



**STRATEGY
RESEARCH
PROJECT**

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

**THE U.S. ARMY'S ROLE IN HOMELAND SECURITY:
WHAT CHANGES ARE NEEDED?**

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL RICHARD C. TOWNES
United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2002

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050



20020502 038

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**THE U.S. ARMY'S ROLE IN HOMELAND SECURITY:
What Changes are Needed?**

by

Lieutenant Colonel Richard C. Townes
U.S. Army

Colonel Michael Colpo
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. Government, the Department of Defense, or any of its agencies.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Richard C. Townes
TITLE: The U.S. Army's Role in Homeland Security: What Changes are Needed?
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 09 April 2002 PAGES: 31 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The terrorist attack on 11 September, 2001 was the turning point in how America approaches the issue of homeland defense. Prior to this date, homeland defense was considered to be just one of the many issues facing our nation in the 21st Century. Prior leadership had recognized some of the dangers our nation might face in the hands of terrorist or rogue nations, but had addressed them with only limited resources. It was just one of the many priorities competing for resources. This attack however, has forcibly placed homeland defense as the top issue facing our nation today. Our nation is just beginning to fully understand the threats facing our national security. It is truly a remarkable time in which we live.

Our national leadership is waging a war against a threat that takes advantage of the freedoms offered through democracy. These threats place a growing burden of security and response upon governmental agencies. Our government is working diligently to address these issues, but the enormity of effort involved is daunting. In response, the President has established the Office of Presidential Advisor for Homeland Security to manage and coordinate the efforts of states, the military, the federal government and the nation's interagency to address the multitude of security issues facing our nation today and in the future.

The Department of Defense (DoD) is a supporting effort in this process. It is currently in a continuous review of the possible threats and requirements needed to support our nation's civil authorities in terms of homeland security, defense and civil support. This paper will review the greatest threats posed by rogue states and terrorist organizations in the form of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). It will then review how DoD, and the Army supports homeland security, defense and civil support. Finally, the paper will address possible options for consideration that might better support the Army's mission of homeland defense and civil support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
PREFACE.....	vii
THREATS.....	2
THE DOD'S ROLE IN HOMELAND SECURITY.....	5
THE ARMY'S ROLE.....	8
WHAT ARE THE OPTIONS?	10
CONCLUSION.....	14
ENDNOTES.....	15
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	19

PREFACE

I would like to thank my faculty advisor for his tremendous support and influence in helping me sort through this project. His guidance, mentorship and example provided me the necessary impetus in which to meet my projected timelines and to focus on the work at hand. I would also like to thank my family for their support. They sacrificed their time and patience during the research, study and writing of this document. Their constant support and love made this effort possible.

THE U.S. ARMY'S ROLE IN HOMELAND SECURITY

The military is an organization that must maintain the capabilities necessary to deter, defend against, and defeat any adversary.

—General Henry H. Shelton (Joint Vision 2020)

Since the terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001, the DoD has found itself focused on the destruction of the Al-Qaeda and Taliban organizations in Afghanistan while supporting the defense requirements of our homeland. DoD has done a marvelous job at bridging security gaps found within our country's civil-military organizations in dealing with the issues of homeland defense and civil support. DoD and other governmental agencies have been diligently working to identify threats and weaknesses, and manage resources in their efforts to mitigate the risks at hand. Although currently in draft within DoD, the definitions listed below serve to clarify references found within this paper:

Homeland Security: The preparation for, prevention of, deterrence of, preemption of, defense against, and response to threats and aggression directed towards US territory, sovereignty, domestic population, and infrastructure; as well as crisis management, consequence management, and other domestic civil support.

Homeland Defense: The protection of US territory, sovereignty, domestic population, and critical infrastructure against external threats and aggression.

Civil Support: DoD support to US civil authorities for domestic emergencies, and designated law enforcement and other activities.¹

The issue of homeland defense is not a new one to our country. Our nation has previously identified threats to our national security and has made significant inroads towards improving planning and readiness over the past decade. However, based on the global threats of today, these efforts fell short of what was needed to prevent the terrorist attacks on 11 September. In other words, an attacker who maintains the element of surprise possesses the initiative and is difficult to beat. Detailed analysis and intelligence focused towards potential threats and their targets provides the only means of defeating a threat. What are major threats and how could they present themselves? These are questions addressed only through analysis and intelligence collection. This is where we must start in order to clearly identify the U.S. Army's role.

THREATS

We have all the time in the world.

—James Bond (On Her Majesty's Secret Service)

Unfortunately the words of Ian Fleming's James Bond ring hallow to the public realization of the threats facing our country today. The United States is perhaps the strongest military power in the world, and does not anticipate facing a peer competitor in the near future.² However, the enemies of the United States recognize this fact. They understand through historical and present day examples, such as the Gulf War and Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan, that conventional warfare against the United States cannot, at least in the near term, be won. The military actions being taken against Al-Qaeda and Taliban organizations today should cause great reflection with any individual or nation tempted to further their political, religious or personal agenda at the cost of freedom. The threats faced by the United States will likely come in the form of terrorism supported by rogue nations or failed states. The Hart-Rudman Commission's report entitled Road Map for National Security: Imperative for Change, noted that mass-casualty terrorism directed against the U.S. homeland is a serious and growing concern for the United States.³ In February 2001, the Commission wrote that,

The combination of unconventional weapons proliferation with the persistence of international terrorism will end the relative invulnerability of the U.S. homeland to catastrophic attack. A direct attack against American citizens on American soil is likely over the next quarter century. The risk is not only death and destruction but also a demoralization that could undermine U.S. global leadership.⁴

The Commission's report was a rather accurate prediction of the events on 11 September 2001. Our nation has numerous enemies that could and would use any means available to strike at our society. The threats against the United States in the 21st Century range from truck bombs, explosives on aircraft, terrorist attacks using weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and threats to critical national infrastructure, including cyber war against crucial computer systems.⁵ The idea that people or countries could use these devastating weapons to blackmail or shape our political, economic, military or diplomatic policies is one of great concern to our country. Today, we could easily consider ourselves in a state of undeclared World War.⁶

The United States is vulnerable to external or internal attacks. Our nation's enemies have noticed the relative vulnerability of the U.S. homeland. They are placing greater emphasis on the development of capabilities to threaten the United States directly in order to counter U.S. operational advantages.⁷ Terrorists such as Osama bin Laden and his Al-Qaeda organization

are one of many terrorist groups that exist in our world today. As recently as 5 October 2001 the State Department had identified 28 such organizations that exist external to the United States.⁸ Other threats include rogue nations, such as North Korea, Iraq and Iran, that are known supporters of terrorism to further their political, military, diplomatic or economic agendas. They are also known to either possess or seek WMD. President Clinton recognized the threats facing our country when, in May 1998, he signed Presidential Decision Directives 62 and 63. The goals of these directives created a national strategy for protecting our country's critical infrastructures from a spectrum of threats and assuring their continued operation aimed at combating terrorism.⁹

The worst form of terrorism facing the United States and her allies today exists in the form of WMD. An attack using chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear weapons would cause tremendous death and/or destruction if used on large populated areas such as New York City or Washington D.C. The use of such weapons upon the homeland of the United States would make an extremely strong statement and quickly grab the attention of the world. The military, diplomatic, economic and political effects of such an attack could impact millions of people. This type of devastation has not been seen since the end of World War II with the attacks upon the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. These are weapons that strike fear in the hearts of civilized man. They are frightful weapons of choice by countries or individuals whose goal is to project power and influence through other asymmetric means. Our nation's enemies would like to place themselves in a position of power over the United States in order to achieve their objectives.

Chemical and biological weapons have a long history of use in warfare. Section II, Chapter 1, Article 23 of the Geneva Convention of September 1900 specifically prohibits the use of such weapons in times of war.¹⁰ However, despite these agreements and many others far more recent, the use of such weapons continues today. New York Times reporter Elizabeth Olson noted this problem when she wrote that, "The threat of disease as a weapon of war and terror, the threat of biological weapons, is not speculative, it is a threat that is a 'clear and present danger, and should be condemned in the strongest possible terms."¹¹ The global proliferation of such weapons is a threat to civilization and demands international support in its control.

The vulnerability of our nation to such weapons has been identified in Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) – 7. This document noted that, "The United States is vulnerable to a release of biological agents by rogue nations or terrorists, which could result in the spread of infectious diseases."¹² This council determined

that the national and international disease detection, prevention, and response to chemical or biological attacks are inadequate to protect the health of U.S. citizens.¹³ We are not prepared to cope with such an attack.

The United States is a most recent victim of biological terrorism. Postal letters laced with the anthrax virus have caused sickness and death in cities throughout our country. These weapons created fear and concern for the health of postal service employee's and interrupted mail service throughout the country. Our national postal system is but one means of delivery for chemical or biological weapons. An attack could come not necessarily in the form of a missile, but more likely a container laced with biological or chemical agents poured in to a local water supply. A terrorist bent on killing Americans, or a rogue nation seeking asymmetric advantages in a pre-emptive strike, has available a plethora of chemical or biological agents and materials that are effective in drinking water.¹⁴ The delivery of such weapons is relatively simple.

The best means to battle such threats involves the active deterrence of countries within the international community. Recently in Geneva, the United States "urged each country to enact legislation that makes using biological weapons a crime, and to ease extradition processes."¹⁵ The United States along with 144 other countries signed a global pact banning biological weapons. The United States is working to "empower the United Nation's Secretary General to order inspection of sites when treaty violations are suspected."¹⁶ Deterrence is clearly the responsibility of the international community taking the necessary steps to prevent or limit the development of such weapons.

The United States in the past has been working to limit the proliferation of nuclear technology and materials, while rogue states and terrorists have been working to acquire them.¹⁷ A nuclear attack upon the United States is a scenario of nightmarish proportions. Recently, the terrorist Osama bin Laden declared, "If America used nuclear or chemical weapons against us, then we may retort with chemical and nuclear weapons."¹⁸ This threat of use of WMD clearly supports the National Security Council's concern of nuclear proliferation in the world today. These concerns were amplified in a USA Today article that noted that, "There are concerns of many U.S. officials and proliferation experts about the possibility that terrorists could steal or purchase on the black market enough nuclear fuel or radioactive material to build a rudimentary atomic weapon or, more likely, a dirty bomb."¹⁹

The threat of attack by terrorists, or rogue states is a very real one. From 1993 through 2000, the U.N. agency, which monitors nuclear security, confirmed 153 cases of theft of nuclear materials.²⁰ With this threat in mind, the Hart-Rudman Commission concluded, that the United

States will become increasingly vulnerable to hostile attack on the American homeland, and that the U.S. military superiority will not entirely protect us.²¹ We should anticipate potential adversaries to adapt as our capabilities evolve. An adversary may pursue an asymmetric advantage on the tactical, operational, or strategic level by identifying key vulnerabilities and devising asymmetric concepts and capabilities to strike or exploit them.²²

The threat of attack from a rogue nation or terrorist organization is one in which our country should take very seriously. 11 September 2001 has illuminated this problem and has generated much action and focus. The efforts taken by our government and the international community must deter, preempt and if need be respond to the threat before an attack becomes all too real. How does the DoD support homeland security?

THE DOD'S ROLE IN HOMELAND SECURITY

The purpose of the U.S. Armed Forces is to protect and advance U.S. national interests and, if deterrence fails, to decisively defeat threats to those interests.

—Donald H. Rumsfeld (Quadrennial Defense Review Report)

DoD supports homeland security working in a joint and combined capacity with the various interagency within our government. Any effort taken in preparation or response to threats to our nation's security is made under the direction of the President or Secretary of Defense. DoD's actions in Afghanistan provide the most recent example of how it supports the NCA's objectives in accomplishing the mission of homeland security. Under the Unified Command Plan (UCP) the Commander, United States Central Command (USCENTCOM) received the necessary authority, resources, and guidance to project combat power to the Afghanistan theater of operations to accomplish his assigned mission. These actions support homeland security through the destruction of the Al-Qaeda terrorist organization responsible for the 11 September attacks on the United States. The after effects of this operation provide a deterrent effect for future terrorist actions based upon the United States aggressive use of its elements of national power.

DoD works in a similar fashion in support of homeland defense. The September 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review Report noted that:

The highest priority of the U.S. military is to defend the nation from all enemies. The United States will maintain sufficient military forces to protect the U.S. domestic population, its territory, and its critical defense-related infrastructure against attacks emanating from outside U.S. borders, as appropriate under U.S. law.²³

DoD serves as one of the lead components in the fight to adequately defend our homeland. The military is currently working to cover the identified gaps that cannot be addressed by President Bush's directive under the Military Order of November 13, 2001 that stated:

The ability of the United States to protect the United States and its citizens, and to help its allies and other cooperating nations protect their nations and their citizens, from such further terrorist attacks depends in significant part upon using the United States Armed Forces to identify terrorists and those who support them, to disrupt their activities, and to eliminate their ability to conduct or support such attacks.²⁴

In order to support this requirement, the Secretary of Defense was appointed as a member of the Homeland Security Council assigned to work with the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security. The Secretary of Defense in turn appointed the Secretary of the Army as the DoD executive agent for Homeland Defense. His responsibilities are to coordinate the department's efforts with the White House's Office of Homeland Security.²⁵ This action provided focused leadership and coordinated command structure within DoD's civilian leadership necessary to synchronize and meet the homeland defense needs of our country.

Within DoD, under the UCP, the Commander, Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM) oversees all planning, organization and execution of military responsibilities towards homeland defense and military assistance to civilian authorities (MACA).²⁶ USJFCOM provides the needed command and control headquarters within the UCP to support homeland defense and civil support. The goal of USJFCOM is to coordinate all national security elements to ensure the best possible predictive capability and proactive response needed to protect our country.²⁷ USJFCOM has the authority to task units within the military to support ground, air and naval requirements as needed.²⁸ Specifically, USJFCOM is responsible for defense against land and maritime aggression targeted at our territory, sovereignty, domestic population, and infrastructure, as well as directly supporting the lead federal agency in the management of the consequences of such aggression and other domestic civil support.²⁹

DoD, during times of national emergency, provides support for homeland defense through National Land and Sea Defense, National Aerospace Defense, and Critical Infrastructure Protection, and National Missile Defense.³⁰ National Land and Sea Defense, Aerospace Defense and Critical Infrastructure Protection involve the use of military resources (active, reserve and national guard) to protect our nation from invasion or attack. These actions can take the form of broader security, maritime interdiction, quick reaction forces, combat air patrols, or even airport security. The President, after the attacks on 11 September, directed a state of national emergency and pursuant to the National Emergencies Act, implemented elements of

Title 10 and 14 of the U.S. Code.³¹ Since that fateful day, DoD has been operating continuously to meet the demands of homeland defense.

National Missile Defense, although extremely limited and still largely conceptual, would provide DoD the means to defend the continental United States against a limited threat of strategic ballistic missile attack from rogue nations.³² President Bush's decision to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM) of 1972 with the Soviets has provided DoD the necessary impetus to proceed with the development and limited fielding of an anti-ballistic missile system. This joint effort would include ground-based interceptors, early warning radar, satellite based systems, and essential command and control systems necessary to manage the defense.³³ Congressional funding for this project, although still undecided, is needed to provide the necessary resources to support DoD's efforts to achieve a limited means of ABM defense.

DoD provides resources in support for Civil Authorities under the Federal Response Plan (FRP) in accordance with laws such as the Stafford Act, or the Insurrection Act. When the FRP is implemented, the resources of 27 federal departments and agencies, to include DoD, are made available to augment local and state resources in times of emergency.³⁴ DoD maintains itself as a supporting agency and works on a last in first out basis. Fighting and winning our nation's wars continues to be the primary mission of DoD and takes priority over MACA missions.³⁵ This includes military support to civil authorities (MSCA), and military assistance for civil disturbances (MACDIS). MSCA focuses DoD activities towards assisting and supporting civil governmental agencies in planning or preparing for, or responding to the consequences of civil emergencies or attacks.³⁶ DoD supports MACDIS through activities and measures needed to assist federal, state and local governments to prepare for or respond to civil disturbances including terrorist incidents.³⁷ DoD's support of MACA provides for the flexible use of resources in support of the immediate needs of the local, state and federal government during times of emergency, regardless of the situation. The FRP provides the federal government with a means to provide DoD resources to support the needs of consequence management.³⁸

Additionally, the Commander in Chief (CINC) USJFCOM has established Joint Task Force – Civil Support (JTF-CS) whose mission is to:

Conduct consequence management operations in support of the designated LFA in response to a chemical-biological-radiological-nuclear and high yield explosives (CBRNE) incident or accident in CONUS, Alaska, Hawaii and U.S. Territories and Possessions. The JTF-CS will establish command and control of designated DoD forces and provide military assistance to civil authorities to save lives, prevent injury, and provide temporary critical life support.³⁹

JTF-CS provides the command and control means for DoD to support the consequence management needs of the United States under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's lead.

Within DoD, what is the Army's role in homeland security? How does the system work? Are the resources adequate? What needs to change? These are the questions worthy of review.

THE ARMY'S ROLE

The Army serves the Nation. We defend America's Constitution and our way of life. We protect America's security and our Nation's interests. We answer the Nation's call to serve whenever and wherever required. We must prepare for decisive action in all operations. But above all, we are ready to fight and win the Nation's wars—our nonnegotiable contract with the American people.

—FM 1: The Army

The Army's ability to achieve this fundamental purpose lies at the very heart of how it supports our nation's homeland security needs. The Army provides DoD with a broad range of capabilities and resources needed for support, deterrence or combat. Even the most hostile state sponsors of terrorism, or the terrorist, will think twice about harming Americans and American allies and interests if they fear direct and severe U.S. attack after-or-before the fact.⁴⁰ If deterrence fails, the Army provides a flexible array of resources needed to accomplish the mission at hand. In a recent example, the 10th Special Forces participated in a combined and joint operation in Bosnia designed to gather intelligence on terrorist organizations operating in that country. The Army served as a component of a combined joint special operations task force operating with regular Army units needed to accomplish the mission. The success of this mission netted a vast array of intelligence and several prisoners of the Al-Qaeda terrorist network.⁴¹ The Army often works in a joint environment to accomplish the homeland security needs of our nation.

The Army supports homeland defense by providing highly trained personnel and equipment needed to meet the demands of national land and sea defense, critical infrastructure protection and missile defense. Active Army units support these needs on a mission by mission basis. Usually, the Army National Guard and reserve will provide the bulk of the resources needed to meet the daily security needs of our government. State governors can employ the Army National Guard to support the states security needs under Title 32 of the U.S. Code.⁴² Since 11 September, the Guard has been in action supporting these security needs in air and sea ports as well as other directed critical events and infrastructure. The Army's ability to respond to

these needs provides both state and national leadership flexibility to support the multitude of critical sites within our country during times of emergency.

Historically, the Army is the primary resource provider to DoD for missile defense. The Army's success with missile defense during the Gulf War provides a fairly recent example of counter missile capability. With the onslaught of proliferation of missile technology and the threat of WMD, the President has decided to withdraw our country from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972 with the former Soviet Union.⁴³ The President's decision provides for a defensive missile shield against rogue countries or terrorist possessing the technology to attack the United States using missile technology. Currently, the Army is providing air defense resources to support limited short-range missile protection around critical infrastructure. The development and fielding of a national system will require tremendous resources to fund, man and support a successful national missile defense system.

The Army has also been the primary resource provider to DoD for civil support to include MACA, MSCA, and MACDIS. There are numerous historical examples of the Army providing support for counter drug operations, riot control, or disaster relief in times of emergency. The Secretary of the Army is the key person involved in commitment of Army resources to support these missions. He is the DoD Executive Agent for providing DoD resources to civil authorities. As the Executive Agent, the Secretary of the Army oversees planning guidance and tasks DoD components to plan for and commit DoD resources in response to requests from civil authorities.⁴⁴ He can approve most requests for DoD support. However, in cases of terrorism, potential lethality or civil disturbance, the Secretary of Defense must approve requests for use of lethal force by military personnel in support of law enforcement.⁴⁵

The Army National Guard (ANG) and Reserve is a primary resource provider for civil support missions. A significant mission of the ANG is supporting state and territorial governors by carrying out a full spectrum of tasks authorized in state law.⁴⁶ This point was echoed by the Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld when he stated that, "protecting the American homeland from attack is the foremost responsibility of the U.S. Armed Forces and a primary mission for the Reserve Components."⁴⁷ In other words, the peacetime guard remains an asset used to support local and state authorities in times of need. However, state missions do not determine the force structure and size of the ANG. The ANG is primarily organized to provide the necessary combat units needed to meet the projected combat force requirements of our Army during times of war. With this dichotomy of mission versus structure, the Guard may not be the correct size or configuration to perform its most common state missions...emergency and

disaster relief.⁴⁸ The ANG is composed of eight combat divisions and seventeen separate brigades and regiments spread throughout the fifty states.⁴⁹ Despite this fact, the ANG has been extremely successful in providing the manpower resources to support MACA and homeland defense requirements throughout the country. Recently, the Congressional Budgeting Office noted in Structuring the Active and Reserve Army for the 21st Century that:

Although the force levels in individual states may on occasion be inadequate to deal with particularly demanding domestic crisis (without additional assistance from other states or the federal government), the forces of the Army National Guard as a whole are more than sufficient to fulfill their state missions.⁵⁰

Focus and resources are the Army's fundamental challenge in meeting the needs of homeland defense and civil support. The continuous demands on the Army for supporting training, real world contingencies, transformation and homeland defense requirements have placed a tremendous burden on its people and resources. What are our options?

WHAT ARE THE OPTIONS?

DoD, specifically the Army, must greatly increase and refine its role in supporting homeland defense and civil support, while not sacrificing its ability to support national security. The Hart-Rudman Commission noted this when they wrote that, "The DoD, which has placed its highest priority on preparing for major theater war, should pay far more attention to the homeland security mission."⁵¹ There are several options for consideration that could enhance the Army's ability to better support homeland defense and civil support. These options require that DoD first refine the Army's mission, identify the needed resources to support that mission, seek to resource those needs, then identify the tasks required for training in order to support those requirements. This is a prudent analysis based upon the established threat, and supports the Hart-Rudman Commission's findings that the probability of two major coincident wars is a remote possibility and unlikely in the future.⁵² The Commission also concluded that:

The United States requires a new triad of prevention, protection, and response. Failure to prevent mass-casualty attacks against the American homeland will jeopardize not only American lives but U.S. foreign policy. It would undermine support for U.S. international leadership and for many of our personal freedoms, as well. Indeed, the abrupt undermining of U.S. power and prestige is the worst thing that could happen to the structure of global peace in the next quarter century, and nothing is more likely to produce it than devastating attacks on American soil.⁵³

The after effects of 11 September, as well as the Hart-Rudman Commissions findings and recommendations provide motivation for change.

First, DoD must seek to refine its command and control structure for both the military and its civilian leadership. The Secretary of the Army is currently working in a multi-hatted position as both the executive director for homeland defense within DoD, the executive director for civil support, as well as, the normal duties required as the Secretary of the Army. Although effective, the creation of a dedicated office within DoD focused towards homeland defense and civil support would have some significant advantages over the current organization. First, a dedicated undersecretary or assistant secretary of defense for homeland defense would provide for focused leadership over the long-term between peace and war. This new office would require amendment to the Goldwater-Nichols Reorganization Act of 1986, by making the new secretary responsible for supporting homeland defense, MACA, and other civil support requirements affecting the United States.⁵⁴ Each Secretary of a military department would no longer retain authority to use their component service to support these requirements.⁵⁵ It would also help to eliminate any concern of service branch favoritism and satisfy critics who feel that DoD should pay far more attention to the mission of homeland defense.⁵⁶ While the creation of an additional level of bureaucracy is never desired, this option provides dedicated leadership focused solely on this issue. Finally, this option supports the Hart-Rudman Commission's recommendation for the creation of an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Security within the office of the Secretary of Defense, reporting directly to the Secretary.⁵⁷

This recommendation also provides for the creation of an additional command under the UCP responsible for homeland defense and civil support within the continental United States. While not solely an Army issue, the Army would continue to play a role in the manning, leadership and coordination required within this joint headquarters. Currently, homeland defense is one of many requirements supported by the CINCUSJFCOM. Dedicated leadership within this command is responsible for supporting the needed planning and coordination requirements of homeland defense and civil support. However, there is a need for the creation of a dedicated headquarters responsible for the continuous planning and coordination for homeland defense issues within the United States. A dedicated CINC and staff focused on the coordination, planning and response of DoD resources would demonstrate commitment politically and militarily for the defense of our homeland. While the creation of an additional command would also create another layer of bureaucracy, it provides for focused military leadership at the highest levels within DoD dedicated to addressing threats and meeting the country's security needs. Anything less would demonstrate a lack of commitment. The potentially catastrophic nature of homeland attacks necessitates our being prepared to use the

extensive resources of DoD.⁵⁸ With this in mind, creation of an additional CINC under the UCP could, in the long run, be a worthwhile commitment.

Second, the Army needs to review its current force structure to identify requirements and options that would better support the needs of homeland defense and civil support. Options, conceivably focused on changing the ANG's organization to better meet these needs. There are several courses of action that deserve consideration. The first course of action - minimal growth - would maintain the Guards current organization and mission, while adding additional resources and force structure necessary to meet the anticipated requirements for homeland defense and civil support. This course of action maintains the guard's combat focus for wartime mission requirements under U.S. Code Title 10, while providing the additional resources in terms of manpower, training and equipment to better support the needs of homeland defense and civil support under U.S. Code Title 32.⁵⁹ The Army National Guard's current combat heavy organization would provide the necessary manpower, leadership and resources needed to support an acceptable level of national land and sea defense and critical infrastructure protection.⁶⁰ Additional force structure would be added to support the development of specialty teams that would provide support for civil authorities in terms of MACA, WMD response, counter drug, military support to civil authorities (MSCA) and military assistance to civil disturbances (MACDIS). This option provides additional resources to help mitigate risks during times of need, but hedges on DoD's use of National Guard resources during times of war. In this course of action, the risk and likelihood of full reserve component mobilization to support our nations wartime needs would be minimal. The advantages to this course of action would be lower monetary costs due to limited force structure changes, maintenance of the guards current federal mission, plus low anticipated risk. It asks the guard to do more by increasing their resources to meet the added requirements.

The next course of action –dedicated force – would change the ANG's mission and organization to support only the needs of homeland defense and civil support. This high end course of action would require an increase to the size of the Army's active component force structure needed to meet the needs of peacetime requirements and wartime contingencies. This option is also supported by the Hart-Rudman Commission in that, they urge, in particular, that the National Guard be given homeland security as a primary mission, as the U.S. Constitution itself ordains. The National Guard should be reorganized, trained, and equipped to undertake that mission.⁶¹ The Hart-Rudman commission recommended that the Secretary of Defense, at the President's direction, should make homeland security a primary mission of the National Guard, and the Guard should be organized, properly trained, and adequately equipped

to undertake that mission.⁶² This is the worst-case support option designed for the extreme. It focuses resources to support homeland defense and civil support while limiting risk for wartime contingencies by adding active component force structure. This option meets requirements, dedicates resources and supports homeland defense and civil support needs. However, it is exceptionally costly, limits strategic flexibility and provides for tremendous military growth. The risks found in this option could be defined in terms of meeting the force structure requirements necessary to support active component combat forces during times of war. Yet, the actual loss of combat force structure would need careful analysis based upon anticipated threats.

Another course of action - middle of the road - would change the ANG's current organization to enhance support for civil authorities and homeland defense requirements, while providing only sufficient wartime resources to support one theater of war contingency requirement. ANG force structure would be modified to support anticipated homeland defense wartime needs. This option focuses mission requirements and resources while accepting greater risk for multiple contiguous theater war (MTW) contingencies. The addition of combat, combat support (CS) or combat service support (CSS) units dedicated to supporting homeland defense could increase national flexibility to respond or preempt a WMD attack upon the United States. Based upon the findings and recommendations of the Hart-Rudman Commission and the Heritage Foundation Homeland Security Task Force, this option makes a good deal of sense.⁶³

Third, to support projected NMD requirements, the Army will need significant growth in ABM resources and personnel. The President has decided to pursue a NMD strategy that protects the United States from missile attack by rogue nations or terrorist. Based upon the Army's current capabilities, the growth of its air defense resources would be the best course of action needed to meet this requirement. The addition of force structure is the only means for the Army to meet the mission of ABM defense while supporting its current requirements. The creation of additional air defense or future ABM units would provide the support necessary to resource long, mid and near range missile defense requirements that address the threat to our homeland. Also, NMD defense capabilities could go beyond just supporting homeland defense requirements. Ivan Eland, the director of defense policy studies at the CATO Institute noted that, "If the United States – protected by a missile defense-moved against a regional adversary possessing WMD and long range delivery systems, the adversary having a lower probability of successfully attacking the United States, might instead threaten a missile strike against a U.S. ally."⁶⁴ This point brings forth continued relevance of the Army's ability to project missile defense systems needed to provide protection to ally nations during times of hostilities. The Army is a proven success story in its ABM defense during the Gulf War. DoD's planning to

provide for an adequate NMD defense will no doubt place demands upon the Army's force structure to meet those needs. A growth in capability and force structure is needed to meet these projected needs.

CONCLUSION

The actions being taken by our government and DoD on homeland defense and civil support are rapidly evolving over relatively very short periods of time. The recommendations found in this document could easily have been superseded or agreed upon by the time of its publication. The terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001, have succeeded in solidifying DoD leadership, specifically USJFCOM, on the coordination and development of a national and strategic plan dedicated towards meeting the requirements of homeland defense. This plan will involve DoD and all governmental agencies at the federal, state and local levels. It will prove to be a horrendous effort involving vast quantities of time and resources. It will need a great deal of dedication and focus to insure success. In many cases, it will require growth in the current force structure of our military.

The world is an exceptionally dangerous place to live. Our Army's readiness to meet the security needs of our country is imperative. Identification of requirements and resources will prove to be an exceptionally difficult task. The Army will continue to operate as part of the total joint force necessary to support the security needs of our country. There is a growing momentum towards achieving a higher state of sustainable security within our country. This security will demand the efforts of the total force. The Army cannot do it alone. The resources, plans and procedures needed to mitigate and properly respond to threats will continue to be of great debate. However, it is clear that dedicated leadership focused upon the issue of homeland defense and civil support is needed to insure the greatest readiness possible. The threat of attack by a rogue nation or terrorist with WMD is all too great. The United States must take action to meet and defeat this threat head on. Anything less would be disastrous.

Word Count = 7285

ENDNOTES

¹ General William F. Kernan, "Perspectives on 21st Century Challenges....," briefing slides with scripted commentary, Carlisle Barracks, U.S. Army War College, 28 November, 2001.

² Donald H. Rumsfeld, Quadrennial Defense Review Report (Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, September 2001), 4.

³ U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century, Road Map for National Security: Imperative for Change, 15 February 2001; available from <<http://www.nssg.gov/>>; Internet; accessed 6 December 2001, vi.

⁴ *Ibid.*, viii.

⁵ Michael E. O'Hanlon, Defense Policy Choices for the Bush Administration 2001-05 (Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 2001), 117.

⁶ Elito A. Cohen, "World War IV," The Wall Street Journal, 20 November 2001, 1.

⁷ Donald H. Rumsfeld, Quadrennial Defense Review Report (Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, September 2001), 14.

⁸ State Department, "Fact Sheet: Secretary of State Designates Foreign Terrorist Organizations," 5 October 2001; available from <<http://www.fas.org/irp/news/2001/10/fr100501.html>>; Internet; accessed 26 November 2001.

⁹ The Terrorism Research Center, "Homeland Threats and Domestic Preparedness," November 2001; available from <<http://www.terrorism.com/homeland/homeland.shtml>>; Internet; accessed 21 November 2001.

¹⁰ University of Minnesota, "Convention (II) with Respect to the Laws and Customs of War on Land and its annex: Regulation concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land, 26 Martens Nouveau Recueil (ser. 2) 949, 187 Consol. T.S. 429, entered into force Sept. 4, 1900," 4 September 1900; available from <<http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/instree/1899b.htm>>; Internet; accessed 9 December 2001.

¹¹ Elizabeth Olson, "U.S. Calls For Global Action To Counter Germ Weapons," 20 November 2001; available from <<http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov2001/e20011120calls.htm>>; Internet; accessed 20 November 2001.

¹² Presidential Decision Directive, "Fact Sheet Addressing the Threat of Emerging Infectious Diseases," 12 June 1996; available from <<http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/direct.htm>>; Internet; accessed 15 November 2001.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Donald C. Hickman, "A Chemical and Biological Warfare Threat," Counterproliferation Papers (Maxwell Air Force Base: Air War College, September 1999), 25.

¹⁵ Elizabeth Olson, "U.S. Calls For Global Action To Counter Germ Weapons," 20 November 2001; available from <<http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov2001/e20011120calls.htm>>; Internet; accessed 20 November 2001.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Bill Nichols and Peter Eisler, "The Threat of Nuclear Terror Is Slim But Real," USA Today, 29 November 2001, 1.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century, Road Map for National Security: Imperative for Change, 15 February 2001; available from <<http://www.assq.gov/>>; Internet; accessed 6 December 2001, 2.

²² Henry H. Shelton, Joint Vision 2020 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, June 2000), 5.

²³ Ibid., 18.

²⁴ George W. Bush, Jr., "Military Order of 11/13/01," 13 November 2001; available from <<http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/eo/index.html>>; Internet; accessed 20 November 2001.

²⁵ U.S. Joint Forces Command, "United States Joint Forces Command," 19 November 2001; available from <http://www.acom.mil/NewsLink/Story_Archive/pa102501.html>; Internet; accessed 19 November 2001.

²⁶ Ibid., 3.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Major General William Ward, "Joint Military Operations," briefing slides with script commentary, Carlisle Barracks, U.S. War College, 15 January, 2002.

³¹ George Bush, "Declaration of National Emergency by Reason of Certain Terrorist Attacks" 14 September 2001; available from <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010914-4.html>>; Internet; accessed 5 February 2002.

³² Federation of American Scientist, National Missile Defense, 27 June 2000; <<http://fas.org/spp/starwars/program/nmd/>>; Internet; accessed 29 January 2002, 1.

³³ Ibid.,2.

³⁴ United States Army Forces Command, Domestic Emergency Handbook (Draft), (Ft McPherson, Ga.: Military Assistance Division, 1 October 2001), 6.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ U.S. Army War College, How the Army Runs: A Senior Leader Reference Handbook 2001-2002 (Carlisle: Government Printing Office, 2001), 23-2.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid., 23-4.

³⁹ Ibid., 23-25.

⁴⁰ U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century, Road Map for National Security: Imperative for Change, 15 February 2001; available from <<http://www.nssg.gov/>>; Internet; accessed 6 December 2001, 13.

⁴¹ Sean D. Naylor, "Routing Out Terrorism In Bosnia," Army Times, 10 December 2001, 12.

⁴² Legal Information Institute, US Code, 6 February 2002; available from <<http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>>; Internet; accessed 6 February 2002.

⁴³ Barry, Schweid, "ABM Withdrawal: Bush Pulls Out of 1972 Missile Treaty," 13 December 2001; available from <http://abcnews.go.com/sections/politics/DailyNews/bush_abm011213.html>; Internet; accessed 5 February 2001, 1.

⁴⁴ U.S. Army War College, How the Army Runs: A Senior Leader Reference Handbook 2001-2002 (Carlisle: Government Printing Office, 2001), 23-17.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Congress of the United States Congressional Budget Office, Structuring the Active and Reserve Army for the 21st Century (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997), 13.

⁴⁷ Donald H. Rumsfeld, Quadrennial Defense Review Report (Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, September 2001), 30.

⁴⁸ Congress of the United States Congressional Budget Office, Structuring the Active and Reserve Army for the 21st Century (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997), 13.

⁴⁹ Debra M. Gordon, eds., National Guard Almanac 2000 (Falls Church, Va.: Uniformed Services Almanac, Inc, 2000), 146.

⁵⁰ Congress of the United States Congressional Budget Office, Structuring the Active and Reserve Army for the 21st Century (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997), 25.

⁵¹ U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century, Road Map for National Security Imperative for Change, 15 February 2001; available from <<http://www.nssg.gov/>>; Internet; accessed 6 December 2001, 23.

⁵² *Ibid.*, xiii.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁵⁴ Public Law 99-443, Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986, 1 October 1986; available from <<http://www.ndu.edu/library/goldnich/99433pt1.pdf>>; Internet; accessed 6 February 2002, 7.

⁵⁵ U.S. Army War College, How the Army Runs: A Senior Leader Reference Handbook 2001-2002 (Carlisle: Government Printing Office, 2001), 23-1.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, viii.

⁵⁹ Legal Information Institute, U.S. Code, 6 February 2002; available from <<http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>>; Internet; accessed 6 February 2002.

⁶⁰ Debra M. Gordon, eds., National Guard Almanac 2000 (Falls Church, Va.: Uniformed Services Almanac, Inc, 2000), 146.

⁶¹ U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century, Road Map for National Security: Imperative for Change, 15 February 2001; available from <<http://www.nssg.gov/>>; Internet; accessed 6 December 2001, ix.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 25.

⁶³ L. Paul Bremer III and Edwin Meese III, Defending the American Homeland, January 2002; available from <<http://www.heritage.org/homelanddefense/HomelandDefenseweb.pdf>>; Internet; accessed 12 January 2002, 76.

⁶⁴ Ivan Eland, "Let's Make National Missile Defense Truly 'National'", 27 June 2000; available from <<http://www.cato.org/pubs/fpbriefs/fpb-058es.html>>; Internet; accessed 29 January 2002, 5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bremer, L. Paul III and Meese, Edwin III. Defending the American Homeland. January 2002. Available from <<http://www.heritage.org/homelanddefense/HomelandDefenseweb.pdf>>. Internet. Accessed 12 January 2002.
- Brinkerhoff, John R. "Restore the Militia for Homeland Security." ANSER's Journal of Homeland Security. November 2001. Available from <<http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/Articles/article.cfm?article=26>>. Internet. Accessed 25 November 2001.
- Bush, George. "Declaration of National Emergency by Reason of Certain Terrorist Attacks." 14 September 2001. Available from <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010914-4.html>>. Internet. Accessed 5 February 2002.
- Cohen, Elito A. "World War IV." The Wall Street Journal. 20 November 2001.
- Congress of the United States Congressional Budget Office. Structuring the Active and Reserve Army for the 21st Century. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997.
- Dickinson, Lansing E. "The Military Role in Countering Terrorist Use of Weapons of Mass Destruction." Counterproliferation Papers. Maxwell Air Force Base. Air War College, September 1999.
- Dobbs, Michael. "Establishing a CINC for Homeland Security." ANSER's Journal of Homeland Security. October 2001. Available from <<http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal.html>>. Internet. Accessed 1 November 2001.
- Echevarria, Antulio J. The Army and Homeland Security: A Strategic Perspective. Strategic Studies Institute. U.S. Army War College, March 2001.
- Eland, Ivan. "Let's Make National Missile Defense Truly 'National'". 27 June 2000. Available from <<http://www.cato.org/pubs/fpbriefs/fpb-058es.html>>. Internet. Accessed 29 January 2002.
- Federation of American Scientist. National Missile Defense. 27 June 2000. <<http://fas.org/spp/starwars/program/nmd/>>. Internet. Accessed 29 January 2002.
- Fleming, Ian. On Her Majesty's Secret Service. 1969. Available from <<http://www.geocities.com/Hollywood/Theater/3242/>>. Internet. Accessed 3 December 2001.
- Gordon, Debra M., eds. National Guard Almanac 2000. Falls Church, Va.: Uniformed Services Almanac, Inc., 2000.
- Hickman, Donald C. "A Chemical and Biological Warfare Threat." Counterproliferation Papers. Maxwell Air Force Base: Air War College, September 1999.
- Kernan, General William F. "Perspectives on 21st Century Challenges..." Briefing slides with scripted commentary. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 28 November 2001.
- Legal Information Institute. U.S. Code. 6 February 2002. Available from <<http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>>. Internet. Accessed 6 February 2002.

- Naylor, Sean D. "Routing Out Terrorism in Bosnia." Army Times. 10 December 2001, 12.
- Nichols, Bill and Eisler, Peter. "The Threat of Nuclear Terror Is Slim But Real." USA Today. 29 November 2001.
- O'Hanlon, Michael E. Defense Policy Choices for the Bush Administration 2001-05. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 2001.
- Olson, Elizabeth. "U.S. Calls For Global Action To Counter Germ Weapons." New York Times On Line. 20 November 2001. Available from <<http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov2001/e20011120calls.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 20 November 2001.
- Presidential Decision Directive. "Fact Sheet Addressing the Threat of Emerging Infectious Diseases." 12 June 1996. Available from <<http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/direct.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 15 November 2001.
- Public Law 99-433. Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986. 1 October 1986. Available from <<http://www.ndu.edu/library/goldnich/99433pt1.pdf>>. Internet. Accessed 6 February 2002.
- Rumsfeld, Donald H. Quadrennial Defense Review Report. Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, September 2001.
- Schweid, Barry. "ABM Withdrawal: Bush Pulls Out of 1972 Missile Treaty." 13 December 2001. Available from <http://abcnews.go.com/sections/politics/DailyNews/bush_abm011213.html>. Internet. Accessed 5 February 2001.
- Shelton, General Henry H. Joint Vision 2020. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, June 2000.
- State Department. "Fact Sheet: Secretary of State Designates Foreign Terrorist Organizations." 5 October 2001. Available from <<http://www.fas.org/irp/news/2001/10/fr100501.html>>. Internet. Accessed 26 November 2001.
- The Terrorism Research Center. "Homeland Threats and Domestic Preparedness." November 2001. Available from <<http://www.terrorism.com/homeland/homeland.shtml>>. Internet. Accessed 21 November 2001.
- United States Army Forces Command. Domestic Emergency Handbook (Draft). Ft McPherson, Ga.: Military Assistance Division, 1 October 2001.
- U.S. Army War College. How the Army Runs: A Senior Leader Reference Handbook 2001-2002. Carlisle: Government Printing Office, 2001.
- U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century. Road Map for National Security: Imperative for Change. 15 February 2001. Available from <<http://www.nssg.gov/>>. Internet. Accessed 6 December 2001.
- U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century. Seeking A National Strategy: A Concert for Preserving Security and Promoting Freedom. 19 April 2000. Available from <<http://fas.org/man/docs/000419-phaseiipress.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 6 February 2002.

U.S. Department of the Army. The Army. Field Manual 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 14 June 2001.

United States Joint Forces Command. "United States Joint Forces Command." 19 November 2001. Available from <<http://www.acom.mil/NewsLink/StoryArchive/pa102501.html>>. Internet. Accessed 19 November 2001.

University of Minnesota. "Convention (II) with Respect to the Laws and Customs of War on Land and its annex: Regulation concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land, 26 Martens Nouveau Recueil (ser. 2) 949, 187 Consol. T.S. 429, entered into force Sept. 4, 1900." 4 September 1900. Available from <<http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/instree/1899b.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 9 December 2001.

Ward, Judith A. "Homeland Defense: Are We There Yet?" Counteproliferation Papers. Maxwell Air Force Base: Air War College, April 2001.

Ward, William Major General. "Joint Military Operations." Briefing slides with scripted commentary. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 15 January 2002.