

and more dynamic context. More recent literature in the field is suggesting that emergency management is no longer confined to preparing for, responding to, or recovery from specific disasters. Increasingly, emergency management is seen as an integral part of a more comprehensive community decision-making process. It is increasingly connected to issues such as environmental stewardship, community planning, and sustainable development (Britton, 1999). More analysis is being devoted to emergency management as a component in broader community planning and development activities (Beatley, 1995; Mileti, 1999). The linkage of hazard mitigation, a new emphasis in the field, to the broader task of developing sustainable communities potentially places emergency management at the very heart of community planning (Schneider, 2002). There is a growing consensus that the limited, task oriented, technical, and disaster specific orientation of the old emergency management must be replaced with a broader more strategic framework for the profession.

Without a new framework and a new strategic approach that connects emergency management to the broader issues and community concerns noted above, it will remain in a position of low salience, low stakeholder support, scarce resources, institutional instability, and limited or constrained effectiveness. This new framework for emergency management will require that its operational and technical capacities be linked to the policy setting and stakeholder support bases of the communities it serves. Emergency management organizations must come to see themselves as a part of the dynamic political and social settings in which they work and as having dynamic qualities of their own that enable them to change, adapt, see challenges, identify opportunities, and create long term roles for themselves in the process of community planning and development.

Anchoring emergency management to any strategic or proactive principle is a challenge. It runs contrary to the experience of most emergency managers and certainly contrary to the old emergency management. Even today, most emergency managers are most comfortable with a narrowly defined conception of planning for a particular set of reactive, anticipatory, and planned responses to specific hazards, threats, or emergencies. Emergency management organizations have never been inclined to expand their operational role or their strategic position. This has resulted in a lack of strategic adaptation and lost operating efficiency and the retarding of mission enhancement. In other words, the long term institutional capacity building of emergency management has been constrained and with it the ability to participate in the range of community planning activities for which its professional input is both legitimate and necessary. If emergency management is, as more recent literature suggests, an integral part of broader issues and concerns affecting community life, then it must redefine itself.

THE NEW EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

It is an increasingly common premise that the aim of managerial work in the public sector is to create public value (Moore, 1995). This is to suggest that public managers, including emergency managers, utilize scarce public resources that have value in alternative uses. The challenge is to maximize the value attained through these resources. Managerial success may thus be interpreted as proactively initiating and reshaping public enterprises in ways that increase their value to the publics they are intended to serve (Moore, 1995). One need not delve too deeply into the discussion of public value to see that, in the linkage of emergency management to the broader task of