



## Publication

**Alvin K. Brown, LL.M., J.D.**

Security Expert Witness for Negligent Security, Premises Liability, Use of Force, Workplace Violence Prevention, Insider Threat, and Executive Protection Matters

[https://www.linkedin.com/posts/akbrownlaw\\_as-an-experienced-security-and-intelligence-activity-7467235898645131264-PnUT?utm\\_source=share&utm\\_medium=member\\_desktop&rcm=ACoAAAbCL8oBV1XRNZLhS2LMb\\_wIyPk9741sc00](https://www.linkedin.com/posts/akbrownlaw_as-an-experienced-security-and-intelligence-activity-7467235898645131264-PnUT?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop&rcm=ACoAAAbCL8oBV1XRNZLhS2LMb_wIyPk9741sc00)

As an experienced security and intelligence advisor and educator with nearly 30 years of experience, I am often asked to recommend the “best” tools, systems, and training programs. Those requests are usually straightforward when the client or student is open-minded and willing to evaluate what actually fits the problem. The process becomes much more difficult when someone has already decided on a particular tool or system without rigorous analysis and expects the advisor or trainer to validate a poor fit. In the field of physical security, self-protection, and combatives, that kind of premature commitment can waste time, money, and training energy while leaving real vulnerabilities unresolved.

Too often, decision-makers are sold on slick marketing, impressive branding, or a one-size-fits-all package that claims to solve every organizational problem. That approach is attractive because it is simple, fast, and reassuring. But security problems are rarely simple, and effective self-protection or combative training must be matched to the environment, legal constraints, mission, population, and operational realities of the people who will use it. A program that works for one group may be completely unsuitable for another.

Be cautious of any program that claims to work for everyone, minimizes the importance of context, or treats complex security problems as if they can be solved by a single branded package. Other warning signs include excessive emphasis on style over function, unrealistic techniques that require extensive mastery before they are useful, the absence of legal or policy discussion, poor safety standards, and little or no adaptation to the trainees’ actual mission. If the program cannot explain why its methods are appropriate for your specific environment, it is probably not the right solution.

We must resist the temptation to take the easy road when selecting tools, systems, and training programs for security and self-protection. Effective decision-making requires critical thinking, honest analysis, and the discipline to match a program to the real problem rather than to a marketing narrative. The goal is not to buy the most popular package or adopt the most fashionable system. The goal is to build capability that is appropriate, defensible, and effective

1001 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue West, Suite 375, Bradenton, FL 34205  
Tel: (941) 953-2825 ~ [alvin@sotersolutionsllc.com](mailto:alvin@sotersolutionsllc.com)  
[www.sotersolutionsllc.com](http://www.sotersolutionsllc.com)



for the people and organization it is meant to serve. When we return critical thinking to the process, we improve not only training outcomes, but safety, confidence, and long-term resilience.