Byron Bland, Lee Ross   November 9, 2018

<u>DRAFT</u>

Can we learn again to talk with one another? The purpose of this series of hacks is to see if we can. In *21 Lessons for the 21st Century,* Yuval Harari argues that the place to start the serious soul-searching that we need to do as a country is accepting that we don't really understand what is going on.[1] The dominant themes in the US narrative are ones grounded in classical liberalism and, more recently, neoliberalism. Globalization has challenged this worldview, and it is far from clear what resources we can draw upon to meet those challenges. What we will become as a country depends largely whether we can find a way to talk across the polarization that now divides us.

In "Pursuing a Shared Future in the Face of Globalization: Four Essential Questions," we identified three themes for healing the divisions created by globalization: (1) fostering dignity, (2) safeguarding livelihoods, and (3) encouraging respect. In the short essay below, we discuss issues related to those themes and identify questions for further discussion. The goal of the discussion, we hope, is not necessarily to reach consensus, but rather to better appreciate the experiences and perspectives that we collectively bring to that discussion and to the priorities for further action.

Safeguarding and Securing as Communal Engagement

Abstract: Two distinct but related paradigms serve to assure the safety and well-being of community members. The security paradigm focuses on countering threats while the safeguarding paradigm establishes the partnerships, relationships, and institutions that maintain safety and promote well-being. The key questions pertaining to these paradigms and their relevance to contemporary society are:

1   *What are the threats you most fear in your community? Is the security or safeguarding paradigm the better way to address them? Why? (The emphasis here is on what you fear.)*

2   *From what threats can't the security paradigm protect you? From what threats can't the safeguarding paradigm protect you? Why?*

3   *What are the promises we need to make to vulnerable Americans about how we will respond to the threats they feel?*

* * *

On September 16, 2017, supporters of Donald trump met on the National Mall in Washington DC to show their enthusiasm for his political agenda. It was called the "Mother of All Rallies" (MOAR). Hoping to draw a million demonstrators, the leaders of MOAR announced that the rally was not a fringe right-wing event and asked people to leave their Confederate Flags, Nazi Swastikas, and "hate" symbols at home. The turnout, to the disappointment of its organizers, was in the dismal few hundreds. Nevertheless, it seemed a day destined for confrontations. As counter-protestors rallied in opposition, opposing crowds faced off. Tempers began to flare, and tensions mounted. The Washington Post later reported: "The day seemed almost designed to test Americans' ability to disagree peaceably" (Jamison, Stein, Soong, & Sacchetti, 2017).

An especially confrontational moment occurred when Black Lives Matter of Greater New York (BLM) and M.O.A.R demonstrators, after much shouting, began moving toward each other.[i] Tommy Gunn, one of the organizers of M.O.A.R, interrupted a potentially violent skirmish by taking the stage and inviting Hawk Newsome, organizer of the BLM counterdemonstration, to address to the crowd. Gunn announced: "We're going to give you two minutes of our platform to put your message out. Whether … [we] disagree or agree with your message is irrelevant. It's the fact that you have the right to have the message" (Brooks A. C., 2018).

Newsome accepted the invitation and began by declaring himself to be an American. He went on to say that "the beauty of America was that, when something was broken, you could mobilize to fix it" (Brooks A. C., 2018). When a MOAR protestor shouted that all lives matter, Newsome responded: "You're right, my brother, you're right. You are so right. All lives matter, right? But when a black life is lost, we get no justice. That is why we say black

---

[i] In their study of US political divisions, *Hidden Tribes,* Hawkins et al. found that those most staunchly conservative felt coolest toward Black Lives Matter advocates over any other political group. On a scale of 1/100 with 1 being the cool and 100 being warm, Devoted Conservatives rated BLM a 10, slightly worse than Hillary supporters at 11 and feminists at 19 (Hawkins, Yudkin, Juan-Torres, & Dixon, 2018, p. 105)

lives matter. If you really want to make America great, we do it together." The open hostility that had consumed the crowd seemed to dissipate, at least momentarily.

As much as this fleeting outbreak of razor-thin concord was welcomed, it did not come close to bridging the deeper issues that divided the two groups. For many in MOAR, the police were their protectors. This was their primary and perhaps only purpose. If there was one consistent element running through the various police shootings of American Americans that had occurred over the recent months and years, it was the perception of threat, however erroneous it may appear in retrospect. Indeed, responding to threat was what it meant to be a *police force.*

For many in BLM, the police were the threat from which they needed protection.[2] They believed that the job of the police was to safeguard people, their lives, and their communities. The motto adopted by many police departments across the nation was, first and foremost, *to serve and protect,* and it was this mission that defined what it meant to be a *police service.* BLM supporters felt that the police had failed to live up to its stated goal.

At the center of this standoff were two differing narratives about what it takes to be safe. One narrative revolved around the theme of **securing**. *Safety meant securing us by identifying and countering threats*. The other narrative revolved around the theme of **safeguarding**. *Safety meant safeguarding us by maintaining and preserving our well-being.* Both narratives addressed our fears, but the fears they addressed were quite different. Indeed, the deeper one probed, the greater the gap between them grew.

Fear: What's at Stake

There are two traditions in political thought that can help clarify what we mean when we speak of securing and safeguarding. The first tradition has its origins in Thomas Hobbes.[3] Living in a time of great upheaval and insecurity, Hobbes found a solution to political chaos in the mutual fear that chaos produced. In his famous state of nature (or simply in times when order broke down), each of us is an enemy to the other. We have security only to the extent that our own strength provides. Hobbes's remedy for this situation was to have an all-powerful sovereign impose order through coercion. The critical move for achieving security was to displace the fear we have of each other with the fear we have of the sovereign. We trust the sovereign to act on our behalf in securing our safety.

Not us individually, but the sovereign will identify and counter the threats that attack our individual and collective well-being. For lack of a better term, we will call this the realist tradition, and roughly speaking, the safety it provides involves defeating the threat that we face.[4]

The other tradition dates back at least to the time of Montesquieu. Historically, this tradition has focused upon the havoc that despots and despotic governments can inflict on us. Today, it emphasizes more the intimidation that some groups exercise over other groups. This manifestation of fear arises from the political, social, and economic hierarchies that internally divide and subdue people. It concerns the fear that we have of those who wield power over us. This fear is powerfully present in workplaces, markets, and the public spaces where people meet and mingle as well as in the halls of authoritarian governments. Again, for lack of a better term, we will call this the liberal tradition, and roughly speaking, the safety it provides involves shielding *us* from what might harm us.

In these two traditions lie the initial outlines of the different paradigms about safety that we mentioned earlier—securing and safeguarding. Each contains a different account of how to respond to threat. For the realist tradition, threat comes from people that attack us. The way to respond is to attack back and defeat them. We authorize the state to take whatever means deemed necessary to counter the threat. For the liberal tradition, the threat comes from the harm that is inflicted from within. We want to shield ourselves from that harm so that we mitigate its affects. The realist tradition emphasizes securing, and the liberal tradition emphasizes safeguarding. Who is right? And under what circumstances? The answer may have less to do with abstract political theory and more to do with our concrete fears that actually frightens us.

Protecting People and their Communities

Perhaps more in words than in practice, all communities have sought to protect the lives and livelihoods of their members from imminent threats. Even so, there can be no doubt that communities have frequently protected some members more than others and have, not infrequently, excluded some members from any protection whatsoever. Nevertheless, these painful shortcomings only underscore the importance of deciding how best to provide the safety that communities need. Our answer to this critical question

shapes the institutions that structure our daily lives and determines the resources, both material and non-material, upon which we can draw.

As we have suggested above, many of the questions that arise as a community takes the measures it needs to protect itself concern the interplay of the security and the safeguarding paradigms. Again, in brief, the security paradigm targets threats as it seeks to counter or defeat them, and the safeguarding paradigm locates threats in an array of disruptive dynamics from which communities seek relief. While it is far too simplistic for anything more than heuristic purposes, it is helpful to think of the security paradigm as targeting and destroying and the safeguarding paradigm as maintaining and protecting.

There is, in truth, no bright line separating these two paradigms. In the real world, it comes down to emphasis and focus, and not sharp demarcation and disjuncture. If there is any sharp division, it will be in what we see as threatening and why we fear it. To the extent that we see certain types of people—outsiders, outcasts, people who are violent—as threatening, we will tend to seek safety in the security paradigm. To the extent that we see forces and dynamics that disrupt trusting and trustful relationships—crime, social disorder, community problems like joblessness or drugs—as threatening, we will tend to seek safety in the safeguarding paradigm.

One question we must ask and answer is whether the scope of protection that communities need today can be adequately addressed by either the security or the safeguarding paradigm alone or even together. Thus, our first question is: ***What are the threats you most fear in your community? Is the security or safeguarding paradigm the better way to address them? Why?***

Remember that threat, as opposed to anxiety, is concrete and specific, but fear is very fluid. Clearly, we fear what seems threatening, but what we fear most may not necessarily threaten what we care about most. There was once the notion of "high-class worries." It meant that you could worry about somethings only because other more important things had been taken care of. Likewise, we fear somethings only because other important things have been made safe. On the other hand, some fears are important even if they are not directly relevant to our daily struggles.

Policing: Where the Rubber Meets the Road

Plato may have been the first to address policing philosophically when, in the *Republic,* he identified the guardians as the protectors of the city-state. The guardians were to be reared and trained specifically for the job of, first, protecting the city against foreign enemies and, secondly, maintaining order at home against those who would disrupt it. Because Plato thought that the divisions between *us* and *them* were inherently hostile and violent, he sought to create safety by deploying *our* "good" violence against *their* "bad" violence in order to defeat the threat that *they* posed.[5] In Plato's view, the guardians (police) should be the coercive arm of the state. It should come as no surprise that police departments have historically tended to use the security paradigm as the lens through which they view their mission.[6]

The security paradigm indicates a situation in which human life and human welfare are at risk. We ignore these risks at our own peril because countering them helps us survive in a dangerous world. Nevertheless, the security paradigm may shape policing in ways that have detrimental outcomes. One shortcoming that critics have noted is that the security paradigm tends to "securitize" community problems. In other words, it takes complex community problems and reduces them to the two core security questions: (1) What is the threat? and (2) What does it take to counter or defeat it? Many of the most important threats we face may fall outside this framework.

The word *safeguarding* comes from the Middle French word *sauvegarde*, which means safekeeping.[7] It has roots in the Latin word *praecavere*, from which we get the English word precaution. The notion of safeguarding has the connotation of "guarding beforehand."[8] Safeguarding shares with modern notions of peacekeeping a concern for protecting and preserving what people have and value.[9]

Today, most local communities measure their safety against standards that are derived from the safeguarding paradigm. They want to feel protected against what might harm them, and they wanted to see criminals arrested and anti-social behavior suppressed. But, especially with regard to policing, they are also keenly aware of a subtle tipping point when the security paradigm fails to provide safety and instead becomes threatening. As Jonny Byrne writes about Northern Ireland police reform: "[F]rom the community perspective

'safety' was viewed as both positive and empowering, while 'security' was considered as something done to them by the state" (Burne, 2014, p. 7).

For people to feel safe, they need to feel that they can make their way in the world. They need to feel that the normal—however they define normal—benefits and pleasures of life are within reach. They need to feel that their lives afford them dignity and self-respect and that life does not humiliate them.[10] They want to feel that they can pass on to their children some semblance of the life they have lived and enjoyed. And, they want to think that the tragedies and difficulties they encounter are not the result of arbitrary decisions by people who oppose or hate them. A society with these features allows people to feel safe. People want these features safeguarded.

If truth be told, we want both to be **secured** from threats that could harm us and to be **safeguarded** against harms that threaten us. The real question is: What's most important and when? In many situations, the answer is not in dispute. In some, like the confrontation between BLM and MOAR, there is serious contention about what safety requires. Nevertheless, there is no reason to think that progress toward greater understanding, if not agreement, is possible if people listen to, rather than demonize, each other.

One of the most divisive and heated issue in US politics is immigration. Often, immigration is fused with refugees in the volatile mix of invective partisans frequently shout across the political divide. However, refugees, who are fleeing for their lives, are not immigrants, who want to come to the US to work and live. While there is a clear categorical distinction between them, the reality created by globalization scrambles who is what. Nevertheless, the distinction has moral importance because we owe people escaping violence and persecution more than what we owe people seeking opportunity.

Immigration policy is very complex and must be considered from many angles. Many factors have to do with economics, but not all. One problem that is frequently overlooked and dismissed, at least by liberals, is a concern for safety. America has changed greatly since the 1930s when the foundations of New Deal ethos were put in place. Back then, the US populations was almost complete white, overwhelmingly Christian, and primarily of European descent.[11] Today, America is quite different. Whites comprise only about 61% of the population, and projections are that a majority of US children will be non-white by 2020.

The nation as a whole will be majority non-white by 2044.[12] Many Americans, and not just white Americans, are unsettled by these changes. They feel threatened.

It is hard to separate this sentiment from our racist past as a country. The white nationalism that has recently risen to prominence, even if it was always simmering below the surface, must be rejected outright. But the "new" America can be disconcerting without involving bigotry and prejudice. We want to ask you, for a moment, to take seriously the threats that "left-behind" Americans might legitimately feel. With these as your field of reference, please address the following question: ***From what threats can't the security paradigm protect you? From what threats can't the safeguarding paradigm protect you? Why?***

Living in a Safe World

The Great Recession of 2008 was a watershed event. The economy tanked, and people lost not only their saving but also the stability of their standing in their communities. More than a few analysists have claimed that it was the catalyst that laid the New Deal ethos finally to rest. Across the board, Americans ceased to believe that their government could deal with the problems they faced. And these problems were more than simply economic; they concerned the American Dream.

The notion of a uniquely American Dream is more modern than many may think. In 1931, James Truslow Adams wrote about America as a land where people were free to use their talents to achieve a better life for themselves.[13] It was a vision about what we, coming out of the Great depression and WWII, wanted our country to be. President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal laid the foundation for this American Dream. (Although it must be noted, the New Deal by-in-large ignored the plight of African American in order to garner support for the legislation it proposed.) Roosevelt's "new deal" with the American people defined an ethos that lasted until the advent of globalization. President Bill Clinton captured its core when, in a 1993 Labor Day speech, he explained that, if you work hard and play by the rules, you can expect "a good life for yourself and better chance for your children" (Clinton, 1993).

In *Healing American Democracy,* Mike Hais, Doug Ross, and Morley Winograd point out that the New Deal was a national approach to national issues and that it no longer works.[14]

The paralyzing gridlock that has gripped our country is more than a breakdown in consensus at the national level. It is also a consequence of expecting our national government to address problems aren't national, but global, in scope. Somewhat paradoxically, they claim that the best way to go global is to go local—*localism* is the wave of the future. They make a compelling case, but our interest is not with localism *per se.* It is with living safely.

We began this essay with the question of how to respond to threat. We can ***secure*** and we can ***safeguard***, but these approaches only cover so much. These approaches capture part of a broader theme that safety ultimately resides in ***trusting and trusted relationships****.* It is to this topic that we now turn. Another way of putting the issue is the challenge of creating a new social contract. Wikipedia defines a contract as "a promise or set of promises that are legally enforceable."[15] Indeed, since the advent of modern political theory, promise-keeping has been a major concern.[16] Promises express trust, and trust is most tested when we live in uncertain times.

In the *Human Condition,* Hannah Arendt highlights the political role of promise-making.[17] She claims that making promises creates islands of certainty in the vast sea of uncertainty that surrounds us. Promise-making keeps the future from becoming a threat that we must control through coercion. From this perspective, the security paradigm is relevant in situations where promise-making has failed. In fact, Arendt contends that that mutual promise is the only political arrangement that is not based on coercion. Promises engage us in creating the trustworthy partnerships that make us safe.[ii] Promise-making seeks to expand the influence of safeguarding and restrict the influence of securing.

We need an analogy to bring our thoughts about safety together. The concept of healthy seems particularly apt because healthy, like safety, eludes precise definition. Medical researchers and experienced practitioners can identify illness and discover remedies, but

---

[ii] It is helpful to pay close attention to what Arendt says about promise-making. She argues that promise-making dispels unpredictability, at least partially, because nothing can erase unpredictability completely. First, it reduces the "unreliability of men who never can guarantee today who they will be tomorrow," and secondly, it minimizes the consequences of our inability to foretell the future outcome of actions undertaken by "a community of equals" (1958, p. 244). Attempting to eliminate all uncertainty would destroy the freedom and plurality that people need to flourish. Arendt writes that promises create "guideposts of reliability." If we substitute *safety* for *reliability*, the thrust of her argument remains the same. We safeguard ourselves by making trustworthy promises to each other.

they can't say definitively what healthy is. Their aim is to make someone healthy, but they don't know fully what this entails. They can only try to cure or remedy the diseases that make people sick. It may be best to approach safety in a similar manner.

While it is well known that security is a contested concept, the same can be said for safety.[18] Indeed, the English Oxford Living Dictionary defines security and safety in almost synonymous term.[iii] Security means "being free from danger or threat," and safety means "being protected from ... danger, risk, or injury."[19] However, both definitions leave scholars questioning what makes something a danger, risk, or threat and what does "being free from" or "protect from" actually mean. There are no clear-cut answers. If we can't make creditable promises about keeping each other safe, we will need to make promises about how we will deal with the threats we face.

In a recent New York Times Op-Ed, David Brooks stated that "Democrats have a strong story to tell about what we owe the victims of racism and oppression" but they have weak story to tell other Americans about what we owe them, about what binds us together as Americans.[20] We think that Brooks is right, but we also think that he gave the Republicans a pass. They don't have a strong story to tell the victims of racism and oppression about what binds us together as Americans or a strong story to tell liberal American about what binds Republicans to them.[21] And so, what is the story we want to tell one another about what makes America a safe place for all of us to live. Our question is: ***What are the promises we need to make to vulnerable Americans about how we will respond to the threats they feel?***

Safeguarding and Securing as Community Engagement

In our introductory essay, we emphasized the importance of "safeguarding livelihoods." In this essay, we have explored how we should respond to the threats that we face. With these in mind, please "hack" the following questions:

> 1. *What are the threats you most fear in your community? Is the security or safeguarding paradigm the better way to address them? Why? (The emphasis here is on what you fear.)*

[iii] Security is a "state of being free from danger or threat," and safety is the "condition of being protected from ... danger, risk, or injury." (https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/security; https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/safety)

2. *From what threats can't the security paradigm protect you? From what threats can't the safeguarding paradigm protect you? Why?*

3. *What are the promises we need to make to vulnerable Americans about how we will respond to the threats they feel?*

Works Cited

Adams, J. T. (2001). *The epic of America.* Simon Publication.

Archbold, C. (2013). The history of the police. In C. Archbold, *Policing: a text/reader* (pp. 12-45). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition.* Chicago, IL, USA: The University of Chicago Press.

Baldwin, D. A. (1997). *The concept of security*. Retrieved from Review of International Studies: https://www.princeton.edu/~dbaldwin/selected%20articles/Baldwin%20(1997)%20The%20Concept%20of%20Security.pdf

Brooks, A. C. (2018, January 21). *Empathize with your political foe*. Retrieved from New York Times: https://nyti.ms/2G2R1Zc?smid=nytcore-ios-share

Brooks, D. (2018, November 6). *Do democrats know what unites us?* Retrieved from New York Times: https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/05/opinion/democrats-midterms-immigration-nation.html

Burne, J. (2014, June 14). *Reflections on the Northern Ireland expereince: The lessons underpinning the normalisation of policing and security in a divided society.* Retrieved from Saferworld: http://www.saferworld.org.uk/resources/view-resource/818-reflections-on-the-northern-ireland-experience

Clinton, B. (1993, Septembeer 4). *The President's Radio Address.* Retrieved from American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=47027

Gibson, C., & Jung, K. (2002, September). *Historical census statistics on population totals by race, and by hispanic origin, 1790 to 1990, for the United States, region, divisions, and*

states. Retrieved from US Census Bureau:
https://census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/working-papers/2002/demo/POP-twps0056.pdf

Girard, R. (1979). *Violence and the sacred.* Baltimore, MD, USA: Johns hopkins University Perss.

Girard, R. (2010). *Battling to the end.* East Lansing, MI: Mighigan State Press.

Hais, M., Ross, D., & Winograd, M. (2018). *Healing American democracy: going local.* Tacoma, WA: Blue Zephy.

Harari, Y. N. (2018). *21 lessons for the 21th century.* New York, NY: Spiegel & Grau.

Hawkins, S., Yudkin, D., Juan-Torres, M., & Dixon, T. (2018). *Hidden tribes: a study of America's polarized landscape*. Retrieved from More in Commom: https://hiddentribes.us/pdf/hidden_tribes_report.pdf

Hobbes, T. (1958). *Leviathan.* Indianapolis, IN, USA: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, INC.

Hobbes, T. (1991). *Man and citizen.* (B. Gert, Ed.) indianapolis, IN, USA: Hackett Publishing Company.

Howard, M. (2000). *The invention of peace.* New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.

Jamison, P., Stein, P., Soong, K., & Sacchetti, M. (2017, September 16). *In the nation's capital of rallies, a day full of them featured Trump senitimanets and Juggalos*. Retrieved from New York Times: https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/in-the-nations-capital-of-rallies-a-day-full-of-them-begins-featuring-trump-sentiments-and-juggalos/2017/09/16/f04a7a9c-9a57-11e7-87fc-c3f7ee4035c9_story.html?utm_term=.d97f78eee829

Margalit, A. (1996). *The decent society.* Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press .

Paris, R. (2006, March 29). *Human security: paradigm shift or hot air?* Retrieved from International Security: https://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/10.1162/016228801753191141

Plato. (1969). Republic. In L. R. Loomis, *Plato: Five Great Dialogues.* New York, NY: Gramercy
        Books.

Potter, G. (2013, June 25). *The history of policing in the United States.* Retrieved from EKU
        Online: https://plsonline.eku.edu/sites/plsonline.eku.edu/files/the-history-of-
        policing-in-us.pdf

Robin, C. (2004). *Fear: the history of a political idea.* New York, NY, USA: Oxford University
        Press.

Seligman, A. (1977). *The problem of trust.* Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton University Press.

Skogan, W. G. (1990). *Disorder and decline: Crime and the spiral of decay in American
        neighborhoods.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

Thucydides. (1954). *History of the Peloponessian War.* (R. Warner, Trans.) Middlesex ,
        England, UK: Penguin Books Ltd.

US Census Bureau. (2015, March 3). *New census bureau report analyzes U.S. populations
        projects.* Retrieved from US Census Bureau:
        https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2015/cb15-tps16.html

---

[1] (Harari, 2018, p. 16)
[2] (Skogan, 1990, p. 166)
[3] (Hobbes, Leviathan, 1958) (Hobbes, Man and citizen, 1991)
[4] (Thucydides, 1954)
[5] For the concept of "good" and "bad" violence, see (Girard, Violence and the sacred, 1979)
    and (Girard, Battling to the end, 2010)
[6] Two very good sources on the history of policing are: (1) Carol Archbold's "The History of
    the Police" (Archbold, 2013) and Gary Potter's "The History of Policing in the United
    States" (Potter, 2013).
[7] https://www.etymonline.com/word/safeguard#etymonline_v_22595
[8] https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=safeguarding
[9] (Howard, 2000)
[10] (Margalit, 1996)
[11] (Gibson & Jung, 2002)
[12] (US Census Bureau, 2015)
[13] (Adams, 2001)
[14] (Hais, Ross, & Winograd, 2018)
[15] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Contract

[16] (Seligman, 1977, pp. 13-43)
[17] (Arendt, 1958, pp. 243-244)
[18] (Baldwin, 1997)
[19] https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/security;
https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/safety)
[20] (Brooks D. , 2018)
[21] (Hawkins, Yudkin, Juan-Torres, & Dixon, 2018)