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Executive Summary

Present and future policy actors are in constant need of upgrading their knowledge on today’s realities corresponding with the rapidly changing world. Deliverable 7.3 targeted to develop educational course material for policy and law-makers in societal security as a way to provide a current perspective on policy mechanism unfolding in different security areas. In 2016, the Institute for European Studies (IES) at Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB) organised a conference in the premises of at the European Commission titled: “Managing Societal security: policy-makers as securitising actors”. To give the educational conference a longer lifespan, it was filmed and turned into an interactive online course. Policy practitioners from different EU institutions were brought together with academic experts in the areas of societal security to have an open debate on the role of the EU in prevention, risk assessment and security policies and guidelines. A successful promotion campaign was organised both at the VUB and the Commission to advertise and attract audience to the event. For further educational purposes, the VUB prepared a brochure called “Societal Security at a Glance” to introduce the audience with the history and usage of the societal security approach. J. Peter Burgess, the coordinator of the SOURCE project, also recorded a video, where he presented the project and explained the topicality of the debates organised. Following the event, the recorded conference was split into modules that were put online. The modules were complimented by educational assignments and discussion forums to meet pedagogical requirements. The online course was placed online at the Canvas e-learning platform featuring the most recent innovative solutions for distant learning. The link to the course was then shared on the SOURCE website, distributed to conference speakers and to the SOURCE project partners. In late 2017, the IES board took a decision to run the course as an elective in the framework of the institute’s postgraduate certificate program.

1 The IES, responsible for SOURCE project, is part of VUB. In this report VUB and IES are used interchangeably.
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1. Introduction

As stated in the DOW, task 7.3 implies production of course material for policy and law-makers on societal security. The DOW also specified that course materials represented in the form of texts, brochures and audio-visual materials should also be distributed. The work on Task 7.3 included several stages: 1) Preparatory and planning stage; 2) design and conference implementation; 3) online course implementation; and 4) dissemination.

2. Preparatory stage

In agreement with the task partners (FOI, VICESSE, EOS, TEC and TNO), VUB decided to take full leadership in this task to give more time for the task partners to prepare deliverables WP7.4-5, which required more effort workwise. The planning of the course started with outlining the general idea, identifying the target audience and defining societal security-based themes that would be of interest to the target audience. In summer 2016 VUB made a preliminary plan to organise an event on societal security at the European Commission. Because VUB identified the relevant target group of EU policy and law-makers as professionals at different levels from multiple European institutions: European Commission, Council of the European Union, Parliament, Permanent Representation and other, the conference location envisaged as the one that would allow best reaching the target audience. Concerning the format of the event, VUB opted for a conference that would work as a policy forum open both for academics and policy practitioners in a certain societal security area to have an exhaustive exchange on theory and practise. The conference was foreseen to be adapted and developed into online modules. The event was planned to embrace areas in relation to societal security that were high on European political agenda. The identified areas of relevance to societal security were as follows: 1) data protection, surveillance and privacy; 2) environment and health security; 3) terrorism and counter-radicalisation; 4) cultural diplomacy through the prism of societal security. The spectrum of targets and questions addressed by the speakers was set up under each topic (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Questions to be addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Data protection, surveillance and privacy;</td>
<td>To discuss data protection and surveillance technologies as societal security-related mechanisms and establish the link between them and privacy.</td>
<td>What does the EU do to protect citizen’s data? How can the tensions between privacy and data protection be resolved? In what way does data protection policy impact societal security?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Environment and health security</th>
<th>To receive the latest overview on the EU conceptualisation of environmental and health security to identify which preventive and policies and actions take place in the EU and outside Europe.</th>
<th>What do EU institutions and MS do to protect citizens from diseases and natural disasters? Does any back up plan exist in case of possible epidemics? Are the epidemic threats imaginary or real in the EU? Who provides epidemic risk assessment in the EU and by what means? How effective is the interplay between EU and national emergency policies?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Terrorism and counter-radicalisation</td>
<td>To discuss the overall position of the EU in the world fight against terrorism and racialisation.</td>
<td>What are the preventive counter-terrorism measures elaborated by the EU institutions? In which Member States are these measures effective and why? What could the EU do differently? What are the future prospects of the EU fight against terrorism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cultural diplomacy and societal security</td>
<td>To trace if the link between cultural diplomacy and societal security is</td>
<td>What is cultural diplomacy and what is its added value for the EU policy? What does it have to do with societal security? Are there good practices on cultural diplomacy existing in the EU Member States? Who are the “ambassadors” of peace and security?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When planning on the format of the course online modules, VUB kept in mind that the conference itself was an educational opportunity for professionals dealing with relevant societal security issues and those who were interested to learn more about this concept. To deepen the knowledge on the history of the concept of societal security, its new meaning and deployment in different contexts of legal, social, industrial and political worlds, VUB decided to prepare a brochure covering the ABCs of societal security for policy practitioners. The idea arrived from the fact, that that policy and law-making acting in the name of security can be conceptualised as “securitising actors”, according to the founders of societal security approach, the Copenhagen School of Security Studies. Therefore, the event also intended to explain the newer societal impacts derived from professional activities of various policy actors.

When planning the online course modules, VUB decided to record the conference, to break it into segments and put it in the core of the online course together with a brochure, and additionally to develop pedagogical assignments. The online course is another form of dissemination, targeted at broader academic community and the community of practitioners.
3. Design and implementation

On 2 December 2016, VUB, with the support of the European Commission cabinet of Marianne Thyssen, a Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs, Skills and Labour Mobility, and REA, organised the conference titled: “Policy-makers as securitizing actors: managing societal security in the EU”. For organising this conference VUB received a grant from the SOURCE Network fund\(^1\). The conferences consisted of four panels (sessions) covering the chosen topics (see table 1) followed by the keynote presentation. Each panel was designed in the way to include one academic and one policy practitioner whose presentations were followed by the round of questions and answers. Each panel was managed by a chairperson managing time and the discussion.

As early as summer 2016, VUB made a list of potential speakers who were contacted and who eventually accepted invitation to present in the December event. To attract audience to attend the conference, VUB project researchers in close cooperation with the internal event management team organised an event campaign. Firstly, VUB designed a program and conference annotation to introduce every session by outlining its relevance to societal security and to the current EU political framework (see Annex 1). In addition, VUB wrote and designed a brochure introducing the principles of societal security (see Annex 2). These two types of materials were distributed on the day of the conference. To give a personalised introduction to the SOURCE project specifically and societal security, in general, Peter Burges, SOURCE project coordinator, recorded a welcoming video where he explained what the project is about, what societal security is and why it stands high both in academic debates and policy forums (see Fig 1.).

\[\text{Figure 1. J. Peter Burgess welcome video}\]

Secondly, in November 2016 VUB team was invited to the Cabinet of Marianne Thyssen to discuss the formalities of the co-organised event. All the logistical details (catering, participant access to Berlaymont, the conference venue, wi-fi access, microphones and other details) were discussed. In addition, the Cabinet offered their help in

\(^{1}\) The money was used to cover catering costs at the conference as well as travel expenses and honorarium payment for academic speakers.
advertising the event. They posted the invitation on the Intranet in respective DGs: Security, Santé, Home and Connect (Fig. 2) and circulated individual emails containing invitations for policy officers. Above all, the information on the event and the registration form were placed on the IES-VUB web site (Fig.3), the SOURCE website. WP7 task partners were asked to distribute conference call throughout their networks to attract more attendees.

Figure 2. Invitation to the event

Figure 3. IES-VUB event page

---

Another added value in organising the conference at the European Commission was the possibility to live stream it. The link was made available on the Commission’s intranet site, as well as on the VUB-IES and SOURCE websites, that allowed watching life broadcasting of the event and, to watch the recorded version after the end of the event. The Commission’s video recording service was free of charge. Following data privacy regulations, prior the conference, both the audience and the speakers filled in a written consent, giving their permission for the recording. They were introduced to the format of the event and explained how the cameras operate in the room.

4. Organising the content online

After the conference, VUB received the recording of the event from the Commission’s communication department. In order for the content to be used as educational material, the videos had to be adapted, edited and re-shaped. VUB hired a subcontractor to edit the video presentations, to split them into video lectures by subject, and to add the speakers’ power point presentations to the videos. The edited videos were placed on the VUB-IES Canvas online learning platform and constituted the core educational material. The final video lectures were complemented by a pedagogical section that included tasks and exercises for students under each module. Additional reading material
was prepared mainly based on the sources that featured in the presentations\(^5\). The course was constructed in a similar way as in D7.2. (Training curriculum in societal security for engineers and designers\(^6\)). Following registration, a student receives access to the course, bringing her first to the home page (see Figure 4).

*Figure 4. Home page of the course*

The home page provides introductory information: short course description, purpose, target audience, syllabus and navigation details.

The syllabus of the course features 5 modules, all consisting of video presentations and reading materials, 2 assignments and 1 interactive discussion. The first assignment of each module (Figure 5) aims at checking a

---

\(^5\) To get full access to the course, please go to: [https://ies.instructure.com/](https://ies.instructure.com/) user name: sourcenetwork2015@gmail.com password: guest2018. To review the course with limited functionality (no access to quizzes and forum discussions): [https://ies.instructure.com/courses/11](https://ies.instructure.com/courses/11)

student’s understanding of the video content by answering questions. The questions embed central terms and concepts that are key for understanding the specification of each lecture. The second assignment is rather targeted at increasing creative thinking by using the received knowledge. For instance, as in Figure 5, the student is asked to describe monitoring mechanism they would use in evaluation of preparedness to epidemic in the EU state X based on imaginary position at the European Center for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC).

After fulfilling each assignment, a student receives 10 points, meaning that after studying all the modules, the total number of points is 50. At the end of the course an exam is envisaged, which counts another 50 points. For this particular course, students are tasked with writing a final essay based on an imaginary scenario (Figure 6). The assignment is meant to evaluate a student’s familiarity with various actors in societal security, in addition to the principles and fragments of specialised policies. In principle, the tasks may vary according to the specification of the target groups. Ideally, the course should be coordinated by an educator who could give feedback and check the assignments. The course is less targeted for self-paced learning, although it can also be used in that regard.
5. Dissemination

Firstly, the online course for policy- and law-makers was advertised on SOURCE website. Secondly, the link to the course was sent to SOURCE project partners who distributed the information regarding it further through their contacts. Thirdly, academic conference speakers and policy actors received information about the course. Later VUB received an inquiry from one of the speakers to use the module featuring his presentation for training purposes. Fourthly, to use developed training materials, the VUB-IES Academic Board took a decision to include the course in the list of elective courses for its Postgraduate certificate program on European policy-making: https://www.eu-postgraduate.eu/ The course will operate in spring semester of 2019 due to, on the one hand, reshuffling of the whole program and, on the other hand, formalised procedure for official registration of the course.

Additionally, VUB-IES promoted the course through its internal and external newsletters. Among other, the audiences for both newsletters include, former and current VUB alumni, research networks, academics, policy practitioners.
Annex 1. Conference annotation

CONFERENC ANNOTATION

Managing societal security in the European Union: policy-makers as securitizing actors
10:00 – 10:15 – Welcoming words by SOURCE representatives:

Prof. Dr. Christof Roos and Dr. Irina van der Vet - Institute for European Studies (IES)
Pr. Dr. Peter Burgess, SOURCE project Coordinator (video greetings)
Ms. Hanna Yousef, SOURCE project manager (Arttic)
Ms. Klaudia Tani, European Organization for Security (EOS)

10:15 – 10:40 – Keynote: Prof. Dr. Jaap de Wilde, University of Groningen - Societal security in World Society: Avoiding Voluntary Apartheid

Panel 1. Data protection, surveillance and privacy

Chair: Ms. Klaudia Tani, Project Manager in Crisis management, European Organisation for Security (EOS)

10:40 – 11:00 – Dr. Rocco Bellanova, Senior Researcher, Peace Research Institute (PRIO), Norway
11:00 – 11:20 – Ms. Aleksandra Oczko-Dolny, Policy Officer, Innovation and Industry for Security, DG Migration and Home Affairs
11:20 – 11:35 – Q&A
11:35 – 11:45 – coffee break

Panel 2. Environmental security and epidemics

Chair: Dr. Irina van der Vet, Project Researcher, Institute for European Studies (IES), VUB, Brussels

11:45 – 12:05 – Prof. Dr. Helmut Brand, head of the Department of International Health at Maastricht University, the Netherlands
12:05 – 12:25 – Ms. Svetla Tsolova, Senior Expert in Monitoring and Evaluation, European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC)
12:25 – 12:40 – Q&A
12:40 – 13:20 – lunch

Panel 3. Terrorism and counter-radicalization

Chair: Prof. Dr. Christof Roos, Institute for European Studies (IES), VUB Brussels

13:20 – 13:40 – Dr. Corinne Torrekens, Uuniversité Libre de Bruxelles
13:40 – 13:50 – Mr. Jorge Bento Silva, Deputy Head of Unit: “Terrorism and Radicalisation”, DG Home, European Commission
13:50 - 14:00 – Dr. Christiane Höhn, Principal Adviser to the EU Counter-terrorism Coordinator, Council of the European Union
14:00 – 14:15 – Q&A

Panel 4. Cultural diplomacy and societal security

Chair: Dr. Georgios Kolliarakis, University of Frankfurt, Cluster of Excellence

14:15 – 14:35 – Mr. Diego Marani, Desk Officer, European External Action Service, Brussels
14:35 – 14:55 – Prof. Dr. Richard Higgott, Emeritus Professor of International Political Economy, University of Warwick, Research Professor, Institute for European Studies (IES) and Distinguished Professor of Diplomacy at Vesalius College VUB, Brussels
14:55 – 15:10 – Q&A
15:10 – 15:15 – Concluding remarks by Dr. Georgios Kolliarakis, University of Frankfurt, Cluster of Excellence
15:15 - 15:30 – General discussion
In beginning of the 1990s, when the Cold War period saw its end, security was largely defined in national terms as the defense of state territory and the containment of war by the means of national military. The state and its inviolable power over territory and people was the central focus in Security Studies. In the field of International Relations security was understood in terms of a state’s military power against another states’ military power. Military might have used to be the core political instrument through which domestic and external security were defined (Saleh 2010: 230). The confrontation of the East versus the West was, first of all, an issue of counting arms and soldiers in order to keep the balance of power. The school of political Realism advanced the idea of security being delivered by military power further. Until the end of the 1980s, during the Cold War times, Realist thinking dominated Security Studies.

Thinking ‘security’ in terms of the state being secured by its military power did not only promote the interests of military as an actor in providing for security, it also omitted core developments at local and global levels. A framework that focused on the state rather than peoples and individuals, overlooked a whole range of security issues emerging from sectors, such as: economy, environment, and society. An increase in inequality in society, concerns for sustainability and the environment, as well as claims for participation of ethnic, national and sexual minorities have implications for internal and external security. The end of the confrontation of the Eastern and Western blocs in the 1990s also meant that issues of sub-state nationalism and secession, on the one hand, and the globalization of markets and mobility, on the other, changed the role of the state.

Both, an increase in power of sub-state entities, as well as international organizations, questioned the state’s former monopoly of power in many issue areas, such as trade, welfare provision, and security.

Because the state lost its core role as a security provider, security studies had to rethink their unit of analysis by shifting a research focus from the state structure to human associations, i.e. applying a Constructivist approach. Alexander Wendt (1990) argued that International Relations scholars use constructivism ground-
ing on two major assumptions:

1) that the structures of human associations are determined primarily by shared ideas rather than material forces, and

2) that the identities and interests of purposive actors are constructed by these ideas rather than given by nature” (Wendt 1990: 1).

In this vein, Security Studies broadened their focus by applying a multi-sectorial approach: Security would not only be determined in terms of the effectiveness of a state’s military but also would be explained in terms of its political, economic and environmental sustainability, as well as in terms of the wellbeing of society in general. The society, its structure and dynamics of change were also looked at as possible factors in promoting insecurity. Externally as well as internally located threats to society became part of the security discourse (Waever et al. 1993). A novel approach to security implied a wide number of different threats that were not only referred to the context of a combat.

These threats may also be formulated in terms of problems and vulnerabilities that emerge in public discussions, where they are usually represented as existential threats, because security in its core appeals to human existence and survival (Buzan et al. 1998).
The paradigm shift in Security Studies was summarized in terms of societal security. In its essence, societal security should be distinguished from ‘social security’. The latter is about providing specific services and support for citizens as part of the welfare state policies. The scope, number of actors and purposes of societal security are broader than the ones of social security, although those might be interlinked in specific contexts. Since ‘society’ comprises many issue areas that can serve as an object of a study, academics tried to break the notion of ‘societal’ down to manageable units of analysis. At the end of the 1990’s famous Constructivists in International Relations, Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde published a book Security: A new Framework for Analysis. They suggested analyzing three major dimensions of security: 1) referent object 2) securitizing actors and 3) functional actors.

To put it simply, a referent object is an object represented as existentially threatened, thus having a legitimate claim for survival. A referent object, for instance, is a political regime, institutions, a group of human beings, or a society as a whole. Securitizing actors are those who activate “imaginary” (or real) existential threats and endorse security measures. They do not only prioritize a threat through a number of actions, but also problematize both securitization and the absence of securitization by transforming a certain issue into a matter of security. These actors perform in the name of a referent object and can be represented by international organizations and institutions, or governmental structures. Lastly, functional actors are the ones who directly operate in a particular sector and influence the dynamics of securitization of the sector. For example, functional actors can exist at the level of transnational corporations, state firms and industries working in technological or environmental sectors (Buzan et al. 1998).

After emerging from researchers, the concept of societal security met multiple definitions. Apart from having been defined in terms of survival, it was also considered as a concern with the society’s identity (Waever et al. 1993). Later, the concept subsequently broadened into the notion of resilience. The proponent of the identity approach, notably Ole Waever, defined societal security as being: “[... large, self-sustaining identity of groups capable of reproducing themselves independently from the state; what these are empirically
varies in both time and place. In contemporary Europe [...] these groups are mainly national, but in other regions religious or racial groups have equal relevance. The concept could also be understood as ‘identity security’” (Waever 2008: 583). According to this definition, societal insecurity would occur if a community considers its survival threatened. In this regard, a self-identified community is the unit for security analysis. Next to military aspects of community survival, the socio-economic stability and the environment in which the community finds itself are considered to be equally important (Waever 2008: 585). In contrast to Realist thinking, the Constructivist focus on societal identity acknowledges that threats to ethnic, religious or national communities within the state can be more dangerous than threats the state faces externally.

In the security debate, the idea of ‘societal identity’ met criticism. First, identities of people are changing, layered, or meshed, which raises the question how security can be maintained for fluid and mixed identities. Second, modern diverse societies encompass many differing identities. Applying the concept of ‘societal security’ in terms of securing a community’s identity would in any case risk producing a set concept, essentialist concept, of identity for a given community (Saleh 2010: 237).

At the backdrop of this critique on societal security, as securing a societies’ identity, a redefinition of the concept took place. Instead of securing a given identity, societal security is more and more understood in terms of resilience, the society’s ability to maintain social functions, material infrastructure as well as core immaterial values in critical situations (Burgess 2010). A society is considered secure if it responds to unexpected or catastrophic events in a way that it does not threaten its material and immaterial functions and values. Societal security focuses on protection of critical infrastructure, individuals as well as the core values of society. Accordingly, a resilient society is able to persist in its essential characteristics (Aradau and van Munster 2011). This feature could entail the capability to mobilize resources in a moment of crisis as well as passively endure a situation of stress. The idea of societal security as resilience provides us with a definition that helps to make empirical observations in the field of society-related Security Studies. It allows us to identify possible threats to the functioning of society as well
as the responses the society can produce.

The focus on resilience resonates particularly well with conceptions of security in the Nordic countries. There, research institutions and think tanks like NordForsk, an agency promoting research among Nordic countries, as well as the Research Council of Norway and others, promote a policy relevant notion of societal security (NordForsk 2013). Considering the Nordic countries’ long-tradition of civil defence and sustainable societal development familiarity with the practical implications of the concept lies at hand (Aradau et al. 2014). Accordingly, topics such as disaster relief and crisis management, or risk analysis and preparedness are high on the agenda of security and research agencies in Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden (NordForsk 2013). As a consequence, in Scandinavian countries ‘societal security’ research and its practical application are thriving.

The European Union and its research funding activities have created a second outlet for promoting knowledge and practical expertise on societal security. In the realm of the various EU framework programs (FPs), the EU funded hundreds of research projects on the relationship between society and security since the 1990s. Interestingly, Aradau and collaborators found that the term ‘societal security’ functioned as an umbrella for the European Commission to bring research and security industry together. The Commission Directorate General, DG Enterprise and Industry rather than DG Research and Innovation would oversee research and its policy relevant output. The creation of such a forum on the EU level allowed for a “high-level private-public dialogue” among research, politics and security industry (Aradau et al. 2014: 14).

For Security Studies as well as for the multiple areas of its implication, such as politics, industry or health, the concept of societal security has become a useful paradigm to operate with. The academic concept has settled on the notion of resilience of a society’s norms and core functions in events of catastrophe and crisis. Considering that more and more threats to society are emerging from within the society itself (terrorism, environmental degradation, epidemics, value conflicts) so-
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