

234

Identifying, Quantifying, and Weighing Homeland Security Regulations

Drew Markle

Benefits and costs incurred as a result of changes in domestic security should initially be measured by the same means as all other policies. Government reorganization does not warrant new overall counting methods. Special circumstances do occur however, and occasionally there is an obvious, specific need for new methods. Such circumstances are typically obvious and highly specialized, therefore they do not warrant detailed discussion here. Instead, the purpose of this paper is to examine how traditional counting methods may be looked at from non-typical angles to provide further insight into identifying, quantifying, and weighing policy consequences.

Before studying a possible progression of critical thinking that could be used to account for the benefits and costs of policy consequence, new specific threats will be discussed. This is a highly critical concern when accounting for policies that may have direct effects on national security. Because we live in a constantly evolving world, potential threats must continuously be re-evaluated, as well as vigorously sought out. Then, in order to help keep the paper simple and promote a more precise measurement of costs and benefits, specific areas will be further broken down and examined in the final sections.

The most profound change to have an effect on recent history is the increased role of non-state actors in world affairs. The possibilities and examples are too numerous to list here, but just by citing the examples of Timothy McVeigh and The Mujahideen, it can be seen that aggressors may or may not be U.S. citizens. In order to maximize analysis results, further questions about standing and other policy specific security issues should be investigated. One point that may have been previously overlooked; is whether certain U. S. citizens hold views, which would make them more prone to violent means if a certain policy was implemented.

By examining the previous riots surrounding the WTO and globalization, it becomes blatantly obvious. US citizens may become aggressors against the U.S. The weight of this possibility may have tremendous or little effect on national security. Such determinations must be decided on a case-by-case basis. The issue of importance is that non-state actors or any other individual or small group who holds views conducive to aggression have not been an area of strong concern for the U.S. until recently. Now, as security risks change, potential terrorists must be accounted for. It is now imperative to understand and count for the potential damage that can be caused by a single person regardless of nationality, as it may now be as horrific an act as could be committed by most states.

This is not to say that violent acts, which are the result of state aggression, are now any less important to account for. However, what most of the world deems as the conventional forms of state aggression have previously been to some degree a part of policy formulation. Therefore, state actions and counting for conventional warfare will not be directly discussed here. Many of the same principles do however apply.

The strongest reason for this assumption lies within the definition of aggression itself. Simply, it is to impose as much chaos, harm, and devastation as possible. Aggression can be considered a "common" definition because it does not change when it is applied to individuals, groups, or states. For this reason it is important to use common criteria for valuing potential areas at risk from all potential aggressors. The following are some of the criteria, along with the most important steps used to evaluate them.

The most obvious and basic step in evaluating a policy is to determine if there is or will be a direct inhibition or reduction to national security. Although to some, it is hard to believe that such a policy would even be considered, precautionary steps should always be taken, and this is the most logical. This step may also be useful in helping to elicit alternatives that may have decreased effects on national vulnerability.

The next area of study should target exactly what the initial policy objective is or was. What was the forethought that led to the policy? What is the primary objective, and who and where are meant to be affected most by the policy? This stage of the evaluation is the basis for all following steps. Establishing perfect information will rarely be obtained for all of the variables involved in the process, however like so many other ventures, the harder and more thorough one works, the more satisfying the final result.

Important areas to keep in mind when quantifying the number of people who will be affected include:

- Estimations of population distributions
- Estimations of potential site specific targets and potential damage range

Estimating population distributions is currently most important for showing where the greatest numbers of people are located. Population distribution of similar peoples may now be an important variable to account for because they are specific targets to groups who have beliefs grounded in persecution.

Secondly, site-specific targets and the potential damage range of such targets must be correctly accounted for. Take for example a policy involving the construction of a nuclear facility, which is paid for solely by the citizens who will use its power and/or the residents of the state it resides in. Typically the costs and benefits may be counted for only those who have direct standing: the power users and/or the state's residents. However in the event of a catastrophe, multiple state populations may be effected and forced to pay because of policy's implementation. Because the possibility exists

where a catastrophe may occur if a policy is implemented, all those who would be affected must be accounted for to some extent.

In concerns of monetization, most of the usual principles apply. As stated before it is not proper to completely revamp all assumptions based on what may only be a temporary change or evolution in risks. Worth note however, is the increased importance in counting for the future benefits of deterrence in preventative policies.

After establishing the primary policy objective, further examination of potential secondary effects, as well as the expected life of the policy, will help to depict a scenario more representative of the potential possibilities, which could have an effect on national security. It is crucial to keep from double counting in this area.

Following these same notions, precise determinations must be made as to whom the beneficiaries of the policy may be, and also any specific reasons they were chosen (both primary and secondary beneficiaries). In order to help correctly differentiate beneficiaries, it may be helpful to divide them into two separate entities: the government and civilian citizens. By separating our "model world" into these divisions monetization can be preformed more precisely. Government is expected, in some form or another to provide certain basic needs for its citizens. This area is extremely difficult to correctly account for as different people feel the government is responsible for different needs. The Constitution of the United States does however provide some framework. "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity..." Because this is the goal of our government it applies to all citizens, while at times other beneficiaries may only be counted under specific parameters.

To determine the number of beneficiaries who will be affected by a policy, it may also prove beneficial to use multiple models. Along the same lines, it must be determined specifically who will pay for the policy. The valuation should consider economic, opportunity, and personal costs, which will be undergone.

Determinations must also be made as to who will be affected most by the policy. The area of examination should transcend two levels: location and population. Examining the variables separately is key to a more thorough analysis. By pinpointing the general geographic location, a broad sketch of many factors begins to be ascertained. Along the same lines, further dissection will allow the analyst the ability to examine issues involving areas such as government sensitive sites and economic centers. The population aspect of this area is important because of density and distribution. Obviously more densely populated areas may be at increased risk and should not be overlooked.

Government sensitive sites and economic centers warrant special consideration because of the huge costs that may be imposed if catastrophe occurs. In terms of government sensitive sites, there are policies that may increase the possibility of sensitive projects being temporarily stopped or wholly destroyed. Calculation of the risks involved should also take into consideration existing contingency plans. There may be no existing plan, or the existing may need to be re-vamped in order to accommodate the new policy objective more completely. All costs associated must be explored!

In evaluating economic centers, determinations must be made of what the specific economic tie is to the area. In some senses every geographic location in the U. S. has some activity in the national economy, however, correct value assumptions must be made, and typically rural resource and commodity producing areas may hold as much value as industrial centers due to specialized production and other factors of comparative advantage. Further examination in this area should look into costs and benefits of secondary markets who may be affected, and also the ability of substitute markets to handle additional processes in the event of a catastrophe. The final evaluation in this area should look at the costs of complete market replacement, if possible.

Finally, it is imperative to mention that we must now think inside the scope of the entire world community. In order to count for complete benefits and costs in many policies, especially those concerning homeland security, it is necessary to account for aliens as well as "our own", as the possibility has increased that they will act violently in order to advance their goals.