

# New Security Models and Public-private Partnership

Vlatko Cvrtila<sup>1</sup> and Anita Perešin<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Applied Sciences VERN, Zagreb, Croatia

<sup>2</sup> Office of National Security Council, Zagreb, Croatia

## ABSTRACT

*Transformation of contemporary security threats shapes new security environment and security paradigm. They explain the transition from security environment, in which conflict is the dominant one, to environment in which all security actors have to prepare various non-military responses to security threats, and very often have to cooperate. New security needs are being developed but in them public sector has less possibilities and capacities for independent actions. Given the nature of endangerment, it seems necessary to create new models of security activities which will involve everyone who can contribute to the prevention and suppression of new threats, and creating resistance of society as a whole. Security response is no longer based only on the reactions to threats, but more on prevention. By taking this into account, it is expected the broader participation of different actors in mutual social responsibilities, thus creating conditions for the development of preventive model as the best answer. In this paper we will analyze the development of new policies of response to security threats and contemporary crisis which is reflected in the formation of public-private partnerships with the private sector in the areas where is common interest and in the involvement of citizens in all aspects of the security activities, particularly in preventive one.*

**Key words:** security threats, new security paradigm, public-private partnership, prevention

## Introduction

Globalization has in many ways changed the modern societies, but also types of activities of all actors. Particularly, significant changes can be traced in the security field in which various new challenges, threats and dangers have occurred. While traditional Cold War security concepts were based on static and reactive approach of managing conventional distinctive types of threats, the appearance of asymmetric threats is changing perception of security and new risks and has direct influence on the development of their responses. Asymmetric is not the only characteristic of new threats and challenges, but also their constant transformation in new forms, as well as spatial coverage that often exceeds national borders. Traditional national systems and mechanisms that are almost entirely rebuilt by relying on national capacities and capabilities, can no longer be effective in modern conditions.

World is constantly exposed to new forms of crisis and disasters. Modern societies are becoming more vulnerable and sensitive to disturbance. New circumstances re-

quire new types of responses, which the nation states cannot provide by themselves. In order to protect their citizens they have to develop cooperation with other actors. World, which is exposed to crises and disasters, is changing dramatically and much faster than we can follow with our responses<sup>1</sup>. Beck speaks of »second modernity«, a world characterized by increased interdependence<sup>2</sup>. That is the world in which »transnational corporations and nation-states are competing and collaborating at the same time, war has become almost unthinkable and both military power and diplomacy have lost their longstanding importance«<sup>2</sup>. This is also world that will bring new transnational risks and crises. The global economic crisis and flu pandemic have showed speed, stability and great influence of contemporary crisis on the modern society<sup>3</sup>. National governments have to become aware that they cannot deal with these kinds of crises and disasters alone as traditional institutional alliances are not enough effective in combating transnational threats that exceed national capacities. Therefore, states

have to collaborate and develop transboundary management capacity<sup>3</sup>. Such a process has been taking place in Europe, where the member states of the European Union have begun to develop joint security arrangements to respond to new security risks.

After the collapse of the Cold War order, it seemed that the international mechanisms will be sufficient to deal with new challenges and threats. New security paradigms, that were developed, are converted into organizational forms and networks in which participants (states) have accepted an increased international responsibility for the security and peace-building. But eventually it turned out that the extension of responsibility for security to the international level is more suited for creating a secure and stable international environment, than for prevention of the effects of new dangers with which democratic societies were faced with. The illusion that international cooperation will contribute to the strengthening of national capacities is becoming visible, which directs the states towards searching for new answers that will be predominantly built on national capabilities. Various factors have influenced on the transformation of national security systems and on reduction of the public sector capacities. At the same time with the process of transformation of the state security capabilities, in its security sector transformation of threats, challenges and risks have occurred, so now it seems that nation states have observed this increase unprepared.

Today threats are no longer generated only through military threat, but we are faced a numerous challenges that are in the categories of political, economic, social and environmental threats. In seeking answers to new security environment, it seems correct to choose the model of extension responsibility for security at the national level in a way that has been achieved by including a larger number of states in international organizations and processes that guarantee longer-term stability. This means that at the national level there should be build new forms of action which will connect actors from the public sector, but also others who may contribute to the development of the national security community. Expansion to new actors and their participation can contribute to the development of new capabilities of society and community, and at the same time through new responsibilities, can develop new security models that will strengthen democracy, human rights and freedoms, and ensure sustainable development. This way, security is no longer opposed to the issues of freedom and democracy, as it was during the Cold War, and it becomes a constitutive element of the overall development of the community. The mentioned changes can have significant influence on all forms of security activities of a community, especially in the area of crisis management.

## Creation of new security paradigm

### *Traditional approach towards security*

The traditional understanding of security is focused on state security which is based on military power and

defense against external threats. Such a state-centric approach was dominant in international relations during the Cold War for two reasons: first, because states were central actors in international relations, and secondly because security was considered their most important task<sup>4</sup>. Linking security concept only with military content puts state in the position of the reference object of security, whereat its power and safety are observed through the strength and size of its military force. The use of force and its effects on the state, society and individuals, as well as activities of the state in order to prevent or waging war, present the main components in researching security. State-centric approach presumes that state must maintain security and protect itself from internal and external threats. Military forces are considered to be an instrument for maintaining security, because by its definition is the state institution that has a monopoly over the legitimate means of force. Other security aspects are either ignored or examined in the context of strengthening military dimension of security.

Security of society and citizens, from the standpoint of the state-centric approach, is being observed in the relation to the level of state security, based on the premise that people are safe if state is secured, and the level of their protection depends on the level of state protection, from which arises personal sense of citizens security.

Critics of this approach upholds the questioning of attitude toward which the state is referent object of security, as well as an exclusive focus on the threat, use and control of military forces. Morgan points out that security dilemma which had an impact on the necessary extension of security concept, occurs as a consequence of strengthening the power of one state to the others which perceived strengthening of military power as a threat to their security<sup>5</sup>. Critics of the traditional security approach considered such situation as an indicator of how former traditional practices and traditional concepts of security have not led to an increased security, but, on the contrary, were cause of insecurity.

### *Copenhagen school and model of »securitization«*

As a response to such narrow definition of security, which is presented by traditional models that are focused on the national security and defense against external military attacks, requirements for the extension and deepening of security as well as for the inclusion and recognition of other, non-military threats have occurred. By introducing new categories of security, Copenhagen school extends the concept of security which introduced society and environment as a new reference objects.

Based on Barry Buzan concept of sectoral analysis of security and concept of »securitization« Ole Weaver, Copenhagen school expands the definition of security by including five security areas: military, political, social, economic and environmental security, and examines how specific issues from the political process is transferred to the security field and how it becomes important<sup>6</sup>.

Copenhagen concept of »securitization« treats security as a speech act and considers that an issue falls un-

der the field of security because it is securitized i.e. it is presented as a threat by the political elite, and not because such a threat really exists in the presented level of threats. Therefore, »securitization« is provision of security importance to some particular issue, phenomena or problem, while the particular issue is considered to be political one when there is a need for urgent action that goes beyond the standard state political procedures. This way overextension of the definition of security has for its consequence a risk that too many questions or insufficiently certain issues can become security problems. By this way political elites are trying to get extraordinary powers for acting in order to be able to more effectively in countering such defined and displayed threat<sup>6</sup>. Successful example of this model is considered to be »securitization« of threat from global terrorism which was produced by the U.S. administration and on which basis, after the terrorist attacks of September 11<sup>th</sup> in 2001, the largest and most significant reorganization of the security sector and the U.S. was carried out, while an example of an unsuccessful »securitization« is the persuasion about existence of the existential threat posed by Saddam's regime in Iraq, that was not accepted by the vast majority of actors in the international community.

Representatives of the Copenhagen school think that security consists of military, economic, environmental, social and political sectors. Benefit of »securitization« is in the provision of orientation towards other security sectors, without privileging military sector and state security while the possible negative aspects of this concept Collins<sup>4</sup> sees in danger that the use of word »security« in relation to the non-military issues could lead to the militarization of other sectors, such as the inadvertent promotion of ideas that armed threats and force should be taken into account during suppression of, for example, environmental threats. Furthermore, Emmers points out that even in democratic societies procedure of »securitization« can lead to restriction of civil freedom in the name of security<sup>7</sup>. Such a trend this author specifically perceives in the period after 9/11 because of the frequent identification of vexed issues as existential threats.

### *Dissemination of the security concept*

The end of the Cold War and globalization processes have changed security environment, and states and societies exposed to new asymmetric security threats. New security threats have led to wider acceptance of security concepts that were promoted by the Copenhagen school. The main security threat no longer presents possibility of a military conflict between two superpowers, but new sources of instability that are appearing, such as internal conflicts within states caused by civil wars, international terrorism and transnational organized crime, energy security, environmental security, unequal economic development, the proliferation of conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction, the phenomenon of failed states, etc.

Security can no longer be observed primarily as state security while reference objects of security are extending

to society and individuals. Likewise, contemporary security problems cannot be resolved solely by using military force or at the national level, which extends security concept to other security dimensions, such as political, economic, social and environmental security. In addition, during the 1990s, the concept of human security has been developed, which introduced citizens – individuals as a reference object of security. Efficiency and effectiveness of this concept is still the subject of various discussions and coping with criticism of authors that believe that this concept is unenforceable, and therefore it has no perspective.

UN defines human security as »a condition in which people are freed from trauma that plagues human development, that means from hunger, pain, oppression, sudden and harmful disruption of everyday life – whether in their homes, workplaces or communities«<sup>8</sup>. Unlike traditional state-centric approach, the concept of human security is a human-centric because it emphasizes desirable humane conditions in which people would be safe. For intercessors of this theory, human security is a goal, while state-centric security presents a mean for its achievement. On the other hand, critics point out that human security is undoubtedly necessary, but it is insufficient because it ignores the external military threats. Kerr concludes that in the modern world people and states are vulnerable, from which it follows that security encompasses both human and national security, whereat state-centric security presents a mean for achieving human security<sup>9</sup>. Collins defines political security as regime security because he sees ruling regime as the reference object security<sup>4</sup>. Weak states and developing ones are faced with a numerous security challenges that mostly deprive from internal sources. This causes for them »insecurity dilemma« because they miss the most basic state elements and effective institutions, monopoly over instruments of coercion and consensus on the idea of state, and Jackson<sup>10</sup>, calls such a state incomplete or »quasi-states«. Threats from inside include violent intervention as a coup, and various forms of uprisings or rebellions from different social groups, such as ethnic groups, religious movements, of local police, etc.

Due to of their internal fragility, poor countries are facing with numerous external threats because they are vulnerable to penetration and intervention of other states and groups, and on transference of conflict and unrest in neighboring regions, primarily due to lack of infrastructure capacity for effective border control.

Social security is studying the way in which society has begun to be seen as a reference object security, while Buzan<sup>11</sup> social security primarily connects with the maintenance of ethno-national identity and sustainable development of traditional patterns of language, culture, religious and national identity and national characteristics. Social security was considered to be one of the sectors of national security in which state could be destabilized by the threats to its language, culture, religion and other customs. During the integration process in Western and the disintegration of the Eastern Europe, Collins<sup>4</sup> has

noted the process of reconceptualization of social security as a self-referential object, which for this author is a middle way between the individual and global security.

Ecological security appeared in 1960s of the last century as a result of the development of environmental awareness and increased activity of numerous environmental movements and non-governmental organizations, but in literature it has different meanings. Barnett<sup>12</sup> views ecological security through four main categories: the way in which environmental change may be a factor in violent conflicts, the way they can pose a risk to national security, the way in which war and war preparations can cause damage to the environment and the way environmental changes may pose a risk to human security.

Economic security is viewed in the context of economic-security relations because economy is not the only thing which is ensured, but also its ability to provide prosperity in the future. In this sense, economic security includes »preservation of structural integrity, ability and interest of creating prosperity, political and economic entities, in the context of various external risks and threats with which is faced in the international economic system«<sup>13</sup>.

#### *Development of »policy of fear«*

Development of so called »policy of fear« can be considered as a consequence of »securitization« of security issues, on which Furedi<sup>14</sup> points out by explaining it on the example of daily exposure to the messages that we live in the age of terror, and that we are exposed to the new terrorism, and a new era of terror »in which no one is insulated from the threat of attack«.

Furedi<sup>14</sup> points out that the fear from terrorism has replaced the traditional government concern about military power of other states and threat of military attack, but as previous traditional security policies were not applied for facing new types of threats. The threat of new terrorism with all its characteristics makes traditional instruments disused and ineffective. However, the question which arises is whether the threat of terrorism really is so big and does it really presents such a threat. Global fear of this new phenomenon arises from the presentation of contemporary terrorism as unpredictable threat with unforeseeable consequences, because today's terrorists can strike anywhere, anytime and almost any weapons, including weapons of mass destruction.

The group of authors that see terrorism as unquestionable threat, but not so big as it is performed<sup>15</sup>, point out the manipulation of statistical data on victims, which serves as a confirmation of the such conclusions (e.g., statistics of victims of terrorist attacks usually include victims of riots and civil wars in conflict areas such as Iraq and Afghanistan, etc.). The constant warning about omnipresent threat of terrorism creates the impression that no one is safe, while the threat gets the character of fictional prediction as something that might happen in the future. Claiming that we cannot ensure ourselves for such a phenomenon, means claiming that it is beyond human reach and control, while the idea that society is

unable to cope with certain risks indicates a strong mood of defeatism toward dangers that lie ahead. Such an attitude, says Furedi<sup>14</sup>, leads to the creation of fear of existential threat because of which human existence is constantly questionable.

Authors, who are looking for an answer to the question why modern threats today get so easily adjectives that emphasize their potentially disastrous, sensationalist and enormous impacts on the community and society, find the explanation in the fundamental reconceptualization of the traditional meanings of risk<sup>14</sup>. Today's risks are being interpreted by the use of »language of probability«, the consequences which are connected with the risk are being expressed as »opportunities« because of which risk management includes calculation of probabilities. For Furedi<sup>14</sup>, modern society is therefore exposed to »self-terrorizing by the market fear, which causes great emotional, cultural and economic damage for it«. Therefore, security issues and interpretation of risk are no longer just »owned« by political and security elites, but also the individuals themselves and society perceive potential hazards that can directly affect their activities. In this sense, the need for cooperation between the state, society and individuals on all security issues is increasing, regardless of whether they appear as visible or only perceived or constructed threat.

#### **Development of New Models of Security Actions**

##### *Intergovernmental security arrangements in the case of the European Union*

As we have already pointed out, modern societies are highly vulnerable and exposed to various threats and risks. The complex security environment that creates such circumstances, are exposing Posner's<sup>14</sup> »world of crisis and disaster« to constant changes. Such circumstances require a new kind of response that the nation-states cannot provide by themselves because the traditional tools that states have at their disposal are no longer sufficient in combating new transnational threats.

One possible strategy for joint action is the conclusion of trans-national security arrangements and better connection of countries in order to strengthen security capabilities to combat transnational threats. Exemplary, within the framework of the European Union, a new EU security paradigm is being created<sup>3</sup> which includes a new conceptual content and that offers new principles for strengthening common approaches and actions in the field of security. The new approach involves cooperation among countries on developing joint security arrangements for an effective response to the challenges of the »new world of crisis and disaster«.

In recent years, EU Member States have intensified their efforts to strengthen cooperation on various security issues. Intensified efforts include a number of new regulations and directives from the security field, strengthening military cooperation and the development

of a new generation of multilateral responses to other transnational threats, such as pandemics, terrorism, disruptions in the work of critical infrastructure, endangerment of the health and environment of large-scale and suppression of financial crisis. While all of these measures are already being implemented by the Member States individually, Boin and Ekengren<sup>3</sup> point on the increased effects of cooperation and implementation of joint measures and mechanisms for suppression of these types of threats and minimizing their consequences. Organization and development of the EU's role in the security field for someone it is a surprise, given the fact that the EU has traditionally served as an institution for the creation of economic integration of member states. However, the fall of the Berlin Wall and Balkan conflict have shown lacks in the security arrangements that dominated Europe in the period after the World War II. Security was predominantly under the authority of nation-states, and international co-operation was carried out within the framework of NATO and the WEU. The terrorist attacks in the U.S., London and Madrid have shown that such a paradigm is out of date and inappropriate in the new conditions. It is necessary to create a new security paradigm that would allow raising the level of European security in the »risky world«.

Boin and Ekengren<sup>3</sup> also argue that the reliance on international organizations such as NATO, UN, WHO, etc., is no longer appropriate because these organizations are designed to respond to the traditional (and still current and present) threats, but they are not able to respond to the challenges to which »a new world of crisis and disasters« is exposed to. By responding to new demands EU has offered to its members three models of help: (1) support for Member States in cases when they cannot cope with the crisis or disaster on the national territory (e.g. in case of natural disasters), which is formalized through the »Solidarity Declaration« of the Council of Europe from 2004, (2) response to external threats and disasters which include the launch of joint military missions in crisis areas, the adoption of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) in 1999 has significantly contributed to this matter. Through these activities the EU, as an international institution, has become a security actor in the international security arena. By this, the strategic objective of strengthening the joint military capabilities of the EU, according to the High Representative of the EU Javier Solana, »is not to replacement for national defense plans and programs, but to provide support to national decision-making processes«; (3) response to transnational threats (such as a flu pandemic, mad cow disease, illegal migration, financial crises, etc.) requires multinational responses. In order to implement abovementioned three models, EU has developed a strategy that allows cooperation in the case of such threats, and has established a joint alert system and a platform for joint crisis management.

Considering that the EU should continue to work on developing the capacity for crises and disasters response, Boin and Ekengren<sup>3</sup> propose the introduction of a crisis

management at the supranational level. Given the fact that old ideas and practices are losing their meaning in the light of new challenges, new ideas gradually accumulate towards reaching the end point, after which the entire community will switch to new paradigm. These authors consider that EU has to develop capacities in order to provide assistance to nation-states in joint efforts to achieve security. A lot of work is needed to be done given the fact that national legislation in the Member States is different and in some segments insufficiently harmonized while the EU security domain is still too fragmented.

### *New models within the state*

Besides the establishment of supranational models and instruments for effective fight against new security threats, there is a need for development and constant alignment of national security regulations to new requirements that stand in front of them. For the purposes of this study we have selected models for introduction of risk assessment, development and evaluation of effectiveness of national security strategy and development of consequence management model. By creating a new security paradigm primary duty of the state is extending from primary task of defense against invasion, to creation of »security climate« which Petroni<sup>16</sup> defines as »an environment in which individuals can safely raise their families and create orderly civil society«. Creating such a security climate requires the involvement of more capacity than the exclusive use of coercive measures against the enemy, and involves the establishment of »good governance« and transparent decision-making process that citizens can clearly understand. According to Bruneau and Scott<sup>17</sup>, security is the product of link between the government and its citizens. Traditional security, which takes place at the state level, explains Petroni<sup>16</sup>, in most states overshadowed »human security«, which takes place at the level of society and individuals. Governments that are facing transnational threats such as terrorism have to establish both types of security. In order to justify the confidence of the citizens, every government has to have a method of risk analysis. It is not enough to explain how there are all instruments for response to risks and protection of citizens, but they have to determine how they will implement this protection. Petroni<sup>16</sup> points out that no government has enough resources for protection of their citizens against all risks, and therefore it has to participate in the process of »risk triage«. Wider range of contemporary security threats and financial crisis that requires savings in the security sector puts state in a situation where it has less available resources on its disposal, while the present threats are spreading fear among the citizens who require protection from the state. Therefore, for Petroni<sup>16</sup> the quality risk assessment is the first element that states have to incorporate into their strategy.

According to Shemella<sup>18</sup>, the second model on which states have to work in order to improve their national mechanisms is development of effective national security

strategy, which must include the interaction of three elements: goal or purpose, methods and instruments through which goal is achieved. Shemella<sup>18</sup> explains how the correlation of strategic goal with the opportunities and resources for its achievement is old anxiety, but the insertion of concept of how to operationally and organizationally achieve it, enables makers of strategies to more correctly identify the appropriate resources. States do not have enough resources to protect all vulnerable targets or to annul all threats. Therefore, Shemella<sup>18</sup> sees development of strategies as a model for efficient distribution of resources through wide spectrum of state institutions, in order to achieve desirable operational goals and political effects. Shemella<sup>18</sup> points out that state, by relying on intelligence and organizational resources has to establish a »network judgment« of advantages and weaknesses of its institutions in relation to threats and dangers assessment. Another important element, according Shemella<sup>18</sup>, is the establishment of inter-agency decision-making process, i.e. the establishment of a system of inter-agency coordination that would enable horizontal action in the case of vertically organized government institutions. This way the best results would be achieved by combining three models: cooperation, coordination and cooperation. Taking into account the organizational structure of network terrorist organizations, and other asymmetric threats, Arquilla and Ronfeld<sup>19</sup> think that only with organizational structure of network it is possible to effectively confront global criminal and terrorist networks, while various authors see hierarchical vertical structure of the security sector and other state institutions as source of their inferiority in relation to groups and organizations which they confront. However, Shemella<sup>20</sup> further believes that quality strategy is not enough without introduction of methodology for measuring its effectiveness, which should become part of evaluation process for obtaining guidance that it goes in the right direction and does it achieves expected results. The level of effectiveness of the strategy depends upon the public perception to what extent society feels secure, and to what extent the measures which state maintains for protect against modern security threats are appropriate and effective.

Modern societies have become more vulnerable to the effects of disasters and catastrophes in general, regardless of fact whether they are caused on purpose or they are result of natural disasters. Although we distinguish and divide types of threats, preparations for action in the case of an attack or disaster, as well as to managing the consequences must be viewed in the context of all-hazards approach. Contemporary security threats are difficult to prevent, although prevention is the main goal of the strategy, so Hoffer<sup>21</sup> points on the third category by which states have to additionally work, and that is consequence management. This management should minimize harm and consequences of executed attack or disaster, and it has for its aim lives salvation, reduction of economic damage as well as fear and panic among the population. According to Hoffer<sup>21</sup>, effective model of such a management consists of five cycles: prepare for case of

possible threats, response to actual events, recovery after the danger has passed, mitigation of future threats through the introduction of lessons learned from the evaluation of previous events and, finally, returning to the stage of preparing to respond in the case of future attacks or disasters. Hoffer<sup>21</sup> explains that consequence management is being implemented parallel with crisis management. However, the difference is that the crisis management is directed towards the methods of attacks execution and includes all activities necessary for their timely detection and prevention, as well as the possibility of re-attack. On the other hand, consequence management is focused on the effects of physical, psychological and financial damage that people and property can suffer.

#### *a. Public-private partnership in the security field*

Contemporary security threats today have new features that are submissive to changes and adaptation to new conditions, changing forms and instruments of action and are difficult to predict. Fight against such threats is primarily a state responsibility. However, if we take into account all their characteristics that in modern conditions are continuously evolving, it is clear that state cannot lead an effective fight alone, without the involvement of all elements of national power, and without the help of the private sector and citizens.

Modern security threats have characteristic of unprecedented insecurity so contemporary strategies are being shaped on this assumption. Many authors point out that the terrorist attack on 9/11 led to a radical transformation of our understanding of security as well as the need for same kind of transformation of our instruments in the fight against them<sup>22,23</sup>. The fact, that it is a threat which is unpredictable and that can cause great uncertainty, has helped to some kind of radicalization of security policies and instruments.

In the fight against contemporary security threats and risks is not only necessary to reduce the risk, but it is extremely important to reduce vulnerability at all levels and to protect society as a whole as well as to minimize the negative consequences of possible attack or disaster. Approach in the fight against contemporary security threats, which exclusively emphasizes state's action, may have limited impact because state is not able to track all aspects of social dynamics in modern conditions. Therefore, it is obvious that this kind of fight state cannot carry out by itself so for the introduction of effective models of fight against terrorism there is a need for mutual actions of government, private sector and citizens.

Given the fact that every attack or work interruption indirectly brings significant financial losses, primarily in the economy, that important economic entities are increasingly becoming targets of terrorist attacks because of the level of damage that they may cause to wider class of society, and that a significant number of such objects, as well as national critical infrastructure are in private »ownership«, in the above mentioned new model it is necessary to involve the private sector. Models of cooperation in the fight against contemporary security threats

between government and the private sector can be developed through the form of public-private partnership that is gaining on its importance. To develop effective instruments for fight against contemporary security threats, it is essential to have participation and joint action of all these mentioned factors – government, private sector and citizens.

Since the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, nearly 80% of all terrorist attacks were directed towards private sector and citizens, and only 20% to the officials and government buildings, diplomatic personnel and members of police and military forces<sup>24</sup>. Terrorist activities are increasingly directed towards high profile of political, economic and infrastructure targets that have symbolic meaning for the main recipient of terroristic message<sup>25</sup>, which means they are now exclusively focused on parts of the economic infrastructure and business systems. Therefore, experts in terrorism agree in the assessment that such intensity of terrorist activity requires much broader cooperation between business and the public sector and government agencies to combat terrorism. In addition, it imposes a necessary encouragement and development of broader cooperation in order to promote partnerships between the public and private sector in the fight against new security threats, to jointly contribute to the economic stability and security of society as whole.

In this regard, the international community has recognized the importance of public-private partnerships in the fight against terrorism. Counter-Terrorism Strategy of the United Nations from 2009 also points to the need to develop partnerships with the private sector for the purpose of preventing terrorist attacks on particularly vulnerable targets. With the same goal, in 2006 the Moscow Group, that consists of G8 member states, organized the Global Forum for the development of partnerships between the public and private sector in the fight against terrorism (Global Forum for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism), while the conclusion of the meeting was adoption of G8 strategy for creating that type of partnership (Strategy for Partnerships between States and Businesses to Counter Terrorism). As it was outlined in the mentioned strategy, public and private sector should affiliate their forces in the fight against terrorism. In this type of partnership, it is emphasized, that involvement of private sector is based on voluntary relationship, in a spirit of cooperation and unity based on shared interests and responsibilities. This strategy promotes the necessity of creating a wider international cooperation in promoting this type of partnership through mutual exchange of useful information, knowledge and experience and through joint or coordinated action.

Likewise, the OSCE promotes the involvement of the private sector as much as possible in counterterrorism activities and promotes the development of public-private partnerships in this area, especially when it comes to the protection of critical infrastructure from potential terrorist attacks, protection from possible cybernetic attacks, preventing violent extremist acts and radicaliza-

tion of individuals who could become potential terrorists, terrorist financing and the protection and promotion of human rights in the fight against terrorism. Therefore, OSCE proposes the establishment of public-private partnerships with the media and civil society in the fight against violent extremism and radicalization, and in protection of critical infrastructure and significant gathering of potential terrorist attacks, and in combat against financing of terrorism.

The largest effects and best results in the application of public-private partnerships are expected to be in the case of developing a form of voluntary cooperation, through joint exercises and simulations of action in case of an attack. Group G8 also suggests that the public and private sectors should work together on the production of risk assessment, while the public sector could help to private sector through dissemination of best practices when they are developing business continuity plans. Given the fact that significant systems, which have to respond in the case of crisis, are placed in private ownership and having in mind the fact that the private sector can significantly contribute in providing effective responses to the crisis, it is important that such activities are coordinated, and mechanisms used well, so according to opinion of the expert team of the G8, the best that can be achieved is by introducing joint anti-terrorism trainings and preparation of joint plans. In addition, exchange of information and decision making related to the use of resources for fight against terrorism Taghavi<sup>24</sup> has marked as an area in which public-private partnerships can operate effectively and minimize costs, and at the same time increase the level of safety awareness of citizens and private sector on the models of protection against terrorism. Krueger and Laitin<sup>26</sup> argue that the relationship between these two sectors is simple and that public sector should deliver appropriate and actual information on terrorist threats to private sector and to help it in preparing for the development of its own anti-terrorism plans. In the other direction, the private sector should help the public sector, i.e. the state in the fight against terrorism through the creation expertise for the efficient allocation of resources. Companies should be prepared for the case of a potential terrorist attack through the adoption of appropriate protection plans<sup>27</sup> – for which they need information which collection is under the state jurisdiction and its security bodies. At the same time it is necessary to develop an effective system of trust and indicate the financial savings which can be brought to private sector with timely and adequate preparation in the case of a terrorist attack.

All above mentioned examples lead to the conclusion that through common and timely exchange of quality information, knowledge and experience and through joint and coordinated activities, public and private sector can develop, improve and implement the use of measures that could significantly contribute to the early detection and prevention of terrorist attacks, or reduce the effects of already executed attacks.

The introduction of these types of partnerships is not easy and it requires a mutual willingness to cooperate and trust. Conducted study on the sustainability of public-private partnerships in the fight against international terrorism Taghavi<sup>24</sup> pointed out the specific weaknesses of this model in the case of 250 companies in the UK that have introduced some type of public-private partnerships. Research has shown that the vast majority of companies believe that the government information about terrorist attacks are unreliable, incorrect and exaggerated which is a result of the perception of terrorism as a risk that is always lower in the private sector than in the public one. Additional problem is lack of coordination that can lead to a one-way relationship in public-private partnership which will be in favor of public sector and it can lose its fundamental meaning of working together on the improvement of instruments for combating terrorism. Insufficiently developed models of communication and information sharing between the private and public sectors can lead to imprecise or inaccurate risk assessments and to inappropriate distribution of instruments and resources relevant for the fight against terrorism, by which public-private partnerships in the fight against terrorism loses its meaning. Therefore, the preparation of model of the public-private partnership should be accessed very seriously, with detail elaborated models of cooperation and with a deep respect and development of trust among all participants who are in partnership relation.

Cooperation between the public and private sectors is very important for insuring that the current vulnerability of society is detected on time, and removed in a short time period<sup>28</sup>. In this context, private sector should conduct regular risk assessments and to invest in the protection of key objects that have relevance for the broader society<sup>28</sup>. The National Security Strategy of the United States in 2002 has recognized the need for such investments, but not only as part of an effective corporate management, but also as an important mechanism for the protection of all the stakeholders of security, this means employees and society as a whole.

### *b. Participation of citizens in the security field*

Lee Jarvis and Michael Lister<sup>29</sup> argue that the new threats can effectively be overcome if there is participation of citizens in the implementation of security policy. Those who are participating in its implementation authors call security stakeholders and they emphasize that it is not enough just to act by means of state instruments. In particular, this applies to the strategy for fight against asymmetric threats and security threats that have quite different characteristics from traditional security threats. Contemporary threats are difficult to predict, they are changing forms and instruments, it is difficult to develop responses that would guarantee effective protection and therefore they represent a major challenge for modern societies.

Jarvis and Lister<sup>29</sup> argue that it is not possible to achieve assumptions for fight against contemporary se-

curity threats unless there is an internal participation of the citizens. Contemporary threats have characteristic of unprecedented insecurity so contemporary strategies are being developed on this assumption. Numerous authors point out that the terrorist attack on 9/11 led to a radical transformation of our understanding of security as well as the need for the same kind of transformation of our instruments in the fight against terrorism and other asymmetric threats<sup>22,23</sup>. The fact that these threats are unpredictable and that they can cause great uncertainty has helped to some kind of radicalization of security policies and instruments for their suppression. In addition, the state has made an effort to justify its approach and in order to increase public support for its policies, state constantly repeats to what kind of dangers we are continually exposed to.

Instruments of fight against contemporary security threats were no longer built only in the area of national security, but they have started to form in other parts of the system, such as immigration policy, citizens' mobility and alike. The need for a broader building of measures and instruments to combat contemporary asymmetric threats has led to consequences that were unintended, particularly in the area of human rights and freedoms. Therefore, the approach in the fight against contemporary threats, which emphasizes the exclusive state action, may have a limited impact because the state is not able to track all aspects of social dynamics in modern conditions. Requirements for the centralization of key instruments led to a strengthening of state capacities, but did not increase results. So, participation of citizens seemed as the only way to strengthening of the overall state and society capacities in the fight against contemporary threats.

Jarvis and Lister<sup>29</sup> consider that it is necessary to carry out the process of strengthening citizen's responsibility, in which strategies for fight against contemporary security threats represent a framework which determines participation of the citizens, as well as the content of this participation. Through the analysis of national security strategy, mentioned authors, propose the identification of contents that prescient citizen participation, and instruments through which this is actually achieved, and their inclusion in the strategic documents. Besides this, in designing national security policies, especially policies of crisis responses, it should take into account that managing them in nowadays period is much more complex process that involves numerous organizations, both public and private<sup>30</sup>.

## **Conclusion**

Every transformation of security environment demands also adjustment of system response to the challenges, threats and risks. As we have seen, the contemporary security environment has changed in many ways after the end of the Cold War, but the change has not turned into a long-term status quo, but we have witnessed almost daily changes that are happening in the



security environment, if we observe through the extended concept which encompasses issues of military, political, social, economic and environmental security. Therefore, the security concepts are significantly changed and extended, the effects of crisis activities have wider coverage, while crisis are affecting more and more actors and have extended consequences.

At the same time, modern societies have larger demands in shaping responses to crisis, so they are directing themselves towards finding new models. These models differ from the previous ones because they no longer rely solely on the actions of the public sector, but they also involve the private sector, and citizens who become important actors in the implementation of new security,

especially preventive policies. A new model of public-private partnerships enables the strengthening of community capacity in the response to the security challenges with which we are facing almost on daily basis. In order to implement this model, it is important to identify all needs in the security environment, to prepare legal and security frameworks and create a new partnership in which custom of joint action will be developed.

To develop such a model, security culture should be also progressively changed, and should no longer rely only on force in response to the new security challenges, but also on solidarity, resilience and preparedness of community to act together.

## REFERENCES

1. GRANATT M, YOUNG J, LAGADEC P, Crisis Response, 5 (2009) 5. — 2. BECK U, World at Risk (Ludwig-Maximilian University in Munich, Munich, 2008). — 3. BOIN A, EKENGREN M, J Contingencies Crisis Manage, 4 (2009) 17. — 4. COLLINS A, (Ed) Suvremene sigurnosne studije (Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2010). — 5. MORGAN P, Sigurnost u međunarodnoj politici: Tradicionalni pristupi. In: COLLINS A, (Ed) Suvremene sigurnosne studije (Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2010). — 6. BUZAN B, WAEVER O, DE WILDE J, Security. A New Framework for Analysis (Lynne Rienner, Boulder, 1998). — 7. EMMERS A, Sekuritizacija. In: COLLINS A, (Ed) Suvremene sigurnosne studije (Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2010). — 8. UN Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. Peace and Security Section of the Department of Public Information, accessed 15.10.2012. Available from: URL: [http://www.un.org/terrorism/pdfs/CT\\_Background\\_March\\_2009\\_terrorism2.pdf](http://www.un.org/terrorism/pdfs/CT_Background_March_2009_terrorism2.pdf). — 9. KERR P, Ljudska sigurnost. In: COLLINS A, (Ed) Suvremene sigurnosne studije (Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2010) 114. — 10. JACKSON R, Quasi-States: Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Third World (Cambridge University Press New York, 1990). — 11. BUZAN B, People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era (2nd ed) (Harvester Wheatsheaf, London, 1991). — 12. BARNETT J, Ekološka sigurnost. In: COLLINS A, (Ed) Suvremene sigurnosne studije (Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2010). — 13. DENT MC, Ekonomska sigurnost. In: COLLINS A, (Ed) Suvremene sigurnosne studije (Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2010). — 14. FUREDI F, Poziv na teror (Ljevak, Zagreb, 2009). — 15. GLASSER S, The Washington Post (27 April, 2005). — 16. PETRONI J, Risk Assessment. In: SHEMELLA P, (Ed) Fightingback. What Governments Can Do About Terrorism (Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 2011). — 17. BRUNEAU TC, SCOTT DT, (Eds) Who Guards the Guardians and How (University of Texas Press, Austin, 2006). — 18. SHEMELLA P, Building Effective Counter terrorism Institutions. In: SHEMELLA P, (Ed) Fighting back. What Governments Can Do About Terrorism. (Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 2011). — 19. Arquilla J, Ronfeldt D, Network sand Netwars: The Future of Terror, Crime, and Militancy (RAND, Santa Monica, 2001). — 20. Strategy for Partnerships between States and Business to Counter Terrorism, Moscow, November 30, 2006, accessed 20. 10. 2012. Available from: URL: [http://en.g8russia.ru/page\\_work/32.html](http://en.g8russia.ru/page_work/32.html). — 21. HOFFER EE, Consequence Management. In: SHEMELLA P, (Ed) Fightingback. What Governments Can Do About Terrorism. (Stanford University Press Stanford, California, 2011). — 22. JACKSON R, Writing the War on Terrorism: Language, Politics and Counter-Terrorism (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2005). — 23. JARVIS L, Times of Terror: Discourse, Temporality and the War on Terror. (Palgrave, Basingstoke, 2009). — 24. United Nations Development Program. Human Development Report 1994. (Oxford University Press, New York, 1994). — 25. O'BRIEN LB, FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, accessed 20. 10. 2012. Available from: URL: <http://www.fbi.gov/stats-services/publications/law-enforcement-bulletin/september-2011/the-evolution-of-terrorism-since-9-11>. — 26. KRUEGER AB, LAITIN DD, Foreign Affairs, September/October 2004. — 27. COLEMAN K, Decisions Magazine, accessed 20. 10. 2012. Available from: URL: <http://www.directionsmag.com/articles/counter-terrorism-for-corporations-part-i/123254>. — 28. BULLOCK J, HADDOW G, COPPOLA D, YELETAYSI S, Introduction to Homeland Security: Principles of All-Hazards approach (Butterworth-Heinemann Homeland Security Series, 3rd edition, Washington DC, 2009). — 29. JARVIS L, LISTER M, Contemporary Politics, 16 (2010) 173. — 30. BOIN T, HART P, STERN E, SANDELIJUS B, The Politics of Crisis Management: Public Leadership under Pressure (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005).

V. Cvrtila

University of Applied Sciences VERN, Trg bana Josipa Jelačića 3, Zagreb, Croatia  
e-mail: [vlatko.cvrtila@vern.hr](mailto:vlatko.cvrtila@vern.hr)

## NOVI MODELI SIGURNOSTI I JAVNO-PRIVATNO PARTNERSTVO

### SAŽETAK

Transformacija suvremenih sigurnosnih prijetnji oblikuje novu sigurnosnu okolinu i sigurnosne paradigme. One pojašnjavaju prelazak iz sigurnosnog okruženja u kojemu je dominantan rat u okruženje u kojemu svi dionici sigurnosti moraju pripremiti različite nevojne odgovore na sigurnosne ugroze te vrlo često moraju djelovati zajedno. Stvaraju se nove sigurnosne potrebe u kojima javni sektor ima sve manje mogućnosti i kapaciteta za samostalno djelovanje. S obzirom na prirodu ugrožavanja, čini se potrebnim stvarati nove modele sigurnosnog djelovanja sa svima koji mogu

pridonijeti u prevenciji i sprječavanju novih prijetnji, odnosno stvaranju otpornosti cijelog društva. Sigurnosni odgovori više se ne temelje samo na reakcijama na opasnosti, već sve više na prevenciji. S obzirom na to, očekuje se šira participacija različitih aktera u zajedničkim društvenim odgovornostima, čime se stvaraju pretpostavke za razvijanje preventivnih modela kao najboljeg odgovora. U ovom radu razmatrat ćemo razvoj nove politike odgovora na sigurnosne prijetnje i suvremene krize koja se ogleda u oblikovanju javno-privatnog partnerstva s privatnim sektorom tamo gdje postoji zajednički interes te u uključivanju građana u sve oblike sigurnosnog djelovanja, posebice u preventivne aktivnosti.