute numbers

Core Content/ Content Areas (Six Critical Mission Areas of Homeland Security)[5]	# Programmes listing under goals/ objectives		# Programmes listing as core courses/ modules		#Programmes listing as elective course/ modules	
	US	**EU**	**US**	**EU**	**US**	**EU**
Intelligence and warning	20	6	16	3	14	0
Border and transportation security	5	0	3	0	10	0
Domestic counterterrorism (incl. terrorism)	20	43	8	7	5	5
Protecting critical infrastructure/ key assets	7	0	13	0	10	0
Defending against catastrophic threats	6	0	3	0	9	0
Emergency response and preparedness	21	0	19	0	17	0
Abilities (Asst Sec Defense stated abilities within homeland defense)						
Ethics	6	0	16	4	11	0
Collaboration	16	0	4	0	8	0
Communication	6	0	10	0	9	0
Creative, critical thinking, adaptability	11	0	0	0	0	0
Cultural awareness	4	0	4	0	10	0
Strategic leadership/ leadership	8	0	12	0	7	0
Management/ planning skills	25	0	24	0	18	0
Crisis management	5	0	4	0	2	0
Scientific/ technological expertise	6	0	7	0	9	0
Risk management	3	4	5	0	3	0
HSDECA core competencies[6]						
Intelligence	20	6	16	3	14	0
Law and policy	18	15	23	24	14	26
Emergency management	15	0	17	0	11	0
Risk analysis	10	4	12	0	13	0
Critical infrastructure and key resources	7	0	13	0	7	0
Strategic planning	8	0	20	0	10	0
Terrorism	20	43	28	7	22	2
Strategic communications	1	0	4	0	2	0

Similarly, US programmes tended to offer core modules on *domestic counterterrorism (including terrorism)*, *emergency response and preparedness*, *intelligence and warning*, and *protecting critical infrastructure/key assets*. EU programmes tended not to concentrate on these areas within these core benchmarks. Meanwhile, in terms of elective modules, US

[5] Data refers to US Masters and PhD programmes only, but all EU HS-related programmes
[6] Data refers to US Masters and PhD programmes only, but all EU HS-related programmes

programmes tended to offer themes such as *domestic counterterrorism (including terrorism)*, *emergency response and preparedness*, *intelligence and warning, border and transportation security,* and *protecting critical infrastructure/key assets.* This was not replicated within EU-based programmes.

A similar pattern can be observed if we now turn our attention to "benchmark abilities" (as stated by the Assistant Secretary of Defense within Homeland Defense). Of the US universities reporting these themes under their programme goals and objectives, it can be noted that there tends to be an emphasis on *management/planning skills* and *collaboration*. Similarly, US universities requiring students to undertake core modules included within this area included the themes of *management/planning skills*, *ethics*, and *strategic leadership/leadership*. And where we examined US programme "elective modules", it quickly becomes apparent that there is an emphasis on *management/planning skills*, *ethics, cultural awareness*, and *scientific/technological expertise*. This is not replicated within the EU. With the exception of a handful of programmes which examine *ethics* and *risk management* (see Tables 1 and 2) there is almost a complete lack of themes addressed in their benchmark "abilities".

The HSDECA core competencies confirm this pattern. Under the heading of "% programmes listing under [programme] goals/objectives", US programmes tend to concentrate upon *terrorism*, *intelligence*, *law and policy*, *critical infrastructure and key resources*, *emergency management*, and *risk analysis*. This is scarcely replicated within the EU, although some 29.4% of programmes list *terrorism* as an integral part of their programme's goals/objectives, and some 10.3% engage with *law and policy* under the same heading. In terms of core modules, US programmes tend to focus upon *terrorism*, *law and policy*, *strategic planning, emergency management*, and *intelligence*. Within the EU, however, emphasis only appears to be placed on *law and policy*. And as for the percentage of US programmes offering elective modules based upon the HSDECA rubric, the focus tends to be upon *terrorism*, *intelligence*, *law and policy*, *risk analysis*, and *emergency management*. Meanwhile in the EU there is only a comparable amount of focus upon *law and policy.*

The above dataset demonstrates clearly that there are considerable differences in the way in which US and EU programmes approach the discipline of Homeland Security. Whereas the discipline is a nascent one in the US, it is nevertheless a discipline which encompasses many of the core knowledge areas, abilities, and core competencies associated with HS that we have discussed above. In terms of US Master's and PhD provision *alone*, there are numerous programmes which, in one way or another, cover diverse topics such as *intelligence*, *emergency response*, *management skills*, *law*, and *terrorism*. This is not replicated in the European Union. For various reasons outlined in the final section of this paper, EU Homeland Security-related programmes tend to focus upon *terrorism* and *law*. For some reason, the Europeans tend not to be so interested in the HS areas outlined above, and instead appear to be focussing upon other areas than their American counterparts. When one considers the main issue areas of interest to European programmes and compare these to their US counterparts outlined in Tables 3 and 4 below, the results become intriguing.

Given that EU-based programmes do not seem to map well onto the HS benchmarks discussed above, it was necessary to analyse exactly what the European programmes were actually examining. Using the same three categories of "programme goals and objectives", "universities listing as core modules", and "universities listing as elective modules", a clear pattern began to emerge (see Tables 3 and 4). Although a staggering 63.3% of US programmes listed *security* within their programme goals and objectives, and some 32.6% identified *terrorism* under the same rubric, matters became much more pronounced within the EU-based programmes. Here, some 61.6% of programmes listed *International Relations* under their programme goals and objectives. This was followed in descending order by

security (45.9%), global issues/globalisation (39%), *terrorism* (29.4%), *war* (28.1%), and *political science* (19.9%).

A similar pattern can be observed when we examine the programme core modules. In the US these tend to be in descending order: *security*, *terrorism*, *risk*, *research methods*, and *law*. By contrast, EU-based programmes tend to focus on *International Relations* (41.1%), *security* (35.6%), *global issues/globalisation* (21.2%), and *law* (16.4%). Moving on to consider elective modules, the most numerous of those in the US are *terrorism*, *security*, and *intelligence*. In the EU the most cited electives are: *security* (44.5%), *foreign policy* (19.9%), *war* (19.2%), *International Relations* (16.4%), *The Middle East* (15.8%), *global issues/globalisation* and *Islam* (both 14.4%), and *human rights* (13.7%).

Table 3: Overall data analysis in terms of content: percentages

Areas listed within programme dataset	# Programmes listing under goals/ objectives		# Programmes listing as core courses/ modules		# Programmes listing as elective course/ modules	
	US	**EU**	**US**	**EU**	**US**	**EU**
Conflict management	2	4.1	1	0	1	0
Conflict theory	0	0	0	5.4	2	4.8
Crime and criminal justice	13.3	4.1	8.2	6.2	14.3	0
Democracy	1	0	0	2.1	5.1	11.6
Deterrence	1	1.4	1	1.4	0	0
Development	23.4	0	8.1	5.4	14.3	6.2
Diplomacy	2	0	0	5.4	3.1	4.8
Economics	7.1	2.1	11.2	0	12.2	0
Ethics	7.1	0	11.2	2.7	10.2	0
Europe	1	5.4	0	11.6	3.1	0
European Union CFSP	1	0	0	0	0	2.7
Foreign policy	3.1	0	2	7.5	5.1	19.9
Global issues (globalisation)	2	39	5.1	21.2	9.2	14.4
History	5.1	0	9.2	6.2	6.1	0
Human rights	4.1	12.3	1	4.8	5.1	13.7
Humanitarian law	1	0	2	0	2	3.4
Intelligence	17.3	4.1	17.3	2.1	25.5	0
International politics	2	1.4	2	2.7	5.1	0
International Relations	5.1	61.6	6.1	41.1	7.1	16.4
Intervention	3.1	0	1	0	3.1	2.1
Islam	0	0	1	0	3.1	2.1
Law	23.4	10.3	17.3	16.4	19.4	14.4
Middle East	0	0	0	0	3.1	15.8
Peace and peacekeeping	4.1	4.8	1	2.7	2	0
Political philosophy	0	0	1	2.1	1	0
Political science	5.1	19.9	2	0	1	0
Politics	3.1	0	4.1	0	12.2	8.2
Religion	0	0	1	0	2	6
Research methods	10.2	0	20.4	8.2	6.1	0
Risk	26.5	2.7	22.4	0	22.4	0
Security	63.3	45.9	40.8	35.6	39.8	44.5
Terrorism	32.6	29.4	28.6	4.8	40.8	1.4
War	6.1	28.1	1	7.5	5.1	19.2

Clearly there are some significant differences between provision in the US and EU. Before we address these differences, it is useful to spend a moment on where there is apparent convergence, although it must be said that this is somewhat rare. In terms of HS benchmarks, there appears to be some similarity in the emphasis upon areas such as

terrorism (within the programme goals and objectives), *security* (within all three areas: programme goals and objectives, core modules, and elective modules) and *law and policy* (again within all three areas: programme goals and objectives, core modules, and elective modules). But similarities within the HS benchmarks are few and far between on the opposite sides of the Atlantic Ocean. The only major similarity between the programmes in terms of generic content is in terms of *terrorism* (within the programme goals and objectives), and *security* (within all three areas: programme goals and objectives, core modules, and elective modules. But overlap in other areas is scant. This raises a question: why are the US and EU programmes so different both in terms of HS benchmarks and generic content? In the next section we begin to speculate why this might be the case.

Table 4: Overall data analysis in terms of content: absolute numbers

Areas listed within programme dataset	# Programmes listing under goals/ objectives		# Programmes listing as core courses/ modules		# Programmes listing as elective course/ modules	
	US	**EU**	**US**	**EU**	**US**	**EU**
Conflict management	2	6	1	0	1	0
Conflict theory	0	0	0	8	2	7
Crime and criminal justice	13	6	8	9	14	0
Democracy	1	0	0	3	5	17
Deterrence	1	2	1	2	0	0
Development	23	0	8	8	14	9
Diplomacy	2	0	0	8	3	7
Economics	7	3	11	0	12	0
Ethics	7	0	11	4	10	0
Europe	1	8	0	17	3	0
European Union CFSP	1	0	0	0	0	4
Foreign policy	3	0	2	11	5	29
Global issues (globalisation)	2	57	5	31	9	21
History	5	0	9	9	6	0
Human rights	4	18	1	7	5	20
Humanitarian law	1	0	2	0	2	5
Intelligence	17	6	17	3	25	0
International politics	2	2	0	4	5	0
International Relations	5	90	6	60	7	24
Intervention	3	0	1	0	3	3
Islam	0	0	1	0	3	3
Law	23	15	17	24	19	21
Middle East	0	0	0	0	3	23
Peace and peacekeeping	4	7	1	4	2	0
Political philosophy	0	0	1	3	1	0
Political science	5	29	2	0	1	0
Politics	3	0	4	0	12	12
Religion	0	0	1	0	2	6
Research methods	10	0	20	12	6	0
Risk	26	4	22	0	22	0
Security	62	67	40	52	39	65
Terrorism	32	43	28	7	40	2
War	6	41	1	11	5	28

Discussion

The data presented above demonstrate clearly that there are few similarities between US and EU-based the programmes and many differences. So how might we best explain these rather large discrepancies between the programmes offered in the US and EU? Why does it appear to be the case that HS-related programmes are flourishing in the US and not the EU?

For the reasons outlined above, definitive answers cannot be given at this stage. It is nevertheless apposite to speculate on why these differences have emerged. In order to assist in this endeavour, we posit three tentative hypotheses which may be used as explanatory factors.

Hypothesis 1: Acts of terrorism in the US and the EU

It would be a mistake to assume that the United States did not suffer terrorist attacks prior to those committed on New York and Washington on 9/11. Examples of earlier terrorist outrages include Timothy McVeigh's bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah building in Oklahoma City in 1995, which led to some 168 deaths and over 600 casualties. Three years later witnessed the bombings of the US embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam in August 1998, although these attacks occurred within Africa as opposed to the US homeland itself. Depending on how one might define the concept of terrorism, there have been other incidents such as the bombing of the USS Cole in October 2000. It might also be argued that physical attacks – and sometimes even the murder – of US medical practitioners who perform abortions are also indicative of terrorist activity within the United States.

Setting aside the relative strengths and weaknesses of these arguments and focusing instead upon the attacks of 9/11, what was most poignant (apart from the horrific images of the events) was the symbolism that the attacks engendered. It was shocking to see how comparatively easy it was for a group of lightly armed but determined terrorists to strike at the very heart of the US political and business establishment. The relative strength of the world's leading military and economic power was laid bare on that morning. Acts of terrorism, which had been sporadic in US history up to this point, nevertheless did not connote an existential threat. But it might be argued that 9/11 represented the moment when the US lost its veil of innocence and awoke to the threat of terrorism within its own homeland. As a result, it might be argued that US universities have decided to attempt to plug a perceived gap in educational provision, and therefore to construct HS-related programmes that focus upon the impact of terrorism on the US homeland, how to prevent it, and increasingly how to manage and respond to catastrophic events such as terrorist attacks and, with arguably increasing frequency since Hurricane Katrina, natural disasters. For such reasons, we are witnessing the mushrooming of HS-related programmes as well as those in Emergency Management.

There have been wildfires on occasion and episodes of bad weather, but up to the point of writing this paper, no such natural disasters have befallen the European Union. Member States have not, for example, had to respond to an event of the magnitude of Hurricane Katrina. What is more, terrorism within the European Union is not a new phenomenon. Ranging from the acts of Basque separatists to those of the Red Brigades and the Red Army Faction, many European nations have a long history of dealing with – and responding to – terrorist attacks. Even though there have been religious-inspired terrorist outrages in the UK and Spain post 9/11, terrorism is not something that has suddenly appeared in the past decade. Both the UK and Spanish governments have sought to fight terrorism for many years now – Irish Republicans within the UK and Basque separatists within Spain. In other words, terrorism within the EU is not a new phenomenon. Although terrorism has developed into an interesting field of study, and there are plenty of EU-based universities offering entire programmes on the subject, it has not warranted the same academic attention as that of Homeland Security-related education in the US. Nevertheless, it might be argued that past episodes of terrorism within Europe, horrendous as they were at the time, seem to be relatively mild in comparison to that prosecuted by Osama bin Laden's self-declared war on various Western states in general and the United States in particular. Whereas earlier terrorist groups had a stated *localised* goal (such as overturning British rule in Ulster, the removal of Spanish influence in the Basque region and so on), the terrorism of Al-Qaeda and its affiliates is directed toward maximum death and destruction on a *global* scale. This group

has threatened future terrorist outrages. Were they to be successful then it is possible that EU-based universities would begin to devote the same academic scrutiny to Homeland Security questions as already undertaken by their colleagues in the US.

Hypothesis 2: Government responses

As has been noted above, the responses of US and European governments to terrorist incidents have been markedly different. Archick *et al*. (2006: 1) remind us that while 'the United States has embarked on a wholesale reorganisation of its domestic security and border protection institutions, European countries have largely preferred to work within their existing institutional architectures to combat terrorism and respond to other security challenges and disasters, both natural and man-made'. As noted above, the US set about radically to reorganise its own domestic institutions, by creating the Department of Homeland Security. It must also be clear that the US had been issued a "Declaration of War" in 1998 by Bin Laden and although it may not have been taken as seriously as it should have been within certain circles of the US government, the 9/11 attacks clearly demonstrated the resolve of the US's newest enemy. What emerged from the metaphorical ashes of the 9/11 attacks was a set of new government institutions *specifically* designed to address Homeland Security issues. The most obvious example of this was the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, although it should not be forgotten that individual states have also sought to address HS-related issues.

This has largely not been the case within the EU, where individual Member State responses to HS threats have not exactly mirrored those in the US. There is, for example, no dedicated Department of Homeland Security within the UK, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy or Spain. Indeed, as Archick *et al*. (2006: 1) remind us, in 'most of these countries, responsibility for different aspects of Homeland Security and counterterrorism is scattered across several ministries, and inter-governmental cooperation plays a key role in addressing threats and challenges to domestic security. In some countries, such as the UK, Germany, and Belgium, responsibility for Homeland Security affairs is also split among federal and regional or state governments'. That is not to say, however, that European nations have left their institutional apparatuses largely unchecked. Instead, Member States have sought successfully to cooperate more closely with other European nations building upon existing institutional arrangements. Prior to the attacks on New York and Washington, many EU Member States sought closer integration on such issues as the completion of the European Single Market. This led to the creation of the Schengen Area where, in certain parts of the EU, a citizen can cross a national frontier without having to present his or her passport at the border. Other areas of integration have proved to be problematic, though, such as those dealing with foreign and defence policy on the one hand, and justice and home affairs on the other. Responsibility for these policy sectors still lie largely in the hands of the individual Member States. Whereas some politicians such as the British Prime Minister have barely concealed their hostility to further EU integration (Kirkup 2009), other commentators have reminded us that an EU system of Homeland Security might actually be prudent. As Archick *et al*. (2006: 2) remind us, some analysts 'argue that more extensive EU efforts to coordinate Homeland Security affairs would help bring order and greater coherence to the myriad of government institutions engaged in protecting domestic security within each EU member state, and encourage common security and budgetary priorities among all members'. But almost two decades have passed since the signing of the Maastricht Treaty and integration in these sensitive areas remains elusive.

It is no exaggeration to argue that the institutional responses to the 9/11 attacks have been very different on both sides of the Atlantic. The United States has sought to address Homeland Security challenges by creating a whole new set of institutional apparatus at the federal level. This has not been replicated within the EU where, to all intents and purposes, HS issues still remain *largely* the preserve of the Member States. This might also be used as

an explanatory factor as to why there has been such an apparent reluctance for European universities to embrace HS-related programmes to the extent that has been witnessed in American academia. In the former, there has been *comparatively* less change in the institutional architecture of the state, whereas there has been a surge in interest on HS-related issues within the latter. This appears to be reflected in HS programme provision. American universities appear to be immersing themselves in HS issues, much as their government has done in the past decade. European governments have changed little in their HS provision and, as a consequence, there has been *comparatively* less emphasis to alter educational provision within Europe. In European academia, therefore, Homeland Security remains an issue that resides within the doldrums. This is not to argue, however, that the Europeans are aloof to HS issues. On the contrary, but the ways in which these issues are addressed are markedly different to those in the US.

Hypothesis 3: Diverging academic trends

In the United States, a growing set of HS institutions has witnessed a concomitant growth in HS-related programmes. US students are perhaps coming to terms with the reasons why the US was attacked on 9/11, and why despite the best efforts of different Presidencies, the US American homeland apparently remains under threat of attack. There is another reason why these programmes have gained in popularity, however. As various HS-related institutions have emerged, the chance of a career within these institutions has also availed itself to potential students. Whilst the relative merits of studying Homeland Security in its own right are clearly uppermost in the minds of American academics when they construct their HS programmes, there is also perhaps another reason – that of the job market. By studying HS-related programmes, successful students may potentially acquire a qualification that will possibly provide them with an advantage to seek a career in either a state or federal HS institution. Whilst critical thinking is of central concern to these programmes, it could be argued that American HS-related programmes are more concerned with understanding HS policy and implementation. For that reason, it might be argued that US Homeland Security programmes tend to be more *policy* oriented.

Questions relating to broader security issues have been of central importance to various European academic programmes for some years now. But how these security issues have been conceptualised and researched is slightly different to that of their American counterparts. Prior to 9/11, one of the major areas of research within political science was that of International Relations. Within these programmes, theoretical questions tended to be given more emphasis than questions on actual policy. Practitioners of IR were not necessarily interested in the minutiae of the practicalities of government – although that is not to say that such questions were ignored – but instead attempted to theorise ontological and metaphysical questions on the nature of the state, and whether or not the state was the appropriate mechanism to impose order in an apparently anarchical international system. Indeed, in this regard it might be argued that comparatively little has changed in European academia post 9/11.

As our data set above demonstrates, theoretical questions posed by the discipline of IR continue to form a major plank of European HS-related programmes, *with some 61.6%* of HS-related programmes focusing upon International Relations. This, coupled with an at times extremely critical European discourse that emerged concerning the behaviour of certain states within the realm of international affairs, appears to offer insights into how US and EU-based programmes on Homeland Security have grown. We should not assume that potential European students have no concerns about their employment prospects. Such a proposition would be risible, especially given the difficulties in the contemporary labour market. But whilst US students on HS-related programmes can gear themselves towards employment in Homeland Security institutions at the state and federal levels, European students by contrast do not have the same employment possibilities. For that reason,

European programmes have tended to concentrate on more established areas of academic scholarship (such as International Relations). In other words, whereas US programmes are more policy oriented, European programmes appear to concern themselves with more abstract theoretical questions.

Conclusion

This paper has sought to investigate differences between US and EU Homeland Security-related education taught in English. After reviewing this provision it is clear that, with the exception of one or two cases, the US and EU programmes differ considerably. The data presented in this paper are still something of a work in progress. But the evidence uncovered thus far enables us to draw some tentative conclusions. For example, it might be hypothesised that these differences can be explained by the symbolism of 9/11 – a huge and devastating attack on the world's leading economic and military superpower. Terrorist attacks have occurred within the EU, but these have been on a smaller (albeit still horrific) scale and by terrorist groups with far fewer goals than that of the global terrorist organisation Al Qaida. We might also hypothesise that differences in educational provision can be attributed to how the respective governments have responded to terrorist attacks. The Americans have been much more proactive than the Europeans. In addition, we might also hypothesise that US universities have followed an economic logic largely absent in Europe – to teach programmes that will arguably lead to clearly defined career opportunities. We remain open-minded about these hypotheses, though. They might be wrong, there might be further issues to consider once our data has been collected further and the metaphorical fog begins to lift. But at the time of writing we are reminded of the famous dictum that "Americans are from Mars and Europeans are from Venus". To which might be added: "especially when it applies to the teaching of Homeland Security-related issues".

Bibliography

Archick, K., Ek, C., Gallis, P., Miko, F., and Woehre, S. (2006) *European Approaches to Homeland Security and Counterterrorism. Congressional Research Service*. The Library of Congress, Order Code RL33573, Available from: www.fas.org/sgp/crs/homesec/RL33573.pdf.

Carroll, L. (1997) [1865] *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking Glass*, London: Puffin.

DGO (2009) *Draft General Overview for academic programs (associate's, undergraduate and graduate) seeking program accreditation*. (Nov. 2009). Homeland Security and Defense Education Consortium Association.

Home Office (2009) "About us", Available from: http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/about-us/organisation/home-office-structure

Klitz, L. (2009) "Civic mission of HS education: A response to McCreight", *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*, Volume 6, issue 1, article 57.

Larrabee, F.S. and Lindley-French, J. (2008) *Revitalizing the Transatlantic Security Partnership - An Agenda for Action.* A Venusberg Group and Rand Corporation Project

McCreight, R. (2009) "Educational challenges in Homeland Security and Emergency Management", *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*, Volume 6 (1), article 34.

Napolitano, J. (2011) “State of America’s Homeland Security Address”, *US Department of Homeland Security*, 27 January 2011, Available from: http://www.dhs.gov/ynews/speeches/sp_1296152572413.shtm.

NRC (2005) National Research Council, *Frameworks for Higher Education in Homeland Security*, Committee on Educational Paradigms for Homeland Security, Policy and Global Affairs, Washington DC: The National Academies Press.

NSHS (2002) *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, Office of Homeland Security, Available from: http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat_strat_hls.pdf.

Roberts, G. K. (1978) “The explanation of politics: comparison, strategy and theory,” in P.G. Lewis, D.C. Potter and F.G. Castles, eds., *The Practice of Comparative Politics: A Reader: Second Edition*, London: Longman, Ch. 19, 287-304.

van Deth, J. W. (1998) “Equivalence in comparative political research,” in J.W. van Deth, ed., *Comparative Politics: The problem of equivalence*, London: Routledge, Ch. 1, 1-19.