



# DEFEATING TERRORISM

## STRATEGIC ISSUE ANALYSIS



### **The Military's Role in the New Domestic Security Environment: Will Army Missions Change? Lieutenant Colonel Dallas D. Owens**

#### Conclusions:

- Events on September 11, 2001, changed aspects of the domestic security environment that will ultimately redefine military roles and affect Army missions for domestic security.
- New or enhanced Army missions are in the areas of internal air defense, international response, intelligence sharing, immigration support, national level coordination, law enforcement support, and infrastructure protection.
- The Army's Active Component is likely to require additional air defense, intelligence, and information operations forces.
- The Army's Reserve Components are likely to require significant additional increases in military police forces and minor increases in air defense, intelligence, and information operations forces.

#### **The Issue.**

Events on September 11, 2001, changed many aspects of the domestic security environment. Those changes will ultimately redefine the military role in domestic security, which will subsequently affect Army missions. After a solid analysis of the new or revised missions, the Army will be required to adjust its force structure significantly and adapt to major DoD structural changes, particularly those necessitated by development of the Homeland Security Agency.

The military's role in domestic security has evolved over many years and is constrained by the Constitution of the United States and subsequent laws. That evolution has been engendered by periodic changes in the domestic security environment, either when new requirements were identified or when old methods of dealing with previously-identified requirements were found to be inadequate. The military's current role in domestic security is officially defined by a collection of DoD and other agency documents.<sup>1</sup> This paper will examine the major changes for the military role and will determine which of those are likely to result in significant changes for the Army's mission. The domestic security environment is divided into two dimensions for

purposes of examining the issues pertinent to military roles and missions. The first, crisis management, is the prevention of events that threaten national security. The second, consequence management, deals with those times when prevention fails, and the military and others respond to those events to minimize damage and effect recovery. Consequence management also covers the actions taken to provide consequences for the perpetrator of the event. Any examination of changes in requirements—or assignment of responsibility for those requirements—in domestic security must consider both prevention actions and response actions.

#### **Prevention and Response Requirements.**

With perhaps one exception, no new preventive requirements were discovered in the aftermath of the attacks on September 11. Before the attack, there were valid requirements to identify potential enemies, deny them entry into the United States, and to apprehend those who nonetheless were able to enter and would commit criminal acts. These roles were primarily performed, respectively, by the intelligence community, immigration services, and the Department of Justice. The military provide some minor amount of support to the intelligence

collection effort and some likewise small amount of assistance to immigration agencies (primarily border patrol support). Military support to law enforcement is generally proscribed by law. The one potentially new or—more accurately—renewed requirement is for internal air defense, i.e., prevention of a similar attack in which terrorists use the airplane as a bomb. Air marshals and airport security offices will play a major role in this effort, but the air defense role is uniquely suited to the military since no other agency has the necessary equipment, training, and response time to perform the role adequately.

In the response category, there has been no change in the requirement to respond, either domestically or internationally. However, there has been a subtle shift in the meaning of the international response. After a criminal incident of this nature, American citizens expect immediate response in the form of domestic disaster assistance, normally coordinated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, with military support provided as necessary. They also expect the perpetrators to be caught and brought to justice as quickly as possible. Domestically, this role is normally performed by the Department of Justice, working with local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies. This requirement remains valid, but the magnitude of the attack has caused it to be characterized as an act of war, making the military the expected main means of dealing with the perpetrators. This role is the norm for international response, but the domestic division of responsibility between civilian law enforcement agencies and the military is yet to be defined completely.

Internationally, the military is currently at center stage in responding to the attack. The stage is shared by the Department of State, but for the purpose of finding and rooting out Usama bin Laden and al Qaida, at least in Afghanistan, the military is clearly in the lead, with the State Department supporting with diplomatic efforts to obtain basing rights, maintain coalitions, etc. Subsequent stages of the war may find the lead role taken by the Department of State as the push for military action dissipates.

The military is comfortable with its traditional role as international responder, but there are new strategic implications to success or failure. The

traditional battle-war linkage has become a more direct battle-national perception linkage. In other words, a successful battle or operation would lead not only to the longer-term goal of “winning a war,” but also to the establishment and sustainment of the perception of security by the populace of the homeland. Failed operations no longer represent a short-term setback with tangential effects on popular opinion; they may have immediate consequences for feelings of security. The requirement for public success for every operation will be an enormous burden on the military.

### **Prevention and Response Failures.**

In the prevention category, intelligence is most often noted publicly as a failure. Most cite inadequate coordination and insufficient resources as the major causes for that failure. The resource issue surrounds both personnel (type and number) and funds, with a major focus on human intelligence. Correcting this failure, particularly the human intelligence aspect, will take long-term investment that recognizes the difficulty and risk in identifying and infiltrating terrorist cells. The coordination issue involves intelligence sharing, both national and international, and is linked to the coordination of the collection and dissemination effort. The military has little stake in the collection issue, but has significant stake in intelligence sharing.

Response failures continue to be identified. Domestically, the creation of a cabinet-level post for homeland defense indicates some recognition that improvements in response coordination are needed. The actual events did not create this recognition,<sup>2</sup> but they drove home its importance and immediacy. Infrastructure security measures have been condemned on many fronts; again, few of the inadequacies came as a surprise. Recognition of domestic inadequacies has two consequences for the military. As a supporting agency, the oversight and coordination role at the cabinet level will have some effect on how support is provided, but that effect will only gradually be felt as the post evolves. Infrastructure protection will affect the military in the short term with assignments of missions to complement capabilities of law enforcement to protect selected key assets. Concurrently, force protection requirements have increased at military facilities, its own internal key infrastructure.

## Army Missions.

The impact on military roles will affect Army missions when the Army is the appropriate service for performing the military role. New missions include:

- **Internal Air Defense:** Though much of this mission will fall to the Air Force, the Army may be expected to provide air defense for fixed key infrastructure. This mission is similar to or an extension of that proposed as part of the missile defense program, which has significant force structure implications.<sup>3</sup>

**Recommendation:** Determine the Army's mission and analyze the adequacy of existing structure. If the requirement is large, constant, and long term, the Army's Active Component (AC) will require additional air defense forces. The Reserve Component could provide near-term support while the AC restructures.

- **International Response:** The Army will not necessarily see changes at the tactical level, depending on how battles are conducted. It will be a challenge to Army leadership to ensure that the perceived requirement to succeed in every battle does not affect the performance of its units.

**Recommendation:** The Army can attempt to shield its units from undue pressures, but the CINCs and DoD have more ability than the services to meet this challenge. The military should also anticipate an occasional tactical failure and assume such failures will become public. A plan should be prepared to minimize the impact of such failures on the public perception of increased threat to its security and to strategic goals.

- **Intelligence Sharing:** Though not a new mission for the Army, the new emphasis will have some impact on the Army as a collector and user of intelligence. The greatest burden is likely to be in the requirement to receive greater amounts of intelligence at the higher echelons of the Army. Receiving more may require additional assets to interpret and disseminate what is received. The great danger is that more would be received, but not disseminated to the units that need it most.

**Recommendation:** The Army should reassess its ability to receive, interpret, and disseminate intelligence. If that ability proves

insufficient, intelligence assets should be increased.

- **Immigration Support:** The Army's mission for immigration support has traditionally been in the areas of command and control and communications. The law enforcement nature of border patrolling is beyond what the Army sees as its domestic role and is not legally appropriate under most routine circumstances. However, the Army National Guard—in state status, not federal—may perform law enforcement functions. The Army's position will probably remain one of only providing short-term support, preferably not of a law enforcement nature, until immigration can expand capacity to the needed level.

**Recommendation:** Anticipating a long-term demand for intermittent support, the Army needs to analyze the skills needed for such support and make the minor changes in RC force structure necessary to meet that requirement. The RC is the most appropriate force to meet the requirement because of its intermittent and short-term nature.

- **National Level Coordination:** Clearly a perception exists that coordination of homeland security has "failed," but it is not yet certain what the new office will do to correct that failure or how successful those corrections will be. At this point, it is equally clear that the military will need to respond to new coordination demands, but specifics are lacking. Likewise, the Army's mission in this coordination scheme is not yet apparent. The DoD will continue to make internal adjustments and the Army's mission will become more clear over the next few months. The Army's mission for support to civilian authorities will receive new emphasis and reorganization recommendations like those provided by the Hart-Rudman Commission<sup>4</sup> will receive new consideration.

**Recommendation:** The overall military reorganization will largely determine the Army's reaction. However, the Army should resist pressures to restructure radically—at the expense of important long-term issues—to address immediate concerns. Restructuring responsibilities and staffs to coordinate DoD response better is certainly necessary. Some force restructuring is also needed, but many recommendations being proposed, both internal to DoD and in Congress,

may not be beneficial to either the Army or the Nation.

- **Law Enforcement Support:** Under the general rubric of "security," a labor-intensive Army mission resulted from the 11 September attacks. The guards at airports and Army facilities were the highest profile Army missions. These missions were not new, but the "off-site" security requirements are a unique and potentially large twist to expected consequence management. If this mission is seen as a long-term or frequently-spiking requirement, there are definite force structure implications. The Army's military police are already in high demand with peacekeeping and routine installation requirements. Significant additional requirements certainly exceed capabilities. If the current novel funding status of Army National Guard airport security portends things to come, the Active and Reserve Components both need more military police structure. Indeed, it is possible to have soldiers other than military police perform security missions and many security missions are only marginally law enforcement in nature, but it is wise to have appropriately-trained soldiers perform missions that even loosely fall into the category of law enforcement duties.

**Recommendation:** See Infrastructure Protection.

- **Infrastructure Protection:** The mission of infrastructure protection clearly crosses the boundaries of two, and possibly three, missions already discussed: domestic air defense, law enforcement, and (possibly) immigration support. The preferred mission for the Army is to have long-term responsibility for its own facilities, but only short-term enhancement missions for nonmilitary infrastructure. If the latter become long term or the short-term spikes become frequent, the Army's force structure would certainly be affected. The nature of those effects would depend on the magnitude of the mission and types of infrastructure selected for protection. For instance, information network protection missions are far different than port security protection, both in manpower levels and skills.

**Recommendation:** Each of the three related missions (domestic air defense, law enforcement, and immigration support) and infrastructure

protection have minor force structure impacts. Cumulative impacts, though, are potentially significant. For the AC, those impacts may be for additional air defense, intelligence, and information operations forces. For the RC, implications are for significantly more military police forces and minor increases in the three types having impacts on the AC. Most of these requirements likely will be met with existing structure. The AC will need to make difficult choices to shift forces, but the RC should have less difficulty. The Army National Guard has previously committed to providing increased combat support and combat service support forces through their Division Redesign program. Traditionally, the Army Reserve also readily changes its force structure to remain complementary to active forces.

### Endnotes.

1. For consequence management, the defining documents are the Federal Response Plan, U.S. Government Interagency Domestic Terrorism Concept of Operations Plan, DoD Directive 5100.1 (Functions of the Department of Defense and Its Major Components), and the 3025 series of DoD Directives on Military Assistance to Civil Authorities (MACA). Domestically, the DoD role is clearly one of support to a Lead Federal Agency (LFA) in either crisis management (LFA: Department of Justice) or consequence management (LFA: Federal Emergency Management Agency). For consequence management, missions would be the outcome of taskings by the LFA, subsequent to Requests For Assistance (RFAs) from local and State first responders. For crisis management, the LFA would request assistance as appropriate to the nature of the threat.

2. The Hart-Rudman Commission and others identified this need prior to the event.

3. Antulio J. Echevarria II, *The Army and Homeland Security: A Strategic Perspective*, Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, March 2001.

4. For discussion about the assumptions behind and implications of the Hart-Rudman Commission recommendations, see Ian Roxborough, *The Hart-Rudman Commission and the Homeland Defense*, Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, September 2001. Also see Michael P. Fleming, *National Security Roles for the National Guard*, *Journal of Homeland Defense*, August 2001, <http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/Articles/article.cfm?article=20>

---

More information on the Strategic Studies Institute may be found on the Institute's Homepage at <http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usassi/welcome.htm> or by calling (717) 245-4212.