

National Security and Defence

Artur Victoria

Safety is a necessity, an aspiration, and an inalienable right of the human being. Understanding Security is always a sense of guarantee, protection, or tranquillity in the face of obstacles and threats, actions contrary to the person, institutions, or essential goods, existing or intended.

Concerning the Common Good, Security is an indispensable element in seeking the closest possible approximation to those ideal, thanks to the degree of assurance it must provide.

The State bears the most significant responsibility for the safety of all, as it must and may demand the fulfillment of the duties and functions necessary to maintain this condition.

One of the most challenging problems that the leaders of a nation face is to strike the right balance between the obligations and responsibilities of the State - aimed at the collective interest and the monopoly of the legitimate use of force - and those of the citizen, the possessor of a inalienable rights and, on the other hand, subordinate to the legal order of the rule of law. In the outer sphere, as well as in the domestic area, the aspiration for the Security of nations is constant.

Security matters encompass both the so-called hostile universe, the one in which attitudes are contrary to efforts aimed at the attainment and preservation of the National Objectives, and the non-antagonistic one.

Fear can threaten the tranquillity of man, individually or collectively.

To make it difficult or impeding the protection causing concerns, and what is capable of generating conflict, are the so-called reasons for insecurity.

That can take many forms. Sometimes result from the scarcity of essential resources to meet the basic needs of the population.

These reasons for insecurity may also stem from threats to the Nation's sovereignty, heritage, or territorial integrity.

Sometimes they take on very subtle forms, such as those arising from the improper intrusion of external cultures that undermine national cultural identity. Thus, the concept of Security, in the broad sense, includes the guarantee against all forms of threat to the individual or social groups, and may assume different shapes.

Security is the feeling of warranty that is necessary and indispensable to society and each of its members against threats of any kind.

The scope of Security is divided into the following levels: individual, community, national, and collective.

These levels reflect the complexity and size of everyone's responsibility for Security. The State corresponds to higher charges as a holder than a substantial portion of the National Power.

Regarding individual Security, man must have guaranteed rights such as freedom, property, mobility, protection against crime, and also the solution of his fundamental problems such as health, education, justice, social security, subsistence, and opportunities.

Since man is essentially a gregarious being, it is not enough for him to be backed by individual Security.

Security is the guarantee of levels of stability of political, economic, and social relations, which preserve and regulate property, capital, and labour for their full use in the individual and social interest.

Security guarantees the coexistence between individuals and groups.

It brings the factor of harmonization for society.

National Security is related to the inviolability of the territory and national heritage. It also aims to guarantee the unity and culture of the Nation and the functioning of the rule of law.

The threats to national Security most often originate from the external environment of the Nation can reach such a degree of generalization and severity that become significant factors of instability for the Nation.

The conception of Collective Security stems from the idea that the elimination of areas of friction and a higher possibility to reach and preserve the objectives of common interest.

It should be noted, however, that National Security is not at the service of Collective Security, on the contrary, the latter complements the former.

The defense is an act, or set of measures, attitudes, and actions, which counteract a particular type of threat, and which is characterized and sized to provide a sense of Security.

The defense is an act or set of actions performed to obtain or safeguard the conditions recognized as Security.

It results as Security is a feeling, while Defense is an act.

Acts of defense guarantee security at different levels. On the other hand, these actions will always be coordinated, supervised, or directly implemented by the State, according to the legal-political order and specific planning.

Defense System is the set of means, availabilities, and relationships through which the National Power is supported - or part of it - and that interact in a coordinated manner, to guarantee or restore the feeling of Security.

It is important to note that the Defense System can take on specific characteristics depending on the type of defense action to be planned and conducted.

This system operates in a Defense Environment, which is configured every time it is necessary to regroup resources of all kinds, to guarantee or restore Security at any of its levels of perception.

Defense Environment is the context with some kind of incidence of external or internal factors - of political, military, scientific-technological, economic or psychosocial origin - not consistent with the existing or desired level of Security.

Public Security encompasses human Security as an individual being and as a social being. It thus incorporates the interrelationships between the individual and community levels of Security.

Therefore, the implementation of Public Security requires the guarantee of the exercise of individual and group rights, the maintenance of the stability of institutions, the functioning of public services, and the prevention of social damage.

Public Order is the situation of normality whose preservation rests with the State, the institutions and the members of society, according to legally established legal norms.

Public Security is exercised employing Public Defense actions implemented by the Public Defense System, for the preservation of the Public Order.

Public Security is the State of normality in the society, guaranteed by the Public Order. It is done through the application of the Police Power, the exclusive prerogative of the State.

The Public Defense, also related to the Public Order, should promote the necessary actions for its preservation.

Public Defense is the set of measures, attitudes, and activities, coordinated and applied by the State, through actual or potential application of the Police Power to overcome specific threats to Public Order.

These Public Defense actions are implemented in the Public Defense Environment by a Public Defense System, whose central body is, depending on the political form of Government, usually the Ministry of Justice or the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

There are subsystems, centered on the respective Public Security Offices or related entities.

The Public Defense, also related to the Public Order, should promote the necessary actions for its preservation. Public Defense is the set of measures, attitudes, and activities, coordinated and applied by the State, through actual or potential application of the Police Power to overcome specific threats to Public Order.

National Security National Security stems from the need to protect society as a whole and the preservation by ensuring that national interests and aspirations are met. , requiring constant monitoring of the international conjuncture.

National Security is the responsibility of the State and from the entire Nation, whose survival calls for the cooperation of the national community and each individual.

National Security is the guarantee that the objectives of sovereign existence, democratic identity, social integration, heritage integrity, progress, and social peace are sought and preserved.

Here is a clear distinction in treatment when threatening National Security.

In the event of antagonism, that is, obstacles that adversely hinder or prevent the achievement or preservation of the National Objectives, the measures will be predominantly coercive to varying degrees and levels. In case of adverse factors that threaten the National Objectives, the rules will be mostly preventive, conducted in a process characterized by their emergence and exceptionality.

National Defense

When National Power is effectively applied through actions aimed at overcoming internal or external antagonisms that may affect the purpose and / or maintenance of the Fundamental Objectives, National Defense materializes.

These defense actions are implemented by a system that meets the concept of Defense System State-owned means.

However it may incorporate foreign institutions to the apparatus provided that they act in a coordinated manner, under the guidance or supervision of the State, in actions in Defense of national interests and needs.

The concept of National Defense: National Defense is the set of actions of the State, for the integrity of the territory, sovereignty, and national interests against predominantly potential or existing external threats.

Although the concept presented brings the idea of "emphasis on the military expression," other measures and actions of the State can be implemented and are not excluded.

Thus, National Defense involves the entire Nation and can assume different connotations.

On the other hand, while there is a clear preponderance of concerns about external threats, defense actions, depending on the type of risk, can be implemented both externally and internally.

The general guidance in the execution of these defense actions must be contained in specific documentation. This document is called the National Defense Policy.

National Defense Policy is the set of Government Objectives and guidelines to conquer and maintain them, overcoming threats and aggressions of internal or external origin that manifest themselves.

Or may speak out against the Security and Development of the Nation.

To overcome obstacles, achieve and preserve the Goals, following the guidelines established by the National Defense Policy.

External Defense is present to establish specific policies and strategic actions concerning the strengthening of Power, since the increase of power means to increase the possibilities of negotiating and deterring.

And even, if necessary, to act coercively

In External Defense Actions are actions planned and coordinated by the Government, applied in the external environment of the Nation and aimed at overcoming threats that might undermine it.

Internal Defense Actions are responses to specific threats against National Security at home.

Such risks are infringing the legitimately established legal order and are duly evidenced by initiatives and acts that hinder or endanger the attainment or maintenance of the Constitution.

The response to such attitudes and acts of manifest antagonism will be the adoption of planned and coordinated measures that must be provided or determined by the legal system of the State.

Internal Defense Actions are actions planned and coordinated by the Government, limited and/or determined by the legal system aimed at overcoming situations that may act against the public Security.

The Constitution of each Country determines the adoption of preventive and operational attitudes and measures, establishing responsibilities according to the progressiveness of the threats.

Military Aspects of Defense. The use of, or part of Power in defense actions aimed at guaranteeing National Security may have the predominance of a particular expression of power. When the military expression is predominant, defensive measures have at least one unique characteristic: actual employment or the mere threat of the use of force and/or violence. In this particular case, the National Defense System assumes specific features.

A Military Defense System can be conceptualized as the set of means, availability, and relationships, predominantly military, able to be used in a coordinated manner and with the actual use with a threat use of form and/or violence in defense of national interests in a defined situation.

The Military Defense System has as its central organ the Ministry of Defense, which is responsible for coordinating, supervising, and/or executing defense actions, in which military expression predominates.

The Ministry of Defense performs tasks articulating itself with other sectors of the State or even non-state organizations, always acting as determined by the President of the Republic and operating within the legal limits.

Bibliography

Alseraidi, Suhail M. USA Homeland Security: A Model for the United Arab Emirates. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, March 24, 2009. 26pp. (AD-A500-864) <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA500864>

Bennett, James T. Homeland Security Scams. New Brunswick: Transaction, 2006. 218pp. (HV6432.4 .B25 2006)

Carafano, James Jay. Homeland Security Spending for the Long War. Washington, DC: Heritage Foundation, 2007. 12pp. (HD87 .H26 no.989) <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Lecture/Homeland-Security-Spending-for-the-Long-War>

Carafano, James Jay. Thinking for the Long War: Strategic Planning and Review for the Department of Homeland Security. Washington, DC: Heritage Foundation, March 28, 2007. 5pp. (HD87 .H26 no.1008)

<http://www.heritage.org/Research/Lecture/Thinking-for-theLong-War-Strategic-Planning-and-Review-for-the-Department-of-Homeland-Security>

Center for the Study of the Presidency. Project on National Security Reform. Forging a New Shield. Arlington: Center for the Study of the Presidency, Project on National Security Reform, November 2008. 793pp. (UA23 .F67 2008) http://www.pnsr.org/data/files/pnsr_forging_a_new_shield_report.pdf

Center for the Study of the Presidency. Project on National Security Reform. Forging a New Shield: Executive Summary. Arlington: Center for the Study of the Presidency, Project on National Security Reform, November 2008. 17pp. (UA23 .F672 2008) http://pnsr.org/data/files/pnsr%20forging_exec%20summary_12-2-08.pdf

Chertoff, Michael. Department of Homeland Security: Charting a Path Forward. Washington, DC: Heritage Foundation, April 3, 2006. 8pp. (HD87 .H26 no.933) <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Lecture/Department-of-Homeland-Security-Charting-a-Path-Forward>

Chertoff, Michael. Homeland Security: Assessing the First Five Years. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009. 203pp. (HV6432.4 .C54 2009)

Clarke, John Louie, ed. Armies in Homeland Security: American and European Perspectives. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 2006. 251pp. (UA926 .A65 2006)

Conner, Christopher E. Is There a Role for Special Operations Forces in Homeland Security. Civilian Research Project. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College; Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Security Studies Program, May 30, 2006. 8pp. (SSC 2006 CON)

Cumti, Amanda Merritt. U.S. Army North/5th Army: Building Relationships to Defend the Homeland and Meet Emerging Regional Challenges. Arlington: Association of the United States Army, Institute of Land Warfare, February 15, 2007. 11pp. (UA10.5 .N16 07-1) http://www3.usa.org/pdfdocs/nsw07_1.pdf

usimano, Deborah Marie. Foreign and Domestic Security—A Unified Strategy. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, February 27, 2009. 24pp. (AD-A494-791) <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA494791>

Davis, Lois M., et al. Long-Term Effects of Law Enforcement's Post-9/11 Focus on Counterterrorism and Homeland Security. Santa Monica: RAND, 2010. 133pp. http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2010/RAND_MG1031.pdf

Doubler, Michael Dale. The National Guard and the War on Terror: The Attacks of 9/11 and Homeland Security. Arlington: National Guard Bureau, Office of Public Affairs, Historical Services Division, May 1, 2006. 102pp. (UA42 .D581 2006)

Emanuel, Frank D. The Security of the Homeland (A National Guard Perspective). Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, March 13, 2008. 24pp. (AD-A479-006) <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA479006>

Ethridge, Terry. Homeland Security and Defense: The One Army Approach. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, March 7, 2006. 19pp. (AD-A449850) <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA449850>

Flynn, Stephen E., and Daniel B. Prieto. Neglected Defense: Mobilizing the Private Sector to Support Homeland Security. New York: Council on Foreign Relations, March 2006. 49pp. (E183.7 .C68 no.13) <http://www.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/NeglectedDefenseCSR.pdf>

Garshak, Michael J. Analysis of the U.S. Army's Two-Reserve Structure: Is a Federal Army Reserve Force Necessary? Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, March 15, 2006. 22pp. (AD-A449-654) <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA449654>

Hilsdon, Steven R. The National Guard: Recommendations to Develop the Joint Future Force. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, March 19, 2010. 28pp. (AD-A519-877) <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA519877>

Kettl, Donald F. System under Stress: Homeland Security and American Politics. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2007. 166pp. (HV6432 .K27 2007)

Larence, Eileen Regen. Homeland Security: Preliminary Information on Federal Actions to Address Challenges Faced by State and Local Information Fusion Centers; Testimony before the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing and Terrorism Risk Assessment, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Accountability Office, September 27, 2007. 13pp. (HV6432 .L17 2007) <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d071241t.pdf>

Mayer, Matt A. *Homeland Security and Federalism: Protecting America from Outside the Beltway*. Westport: Praeger, 2009. Praeger Security International

McGinnis, Gary L. *Revolutionizing Northern Command*. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, March 19, 2010. 30pp. (AD-A520-027) <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA520027>

Nuismer, Barbara A. *Regional Civil Support Forces for Homeland Defense and Civil Support Missions*. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, March 12, 2007. 24pp. (AD-A467-297) <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA467297>

Pitts, Michael J. *A Road Map for National Security: The Intersection of the Departments of Homeland Security and Defense*. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, March 6, 2006. 21pp. (AD-A448-441) <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA448441>

Preston, Andrew. "A Fine Balance: The Evolution of the National Security Adviser." In *Rethinking Leadership and "Whole of Government" National Security Reform: Problems, Progress, and Prospects*, edited by Joseph R. Cerami and Jeffrey A. Engel, 127-148. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, May 2010. (U413 .A66R48 2010) <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB992.pdf#page=135>

Randol, Mark A. *The Department of Homeland Security Intelligence Enterprise: Operational Overview and Oversight Challenges for Congress*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, March 19, 2010. 57pp. <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/homesecc/R40602.pdf>

Raney, Matthew A. *Post-9/11 Evolution of the National Guard's Role in Homeland Defense*. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, March 30, 2007. 22pp. (AD-A471-305) <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA471305>

Ridge, Thomas J. *The Test of Our Times: America Under Siege—And How We Can Be Safe Again*. New York: Dunne, 2009. 288pp. (HV6432 .R52 2009)

Rodgers, Ernest E., III. *The Army National Guard and the Department of Homeland Security*. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, March 24, 2010. 26pp. (AD-A521-959) <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA521959>

Shea, Dana A., and Daniel Morgan. *The DHS [Department of Homeland Security] Directorate of Science and Technology: Key Issues for Congress*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, June 22, 2009. 52pp. <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/homesecc/RL34356.pdf>

Stringer, Kevin Douglas. *Military Organizations for Homeland Defense and Smaller-Scale Contingencies: A Comparative Approach*. Westport: Praeger, 2006. 222pp. (UH723 .S76 2006)

Sullivan, Michael J. *Homeland Security: Challenges in Creating an Effective Acquisition Organization; Testimony before the Committee on Government Reform, House of Representatives*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Accountability Office, July 27, 2006. 9pp. (HV6432.4 .S84 2006) <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d061012t.pdf>

Thompson, Dennis M. *Command and Control of Homeland Security Response to Catastrophic Incidents*. Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, March 15, 2006. 14pp. (AD-A449-392) <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA449392>