

**EFFECTIVE SECURITY -
MORE COMPLEX THAN IT SEEMS...**

February 2008



**DAVID RUBENS
ASSOCIATES**

David Rubens Associates

David Rubens Associates is a specialist corporate security consultancy offering strategic security services to individuals and organisations across the world.

DRA has worked with government agencies, NGO's, international conglomerates and major global events, and brings a mixture of strategic vision, operational experience and academic research to all of its projects, however large or small.

David Rubens, DRA's founding director, holds an MSc in Security and Risk Management from Scarman Centre, Leicester University, is a Visiting Lecturer on their Global Security and Policing MSc programme, and is currently a Visiting Fellow at the Security and Resilience Department, Cranfield University at the UK Defence Academy, specialising in Terrorism & Public Policy and Strategic Management & Leadership.

David is widely experienced at developing, delivering and managing large-scale strategic security development programmes, and has worked with government agencies and academic institutions in Asia, Africa, Middle East, Caribbean and Eastern Europe.

For further reports, or to discuss the contents, please contact
David Rubens
david@dauidrubens-associates.com

David Rubens Associates
The Arches,
Maygrove Road
London NW6 2EE
post@dauidrubens-associates.com

Effective Security – More Complex Than It Seems...

There has been a significant change, certainly since the events of 9/11, in the way that we perceive the whole concept of 'security'. In previous, perhaps more innocent times, when the main role of security involved protection, whether of a factory, office, person or operation, the skills of the security manager were to identify potential threats, develop effective preventative security measures, and to implement and manage those measures on an on-going basis. In this way they would maximise the security of a named person or facility against an identified danger.

However, in the modern day the threats and dangers that we face are much more complex, and often almost undefinable in their exact nature and manifestation. It is clear that if we, as people responsible for ensuring the safety of our clients, principals and operations, are to be able to do so in an effective manner, our own security management capabilities must be on the same level of sophistication as the threats that we are facing. In this way, for example, we have seen a shift in strategic military thinking from the idea of 'defence' (defence strategies, defence policies, defence options, etc) to 'national security'. Whilst it is clear that defence capabilities are still a vital function of national security, and without a national defence capability no country would be able to claim that it could safeguard its own interests, on a wider scale national security also includes regional and global economic, political, social and over-all geo-political considerations. Paradoxically, the people who understand this the most are senior military strategic thinkers, who are the first to admit that in the face of today's multi-faceted, multi-level threats, military capability alone is not enough to guarantee the security of the homeland or their citizens. Unfortunately, the people who do not understand this are politicians, who have a tendency to see the world in terms of simplistically-described problems that are open to simplistically-described solutions. The problem starts when we offer simplistic solutions to complex situations such as Iraq and Afghanistan, or even the problems of using arable farmland to grow bio-fuel crops which is having major effects on the prices of other staple foods across the world – and especially in areas already suffering from deprivation.

So what can we as security managers and team leaders operating on a much more local level learn from this developments from 'defence' to 'national security'. Well, the first thing is that security is only a very small part of an operation, and 'security' alone may not be the best means of ensuring safety. A team that upsets the local population, that obviously has no considerations of local culture or acceptable behaviour, will clearly create more problems than they solve. A security force that relies purely on reactive options to attacks that are already incoming will clearly not be as effective as a security team that values the

contribution of locals intelligence, and which goes out of its way to ensure that potential local intelligence sources are comfortable about approaching them. A security team that is seen as in some way contributing to the safety and stability of the local area, rather than ensuring the safety of one person or institution by increasing the danger and threat to the surrounding population is in all likelihood going to find that it will soon be in a loop of needing increasingly high levels of security to counter higher levels of threat, which have been created in many ways purely by the direct actions of those security forces themselves.

Although there may be obvious examples of some of the situations I have mentioned above in your own work environments, they are sometimes more subtly hidden than you might think. A simple example would be an executive CP team wearing radios and earpieces in a public space, and immediately becoming highly-visible and attention-attracting. Another might be an embusing technique at an airport that is too high profile for the surrounding environment and potential threat levels. Aggressive driving is another example, as is wearing inappropriate clothing, either too smart for the principal's situation or too casual.

Even in PSD situations, the first priority must be to try and prevent situations occurring rather than reacting to events that are already underway, and the ability to fit in and be a natural part of the environment that you are operating in is as valid a rule in the corporate security world of Geneva, Bahrain or Moscow as it would be in a jungle or arctic survival exercise in Brunei or Norway.

The reason that basic principle are called basic principles is because, having been tried and tested over many years and countless operations, they usually work in whatever situation that you are operating in, and they are usually the best way of ensuring that you get through whatever needs to be done in the most effective manner, in ways that maximise your security at the same time that they minimise the likelihood of anything bad happening. The person who claims that he is going to 'beat the jungle' will not last long – and it is probably just as true in whatever security role you find yourself.



David Rubens Associates

The Arches,
Maygrove Road
London NW6 2EE

post@davidrubens-associates.com
www.davidrubens-associates.com