

# Defending Democracy and Securing Diversity

*Edited by*  
**Christian Leuprecht**



# Defending Democracy and Securing Diversity

Old sergeants say, “we’re here to defend democracy, not to practice it!” But are they right? The special mandate with which defence and security organizations are tasked imposes unique constraints with respect to the accommodation of diversity which differs from those faced by any other public or private organization. Yet, the compound effect of demographic, political, economic, social and legal pressures is making diversity as inevitable in the defence and security sector as in any other organization in advanced industrialized democracies. Owing in part to a dearth of research on the way the defence and security sectors can leverage diversity to enhance their functional imperatives, such sectors have been reticent about diversity.

The chapters in this volume strive to enlighten the debate by laying out the concepts, clarifying theoretical issues, and providing empirical evidence. The case studies draw on Canada, Guyana, the Netherlands, South Africa, and the United Kingdom. They examine ethno-cultural, gender, and sexual-minority diversity in a variety of missions, including Bosnia-Herzegovina and Afghanistan. The chapters are notable for their methodological pluralism and interdisciplinary range including political science, sociology, anthropology, and psychology. Although scholarly in nature, the book is readily accessible to professionals and practitioners alike.

This book was published as a special issue of *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*.

**Christian Leuprecht** is associate professor of political science at the Royal Military College of Canada and cross-appointed to the School of Policy Studies and Department of Political Studies at Queen’s University.

This timely volume breaks new ground on one of the most pressing issues confronting civil-military relations in the twenty-first century: The challenges security and armed forces face with respect to diversity. On the one hand, the volume offers constructive insights to help understand diversity as a philosophical, principle-based requirement to amend culture instead of just as a legislative, rules-based need to amend workforce practices. On the other hand, it explains to a broader public why the profession of arms functions the way it does and the critical issues that security and armed forces must balance when adjusting to broader social trends. ... an indispensable read for scholars, practitioners, and policy-makers alike!

*Aaron Belkin, Associate Professor of Political Science and International Relations and founding director, Palm Center, University of California, Santa Barbara*

“One of the most common arguments against the promotion of diversity in the security sector is that this offends the ‘merit’ principle, and detracts from efficiency. Leuprecht’s welcome edited volume shows what is wrong with this argument. The contributors demonstrate that a representative security sector is desirable, not just on grounds of justice, but on grounds of functionality too. Promoting representativeness, that is, enhances security.”

*John McGarry, Canada Research Chair in Nationalism and Democracy, Queen’s University, Kingston, Canada*

Over the past decade the concept of ‘diversity’ has gained a leading place in academic thought, business practice and public policy around the world. In many ways and places, this has replaced multiculturalism as a guiding idea within state agencies. Comprising insightful studies on the security sector, this book contributes significantly towards understanding the contemporary spread and permutation of the diversity concept, its reworking in different public spheres and its implementation in policies across a variety of contexts and institutions.

*Steven Vertovec, Professor and Director, Max-Planck-Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity*

# **Defending Democracy and Securing Diversity**

Edited by Christian Leuprecht

First published 2011  
by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada  
by Routledge  
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2011 Taylor & Francis

First issued in paperback 2013

This book is a reproduction of *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, vol. 47, issue 4. The Publisher requests to those authors who may be citing this book to state, also, the bibliographical details of the special issue on which the book was based

Typeset in Times by Value Chain, India

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN13: 978-0-415-57649-9 (hbk)  
ISBN13: 978-0-415-84696-7 (pbk)

# Contents

<i>Abstracts</i>	vii
Introductory Note <i>Christian Leuprecht</i>	1
1. Rethinking Diversity and Security <i>Alan Okros</i>	4
2. Evolution of Policing and Security: Implications for Diverse Security Sectors <i>David Last</i>	32
3. Evolving UK Policy on Diversity in the Armed Services: Multiculturalism and its Discontents <i>David Mason and Christopher Dandeker</i>	51
4. Harnessing Social Diversity in the British Armed Forces: The Limitations of 'Management' Approaches <i>Victoria Marie Basham</i>	69
5. Sex, Gender and Cultural Intelligence in the Canadian Forces <i>Karen D. Davis</i>	88
6. Ethnic Cultural Minorities and their Interest in a Job in the Royal Dutch Army <i>Jelle van den Berg and Rudy Richardson</i>	114
7. Can Women Make a Difference? Female Peacekeepers in Bosnia and Kosovo <i>Liora Sion</i>	134

vi *Contents*

8. Diversity in the Canadian Forces: Lessons from Afghanistan <i>Anne Irwin</i>	152
9. Ethnic Diversity and Police–Community Relations in Guyana <i>Joan Mars</i>	164
10. The Politics of Race and Gender in the South African Armed Forces: Issues, Challenges, Lessons <i>Lindy Heinecken and Noëlle van der Waag-Cowling</i>	175
11. Gender Mainstreaming: Lessons for Diversity <i>Donna Winslow</i>	197
12. Diversity as Strategy: Democracy’s Ultimate Litmus Test <i>Christian Leuprecht</i>	217
<i>Index</i>	238

# Abstracts

## **Rethinking Diversity and Security**

ALAN OKROS

This article examines recent evolution in the understanding of both diversity and security. It calls for the security sector to move beyond the perspective of diversity as externally driven demographic change to an internally embraced philosophy, while also moving its focus from physical state security to human security. The concepts of diversity and security are reviewed to provide broader understanding in emerging contexts and in particular to link the two through the recommendation that valuing diversity through identity rather than physiological group membership is essential to achieving what government, society and communities in need are expecting when confronted with crises that disrupt daily life and human security. A range of social science literatures are integrated to present theories and models that illustrate the central issues at play when institutions seek to evolve, to adjust to external factors and adopt new internal philosophies. Based on this analysis, implications are presented for key aspects of institutional functioning, including examining internal culture, shifting professional attributes and adopting new leadership approaches.

## **Evolution of Policing and Security: Implications for Diverse Security Sectors**

DAVID LAST

Secondary sources and illustrative anecdotes put the evolution of diverse security sectors into context. Police and military organisations have co-evolved with states, and with the expansion of states into international markets, sometimes coercing and sometimes serving communities. In this process, the



instruments of state have variously dominated, co-opted, or accommodated different cultural traditions and identity groups, which also evolve in the process. Inclusion and accommodation can involve co-option of elites, ethnic units, units of convenience, recognition of individual identity, and less visible physical accommodations. Informal structures like ethnic trust networks influence whether accommodation threatens the integrity of security organisations or the security of the state.

**Evolving UK Policy on Diversity in the Armed Services:  
Multiculturalism and its Discontents**

DAVID MASON & CHRISTOPHER DANDEKER

Reflecting a generally multiculturalist rhetoric, UK policy in this area has hitherto focused on enhancing the degree to which the armed services represent or reflect the ethnic makeup of the UK population. Ambitious targets have been set and some progress made in moving towards them. However, the dynamics of population change, together with the diverse preferences of ethno-religious minorities, have meant that the goal of representativeness has remained out of reach. At the same time, the armed services have continued to struggle with an ongoing recruitment problem while the volume of operational commitments has shown little sign of reducing. The authors have previously argued that the heritage of empire has been a key background factor, from the perspective both of the armed services and of potential minority ethnic recruits. Since 11 September 2001, a further series of complicating circumstances has entered the arena. The 'war on terror' has generated a clear sense of marginalisation among some of Britain's Muslim minorities, while the participation of British-born Muslims in the 2 July 2005 attacks in London has raised new questions about the relationship between formal citizenship, identity, rights and duties. It has also led to the very principle of multiculturalism, long challenged by both the white right-wing and black nationalists, being increasingly questioned across the political spectrum.

**Harnessing Social Diversity in the British Armed Forces:  
The Limitations of 'Management' Approaches**

VICTORIA MARIE BASHAM

This article explores how the British Ministry of Defence's aim to accommodate and harness a demographically diverse workforce is undermined by the ways it seeks to manage this change. By focusing on policy discourses identified as the 'diversity blind' and the 'management imperative' approaches, and on

insights from research with British military personnel, the article demonstrates how policy discourses can expose individuals to harassment and undermine the military's social legitimacy. It is only by examining what it is that the military is trying to protect – its white, heterosexual, masculine identity – that it becomes clear how status quo power relations remain intact.

### **Sex, Gender and Cultural Intelligence in the Canadian Forces**

KAREN D. DAVIS

Cultural awareness, along with the capacity to effectively develop and apply cultural knowledge, has become critical for military leaders. Based on a multi-dimensional model of cultural intelligence and a review of selected aspects of the Canadian Forces' (CF) experience with gender integration, this paper highlights implications for the development of culturally intelligent military leaders and teams. The gendered evolution of the CF in recent decades has been critical in preparing the CF for the complexity of challenges that it faces today. In spite of progress, significant resistance to expanded roles for women has been based upon the assumption that gender is a dichotomous biologically determined construct. On the other hand, the institutional discourse that has developed in the face of legal imperatives permitting women to join the combat arms since 1989 claims that the CF is gender neutral. The analysis presented in this paper suggests that such limited constructs of gender act to reduce the capacity of the CF to develop cultural intelligence, a critical contributor to mission success, among male and female members.

### **Ethnic Cultural Minorities and their Interest in a Job in the Royal Dutch Army**

JELLE VAN DEN BERG & RUDY RICHARDSON

In 2007, the Dutch Department of Defence announced a new 'Gender and Diversity' policy. A keystone in the policy is an accent on the recruitment of ethnic cultural minorities (ECM). To recruit ECM personnel it is important to know whether they are interested in a job in the Dutch armed forces. This article describes the results of an exploratory survey (N=431) of interest or non-interest of young Dutch high school pupils in a job in the Dutch army) and the factors that affect this (non-)interest. Survey participants were drawn from the four big cities in the Netherlands: Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht.

**Can Women Make a Difference? Female Peacekeepers in Bosnia and Kosovo**

LIORA SION

By using participant observation, this article analyses the participation of women in peacekeeping missions through the experience of Dutch female peacekeepers in Bosnia and Kosovo in 1999–2000. Its argument is threefold. First, it argues that although peacekeeping is a relatively new military model it reproduces the same traditional combat-oriented mindset of gender roles. Therefore, women are limited in their ability to contribute to peace missions. Second, because peacekeeping missions are perceived by peacekeepers as rather feminine, they are seen as a challenge to male combat and masculine identity. As a result, soldiers reject the participation of women and perceive them as endangering even further the missions' prestige. Third, despite the shared difficulties, women do not support each other and tend to view the other women in a stereotypical way. This contributes to their isolation and self-disapproval.

**Diversity in the Canadian Forces: Lessons from Afghanistan**

ANNE IRWIN

Based on anthropological fieldwork with an infantry unit of the Canadian Forces deployed to Afghanistan in 2006, this article argues that traditional measures of diversity are inadequate to represent diversity as it is experienced by the soldiers of the unit. It suggests two alternative but complementary approaches to assessing diversity in the unit, making further the case that their adoption would both improve perceptions of the heterogeneity of the unit and also increase acceptance and appreciation of that diversity among the soldiers within the unit.

**Ethnic Diversity and Police–Community Relations in Guyana**

JOAN MARS

From its inception during the colonial period, the Guyana Police Force has always been plagued by its inability to reflect the racial and ethnic diversity of the community it is mandated to serve. This shortcoming, combined with the early adoption of a military model of policing, has helped to create a legacy of poor police–community relations which continues to plague the country's security sector. The recent recommendations of the Disciplined Forces

Commission (Georgetown, Guyana, 2004) on the subject of ethnic imbalances in the Force and the proper functions of community policing groups are critically reviewed.

**The Politics of Race and Gender in the South African Armed Forces: Issues, Challenges, Lessons**

LINDY HEINECKEN & NOËLLE VAN DER WAGG-COWLING

This article examines the politics of race and gender in the South African armed forces since 1994. The first section provides an overview of the changing racial profile of the South African National Defence Force (SANDF). Thereafter the challenges which the integration of former enemy forces and affirmative action have posed in terms of changing power relations, professionalism, efficiency and effectiveness are discussed, before providing a brief overview of the different approaches to diversity management. The focus then shifts to gender and the debates on gender equality. The implications of the changed gender/racial profile are sketched, before moving on to some of the more contentious issues of sexuality, authority relations, leadership, sexual harassment and gender-based violence. The final section examines some of the difficulties women face whilst deployed on peacekeeping missions and how the unique needs of women in this patriarchal environment continue to be overlooked. The final section looks at how gender mainstreaming initiatives are being managed. For the SANDF finding the right balance between demographic representivity for the sake of redress and political expedience, and efficiency for the sake of military effectiveness continues to be an ongoing challenge.

**Gender Mainstreaming: Lessons for Diversity**

DONNA WINSLOW

The promotion of gender, ethnic and equal opportunity policies in the defence sector is a key issue. This paper examines the importance of developing policy and setting international standards – areas where lessons from gender issues might be applied to those of diversity. Efforts to promote gender mainstreaming by the United Nations challenge stereotypes and discriminatory practices in and by armed forces. Mainstreaming a gender or diversity perspective is a strategy for making these perspectives an integral part of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes.

**Diversity as Strategy: Democracy's Ultimate Litmus Test**

CHRISTIAN LEUPRECHT

Advanced democracies' defence and security forces have the privileged task of upholding the democratic way of life and its underlying values. Why, then, are they increasingly unrepresentative of the societies they allegedly serve? These organisations widely see diversity as a liability. They appear to have good reasons to defend their reticence. Contra the prevailing logic, this article posits diversity as a strategic asset. However, rather than relying on normative theoretical claims, the article defends the merits of diversity in the security and defence sectors on functional grounds. Operational, demographic, economic, formal-constitutional, and political trends militate for a paradigm shift: diversity's payoffs for the organisations' functional imperative greatly outweigh perceived costs.

# Introductory Note

CHRISTIAN LEUPRECHT

*Royal Military College of Canada*

Diversity and security have long had an uneasy co-existence. The relationship between diversity and security is often portrayed as a dichotomy with a troubled history. Conventionally, diversity is posited as ‘the problem’ to which security is ‘the solution’. Disciples of Ulrich Beck and Anthony Giddens, however, readily admit that self-reflexivity has shattered the modernist faith in linear thinking where there is a solution to every problem. The dialectic between diversity and security is emblematic of this claim. Owing to demographic change, the changing nature of the security environment, and the transnational diffusion of the democratic norms of freedom, equality, and justice, diversity and security actually turn out to be different sides of the same coin. The purpose of this volume is to articulate that this is not merely a normative claim but rather an empirical one. Treating various aspects and dimensions of diversity as the independent variable allows the articles in this special issue to shed a different light on the defence and security sector.

To gauge the scope of the argument – that, contrary to the conventional wisdom of decades gone by, there are good reasons why, in the twenty-first century, diversity is at the very heart of the defence and security sector – it has to be falsifiable. One way to broach falsification is by thinking of counter-factuals. An examination of the issue of diversity in the context of the defence and security sector has the methodological advantage of actually being replete with cases where the defence and security sector has resisted diversity. By and large, the chapters attest to the security and defence

## 2 *Introduction*

sector's relatively poor record on diversity. Yet, they also show that the winds of change are blowing. In many cases, it is actually more akin to a sudden storm that is catching the defence and security establishment off-guard. Precisely because the pace of change is so rapid, there is a great deal of uncertainty in the air. Uncertainty tends to make soldiers and police officers apprehensive. After all, their profession is fraught with danger: imperilling the organisation's integrity not only undermines the capacity to carry out its mission effectively but may also put lives at risk unnecessarily. Ultimately, it is in every citizen's interest that the functional imperative of these organisations be preserved and those who serve in the profession of arms respected as they have volunteered for the (unenviable) task of dedicating themselves to protecting our values and way of life. Notwithstanding the limits on operationalising diversity in these professions, the articles in this volume substantiate empirically the many benefits that accrue to diversity while the costs of failing to diversify grow exponentially. Although the collection falls short of covering all relevant countries and groups (which is neither its design nor purpose), the cumulative evidence from Canada, Guyana the Netherlands, South Africa, and the United Kingdom as presented in this volume in support of the core thesis is compelling.

This book starts with contributions by Al Okros and David Last that lay out and clarify conceptual issues as they affect the armed forces in particular as a profession and the security sector more broadly. This conceptual and theoretical background sets the stage for three country case studies by, respectively, David Mason and Christopher Dandeker, Victoria Basham, and Karen Davis, to shed light on the glacial pace at which racialised minorities, sexual minorities and women have been making inroads into the defence establishment and the drivers of diversity in the United Kingdom and Canada. Whether under-represented racialised groups actually have an interest at all in joining the armed forces, the drivers of their (dis)interest and the conditions under which the armed forces might become an employer of choice are examined by Jelle van den Berg and Rudy Richardson in the context of the Netherlands. The subsequent contributions deal with the tenuous balance between the functional imperative and diversity. How diversity plays out while deployed in the field on expeditionary missions is the subject of the contributions that follow. Liora Sion's case study of the Dutch deployment to the Balkans illustrates the perceived liability of women to the mission and its manifestation. Anne Irwin goes on to deconstruct this kind of misperception to show that it is based on confusion between the attributes that are deemed to matter and those that actually matter for the purpose of operational effectiveness. The adverse implications for the operational effectiveness of addressing issues of diversity in an adequate and timely fashion are exemplified in Joan Mars's study of Guyana. Conversely, Lindy Heinecken and Noëlle van

der Waag-Cowling show that diversity has its limits: social engineering can indeed compromise the institution's ability to carry out its functional imperative. Finally, Donna Winslow's contribution examines the manifestation of diversity in the form of international norms and their diffusion.

Initial versions of the chapters that comprise this special issue were spawned by a workshop on diversity in the armed forces that was held in Kingston, Canada in November 2007, underwritten by the Queen's Centre for International Relations (QCIR) in collaboration with the Royal Military College of Canada and the International Political Science Association's Research Committee 16 on Socio-Economic Pluralism. Additional subventions came from the University of California Santa Barbara's Palm Center, and the Special Project Fund maintained by the Security and Defence Forum of Canada's Department of National Defence which for more than 40 years has been a steadfast supporter of informed and impartial research relevant to the mission of the Canadian Forces. The chapters have since undergone substantial revision in response to feedback, including from the editors of *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics* and its reviewers to whom I am greatly indebted. Many people labour behind the scenes without whom an endeavour such as this would not have come to pass. They include Maureen Bartram's impeccable attention to detail in her capacity as the QCIR's administrative assistant and Shelley Barry at the publisher's end who skilfully turned these chapters into the publication you have before you.



# Rethinking Diversity and Security

ALAN OKROS

*Department of Command, Leadership and Management, Canadian Forces College, Toronto, ON, Canada*

**ABSTRACT** *This article examines recent evolution in the understanding of both diversity and security. It calls for the security sector to move beyond the perspective of diversity as externally driven demographic change to an internally embraced philosophy, while also moving its focus from physical state security to human security. The concepts of diversity and security are reviewed to provide broader understanding in emerging contexts and in particular to link the two through the recommendation that valuing diversity through identity rather than physiological group membership is essential to achieving what government, society and communities in need are expecting when confronted with crises that disrupt daily life and human security. A range of social science literatures are integrated to present theories and models that illustrate the central issues at play when institutions seek to evolve, to adjust to external factors and adopt new internal philosophies. Based on this analysis, implications are presented for key aspects of institutional functioning, including examining internal culture, shifting professional attributes and adopting new leadership approaches.*

As discussed elsewhere in this issue, matters surrounding diversity in security sector organisations have been the subject of academic study, organisational policy changes and external media commentary for many years. Often, the rationale for addressing diversity has been based on the perspective that it is external factors that have forced organisations to make internal changes. Thus, a common perception has been that the police, military or other security communities have been compelled by social legislation or labour market forces to adjust policies, programmes and standards to allow access to

members of groups that were previously under-represented or explicitly banned from serving. What has often emerged across many organisations, numerous countries and different sub-groups is a generalised pattern of initially the denial of a requirement for changes, then the removal of overt barriers and finally the provision of carefully worded statements of principle (with accompanying policies) to convince all that the newcomers are now welcome members of the team. These pronouncements from on high have been met with everything from enthusiasm to cynicism, often correlated to whether one spends the day sitting around the executive conference table or out on the front lines.

When change has been seen as forced, the ensuing scuffles have tended to focus on the zero-sum logic of cost versus effectiveness. Fundamentally, organisations ask how much time, effort, attention and money have to be diverted from doing the core business to making imposed changes to accommodate a new group. The focus has invariably been on demographic characteristics, with gender, sexual orientation and ethnicity as the most frequent categorisations used to identify the new cohort to be included. Along the way, special interest groups have tried to convince reluctant organisations to change; members of the organisations have tried to convince the public of the dangers of moving too far, too fast; and politicians and government regulators and various oversight committees have attempted to serve as the arbitrators in the middle.

This article will shift beyond the ‘diversity as forced demographic change’ approach by first reviewing and reframing how many have been thinking about diversity and about security and then integrating several disparate bodies of theory to explain the tensions that have arisen and provide some alternate models to illustrate how diversity might be viewed in the security context. Three bodies of theory will be presented. The first domain of theory pertains to the political science and sociological understanding of professions and highlights issues that arise when civil society and government authorities seek to exercise control over professional practice. The second focuses on the sociological consideration of contested jurisdictions and in particular on the tensions created and adjustments required when two or more groups have to cooperate in what were previously separate areas of responsibility. The final section turns to anthropological and psychological literatures to examine the nature of institutional culture as the focal point of the internal tensions when a new sub-group or a new frame of reference is introduced into the existing status quo.

## **Diversity and Security**

In order to fully examine the issues, challenges, tensions and opportunities of achieving diversity within the security sector, it is necessary to start by

considering what is meant by the two central terms. Of importance is that the common understanding of both has been evolving although the implications of the emerging meanings attached to both have not been examined together. This initial discussion challenges certain assumptions and suggests some alternate, more expansive understandings of both terms. As such, it is intended to stimulate broader thinking but is not designed to provide definitive answers.

### *Demographic Diversity vs. Identity Diversity*

As suggested in the introductory comments, the history in North America and Europe has been that either social legislation or change in the labour market has resulted in adjustments to employment policies to permit acceptance of individuals who had previously been barred from service. Thus, the common focus of diversity initiatives in the police and military as key components of the security sector is on the proportionate representation of members of specific target or designated groups. Diversity, therefore, has come to be seen as predominantly an exercise to increase internal workforce demographics, with the assumption that numerical indicators suggesting greater representation of designated groups prove that the organisation is becoming more diverse. Such a perspective is not only misleading but may actually be harmful to the organisation and its members. It is at least a misunderstanding of what diversity is or could be and is likely to inhibit the effectiveness of security sector organisations.

To better understand the concept, it is necessary to take a more encompassing view of what is meant by *diversity* by looking beyond the physiological characteristics that are often used to group individuals together to acknowledge key ways in which people differ. Instead of pertaining to assumed categorisations such as gender, ethnicity, age etc., diversity is best understood to apply to the concept of self; the personalised perspective individuals hold as to who they are and how they relate to the world around them.<sup>1</sup> Thus, diversity is more about elements such as world views, belief systems, ethical frameworks, role obligations and other personal perspectives that reveal how individuals see themselves and perceive others and, more importantly, how they exercise independent reasoning and judgement.<sup>2</sup>

There are several key reasons to move from the current focus on demographic diversity to identity diversity. The most obvious is that the demographic characteristics that are often used (women, persons with disabilities, Aboriginal/Indigenous/Original Peoples, etc.) appear to provide neat, dichotomous categories that, in fact, do not exist. The assumption underlying these categories is that one is either a man or a woman, able-bodied or disabled, Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal, etc. The realities are that these are culturally-embedded terms and hence have different meanings in different

contexts or different communities and that each category label actually represents a set of complex, varied and multi-dimensional constructs. Thus, the assumption that these categories have meaning or describe anything of use is incorrect.<sup>3</sup> The additional terms I introduced (such as worldview, belief system, ethical framework, etc.) represent pluri-faceted constructs that are much more reflective of diversity. The problem, of course, is that they do not lend themselves to simplistic description or enumeration.

At a slightly deeper level, it is important to recognise that, most often, the labels used to assign categories of diversity (and to assign people to categories) are imposed on individuals. The use of artificial categories that are created based on how the dominant work or social group differentiates itself from others produces significant problems for those so classified but, more importantly, prevents organisations from appreciating what diversity is and how it can contribute to valued organisational goals. For example, the common practice of measuring diversity through workforce census with the caveat that individuals have the option to *self-identify* is misleading. Individuals are not able to self-identify (which would imply that they can represent themselves to others in terms that are meaningful to themselves as individuals). They are, in reality, given the option to choose whether or not they fit into a socially constructed category that is defined and interpreted by others. Should they decide not to self-identify or more properly not to agree to be placed in a uni-dimensional category, they are assumed to be part of the dominant majority.

Not only does the use of simplistic categories reduce human beings to a single defining characteristic, but many of the collective terms such as *Aboriginal* – or in the Canadian or British contexts, *Visible* or *Ethnic Minority* or in the United States *non-Hispanic Caucasian* – have little or no real meaning amongst the individuals and communities lumped into the category. Beyond the implicit ethnocentric assumption that ‘others’ are best defined by how ‘we’ think ‘they’ differ from ‘us’, these labels explicitly invalidate the rich and varied identities that are associated with one’s heritage, community, place, nation, clan, tribe, iwi, etc. (see e.g. Ward, 2008). These personal identities and the sense of who one is are of real importance and have real meaning to individuals yet are explicitly rejected as irrelevant.

Another difficulty with the use of demographic categories occurs when these are combined with human resources policies intended to provide workplace *accommodation* as this creates institutionalised *outing*. In order for some individuals to be able to participate in work with the same considerations as others, they must, in fact, make a declaration of group membership. While the vast majority of individuals are automatically given a work station that is based on their physical characteristics<sup>4</sup> or are granted paid holidays for religious observances, others must first declare that they are *different* and

that they *belong* to a labelled sub-group in order to receive the same entitlements. Thus, the very policies intended to create inclusive workplaces by accommodating diversity requirements instead commonly serve to differentiate individuals and force people to agree to be described as part of a designated, hence differentiated, sub-group.

While the focus on demographic diversity often creates many unintended and unhelpful consequences, the greatest problem is that it serves to mask the meaning or the utility of diversity. Shifting the frame of reference from how bureaucratic organisations and the dominant group choose to view others to recognising that the essence of diversity is self-identity provides a much more powerful way to understand what diversity means, how organisational policies assist or inhibit diversity in the workplace and how valuing diversity is central to achieving security objectives. As will be developed in subsequent discussion, the most important facet here is to recognise the direct links between how individuals see themselves to how they engage in abstract reasoning in novel and complex context to how they achieve security objectives in a manner consistent with what the public expects of their police and military. This logic, of course, requires a consideration of what citizens expect from their security organisations, which will be explored in the next section.

### *Integrated Security Solutions*

This discussion will review evolutions in the concepts of security with an emphasis on emerging domestic and international contexts. It is fully acknowledged that the key players in the security sector have well established roles that remain important and valid, with the military responsible for national defence and large-scale physical security issues, the police as lead for public safety and justice and corrections addressing longer-term elements of the public security arena. The focus of this article, however, is on the changing roles and responsibilities being assigned to or assumed by these organisations when they are charged with addressing complex public and physical security issues. I will argue that these new roles present a strong case for the incorporation of diversity as both a philosophy and a practice.

A recurring narrative in the 20 years of post-Cold War political pronouncements and academic writings has been that the world has become increasingly complex, chaotic, dysfunctional and dangerous with the source of conflict and violence shifting from classic state-on-state warfare to Hobbesian intra-state, community-on-community civil strife conducted by *non-state actors* in *failed or failing states*. Whether these are truly ‘new wars’ or just new attention to old problems is a separate debate (see Kaldor, 2007). However, it has become clear that, by the time the *international community* and, in particular,

global or regional powers decide to collectively stick their noses in other people's affairs, the situation on the ground will be characterised by a host of major, interconnected problems that all need to be addressed.<sup>5</sup> The concept of *integrated security solutions* highlights the need for concurrent, complementary and coordinated actions to restore the essential state and community functions that are needed, at a minimum, to establish a degree of calm and normalcy and, ideally, to set the conditions for long term recovery.<sup>6</sup>

In many cases, states and even regional security organisations have also started to adopt similar policies to respond to major disruptions in the domestic context. The need for comprehensive or *whole of government* approaches to address large-scale natural disasters, pandemics or terror acts has led to increased emphasis on cooperation across a range of *first responders*. Thus, to parallel the evolution in the international domain, the same requirement has emerged, although often with a different cast of characters. While the police and military can have a clear role in both the international *failed state* and the domestic *disrupted state* context, the key dance partners internationally are the diplomatic, developmental and humanitarian communities, while at home they are health, transportation and emergency measures coordinators.

The requirements for integrated security solutions in complex domestic and international contexts are raising a host of interesting issues. Although the requirement for integration across multiple sectors is clear, recent events such as Hurricane Katrina, the SARS crisis and the Asian tsunami along with international interventions in a number of countries have exposed significant problems (see e.g. United States Government, 2006; Campbell, 2006; Bennett *et al.*, 2006; UN, 2005). Underlying the general refrain that everybody wants coordination but nobody wants to be coordinated by others are clear indicators of *cultural* differences that reduce effective cross-organisational functioning. To the extent that diversity refers to a capacity to understand and value other points of view, the requirement for multiple organisations in the security sector to work together effectively would suggest that diversity (conceptually) be understood as a key enabler of success. As already indicated in the differentiation between demographic diversity and identity diversity, the difficulty is that achieving the requisite *culture change* requires more than executive fiat announcing the new world order and can, in fact, be impeded if the dominant focus is on *managing* diversity by tracking sub-group representation on Excel® spreadsheets.

Looking beyond the issues of inter-agency cooperation, a more important issue pertains to the shifting perspectives on what security is and hence how it is to be achieved. Traditional models of physical and public security have emphasised the state and state institutions. The emphasis at home and abroad on the rule of law, peaceful and orderly public affairs, open democratic

processes (along with the common additional components in the international context on confronting or disarming *non-state actors*, removing unauthorised roadblocks and extending the authority of the central government) are all elements of an emphasis on state security and necessarily place the state (not the nation) and state structures (including the police and the military) as central to maintaining or imposing peace and order.

A differing perspective that has gained currency is human security.<sup>7</sup> In contrast to state security, this approach is centred on individuals and their families, with an emphasis on the social and community systems that allow people to have a productive life. While there are obvious overlaps in some elements of state and human security (the absence of physical violence, protecting property, etc.) the most crucial difference pertains to who gets to assess whether an appropriate level of security exists. Because both the police and the military are agents of government and, specifically, are tasked to achieve objectives as defined by government, these organisations tend to use the framework of state security to understand their roles, base their actions and evaluate their successes. When security is described and evaluated by individuals, families or communities, there is an obvious requirement for the police and military to be able to understand their expectations, perspectives and concerns. Particularly in the international context, there is a significant difference between the references to ‘winning hearts and minds’ and delivering human security.<sup>8</sup> As applied in contexts such as Iraq and Afghanistan, the current usage of the first implies building support amongst civilian populations for the state and state objectives, while the latter would be focused on creating the conditions that the local population(s) desire (which may not be consistent with the objectives of the central government).<sup>9</sup> A human security perspective reveals that there will be a plethora of individual and community perspectives at play when government security agencies intervene to assist crisis-affected populations caught in chaotic and complex domestic or international emergencies.<sup>10</sup> The requirement to appreciate the range of conflicting and conflicted views on what is needed and how it is to be achieved makes it clear that facilitating inter-agency cooperation is just the first step in achieving integrated security solutions. The more difficult task is for members of security agencies to be able to understand, reconcile and balance the variety of views from different communities with the objectives of the state in order to deliver real security.

### *Diversity in Security*

This initial discussion has examined the common understandings of diversity and security with the presentation of alternate perspectives that challenge certain assumptions and call for broader, more holistic approaches. Shifting from a focus on demographic diversity within organisations and on state

security for defining mission objectives to incorporating identity diversity and human security perspectives serves to introduce significantly more variety, complexity and uncertainty to what are currently seen as rather simplistic uni-dimensional constructs. Diversity is more than mere group representation; security is more than the absence of lawlessness. The intersection of the new ideas presented pertains to the central concept of person-centred, self-defined models. The shift from using externally imposed concepts to recognising that individuals will define for themselves either who they are or what type of social conditions they wish to have around them reveals that, in both cases, the key to effectively achieving security objectives is to create the conditions under which differing individual views, perspectives, frames of reference, etc. are acknowledged, valued, shared and ultimately, integrated. It is fully recognised that such a philosophy may be difficult to put into practice. The following sections will apply relevant theories and models to examine the underlying issues.

## **Professions**

As the first step in considering the deeper issues and complexities of diversity within the security sector, the theories and concepts related to professions will be used as a way to highlight factors and perspectives that are unique to those institutions that serve the public good rather than competing for economic gain. The reference to 'institutions' is used in the sociological sense of a stable social entity that integrates both organisational and professional functions. The organisational components tend to emphasise the formal and differentiating aspects of rules, division of labour, accountabilities, resources allocations, etc. that are used to determine who does which work with which resources and what limitations. The professional components emphasise the informal and shared aspects of norms, values, expectations and beliefs that are used to determine how work objectives are to be achieved through the application of which principles and what worldview(s).

There is an extensive body of literature on professions, with medicine, law and the clergy as the prototypical representatives.<sup>11</sup> First, professions are seen as comprised of an exclusive and identifiable group of people who provide a unique service to society. Most often, this service is focused on addressing a specific societal or common good by resolving complex problems in determining how this societal good is to be achieved. Professionals do so by applying a systematically developed body of knowledge derived from an integration of research, education, training and experience. The breadth and depth of this body of knowledge is related to the complexity of the problem to be resolved and, while most often expressed in terms of procedures and applications, is based on a set of theories that underpin professional practice.



As part of the generalised obligation to serve the common good, professionals have a responsibility to fulfil their function competently and objectively for the benefit of society (not for financial gain). Professional practice is governed by a code of ethics that establishes standards of conduct and most often imposes behavioural norms that are considerably higher than the standards for ordinary citizens. More critically, the primary function of this code is to provide a set of principles or values that all practitioners are expected to rely on for guidance when faced with complex, novel or ambiguous circumstances. Given the importance of applying ethical or moral reasoning in providing the unique service to society, it is expected that the profession's code of ethics should contain values that are widely accepted as legitimate by the society or societies they serve. Increasingly, both the expression of values by the profession and the nature of the endorsement by society are conveyed through symbolic rather than declarative means. That is, they are inferred or implied rather than stated.

These characteristics give rise to five defining attributes of professions (see Abbott, 1988). The first is *Jurisdiction* as a social function or domain of activity over which society and regulatory bodies acknowledge the primacy of the profession and for which the profession seeks the power to regulate and/or control. The second is *Expertise*, particularly the acquisition of specific knowledge, skills and practices that require a lengthy period of education, training and experience to perfect. The third is *Responsibility*, in which the profession (as a whole) and each member of the profession (as an individual practitioner) acknowledge and accept special duties to the society or societies they serve. The fourth is *Identity*, in that the profession holds a unique status and image in society and individuals see their membership in the profession as a key element of their sense of self. The final attribute is a shared *Vocational ethic*. The profession's vocational ethic makes clear the particular set of values, beliefs, expectations and obligations that underpin membership in the profession, ethical reasoning and professional practice. When fully described, the vocational ethic contains two types of values. Outcome values pertain to the prioritisation of what is to be achieved (the ends), while conduct values inform how these outcomes are to be achieved (the means).

As will be developed in subsequent sections, the jurisdiction is central to defining the profession for two reasons. First, it situates the profession in relation to all other agencies and delineates the domain of activity in which others are not authorised to engage or, if they do, to do so with the approval of the dominant profession and, often, within the parameters specified by the profession. The relations between police forces and private security firms (domestically and increasingly in international missions) provide a clear example. Second, the jurisdiction directly defines the three supporting

attributes of expertise, identity and responsibility. Fundamentally, the domain of activity drives the requirement for specific theories, knowledges and skills; for a particular image, including distinguishing ‘badges of office’<sup>12</sup> to ensure that all know who is in the profession and who is not; and for determining which responsibilities to which communities are assumed by members of the profession. While changes in the profession’s jurisdiction can ultimately also lead to changes in the vocational ethic, the generalised assumption is that this is the component that should evolve the most slowly and, if described in terms of broad principles, should remain enduring. The Hippocratic Oath provides a good example of a core tenet of the medical profession that has remained valid over centuries of evolution in the jurisdiction, expertise, identity and responsibilities of that profession.

Viewing the primary security sector institutions of the police and the military using the framework of professions that must function within the boundaries of governmental control and adapt to changes in jurisdiction highlights several key factors that help explain why they have had difficulty incorporating previously marginalised or excluded social sub-groups or adopting pluralistic, postmodern perspectives. The issues of sub-group representation will be addressed by examining issues related to professional self-regulation, while those pertaining to pluralistic perspectives will be considered in the subsequent discussion of the requirement for independent reasoning.

### *Professional Self-Regulation*

Together, the complexity of professional knowledge and the requirement to apply ethical and moral judgement result in professions seeking a significant degree of autonomy (from society and government) in regulating professional practices. This semi-autonomy is to some extent a reflection that the general public and governing bodies accept that non-professionals do not possess the understanding needed to provide specific direction or control over the profession. This does not mean that the citizenry or regulatory agencies cannot or should not provide a degree of oversight or guidance, particularly when the profession is dependent on the public purse. However, to the extent that the profession has the confidence of the public, it is normally afforded considerable latitude in managing its own affairs. As a result, professions engage in self-regulation, particularly regarding enforcing the code of conduct (usually by members of the profession as peers), managing entry to the profession (setting qualifications, certifying professional status and conferring membership), shaping internal culture (particularly the norms, beliefs and assumptions that are broadly shared by members) and generating and endorsing the body of knowledge that underlies professional practice.