

Read Online The Army And Homeland Security A Strategic Perspective Pdf For Free

Preparing the U.S. Army for Homeland Security **Army Science and Technology for Homeland Security** *The Army and Homeland Security* Science and Technology for Army Homeland Security **Preparing the U.S. Army for Homeland Security Concepts, Issues, and Options** **Introduction to Homeland Defense and Defense Support of Civil Authorities (DSCA)** Army Forces for Homeland Security Protecting the Homeland. Insights from Army Wargames **Military Organizations for Homeland Defense and Smaller-scale Contingencies** **Investigating the Benefits and Drawbacks of Realigning the National Guard Under the Department of Homeland Security** **Army Forces for Homeland Security** **The Army and Homeland Security** **The Army and Homeland Security: A Strategic Perspective** *Homeland defense DOD needs to assess the structure of U.S. forces for domestic military missions. The Hart-Rudman Commission and the Homeland Defense* **Enabling Unity of Effort in Homeland Response Operations (Enlarged Edition)** (HDS1) Homeland Defense and DSCA SMARTbook **The Army's Role in Homeland Security** **Securing the Homeland - How Should the Army Fulfill Its Role?** The U.S. Army's Role in Homeland Security *Role of the Army Guard in Homeland Security* **In Support of the Common Defense: a Homeland Defense and Security Journal Volume One** *Guarding the homeland* **The Role of the Army National Guard in the 21st Century** **U.S. Armed Forces and Homeland Defense** Homeland Security **Homeland Security, A Primary Army Function** The Department of Defense and Homeland Security Homeland Security and Defense **Simulations** **Army National Guard: Operational Reserve Or Homeland Security Force?** **Homeland Security: Leveraging Army Expertise to Develop Joint-Interagency Doctrine** **The U.S. Army and the New National Security Strategy** *The U.S. Homeland Security Forces* **A Strategic View of Homeland Security** **The Hart-Rudman Commission and the Homeland Defense Report** **Outlines Priorities for Army Homeland Security Efforts** **Enabling Unity of Effort in Homeland Response Operations** *The Role of the Army National Guard in Homeland Defense*

Verzameling courantenverslagen enz. betreffende de strafzaak der Gebr.

Hogerhuis [sic] te Beetgum uit de jaren 1897-1905

Thank you very much for downloading **The Army And Homeland Security A Strategic Perspective**. Maybe you have knowledge that, people have look hundreds times for their favorite books like this The Army And Homeland Security A Strategic Perspective, but end up in infectious downloads. Rather than reading a good book with a cup of coffee in the afternoon, instead they cope with some harmful virus inside their computer.

The Army And Homeland Security A Strategic Perspective is available in our book collection an online access to it is set as public so you can download it instantly. Our book servers hosts in multiple countries, allowing you to get the most less latency time to download any of our books like this one. Merely said, the The Army And Homeland Security A Strategic Perspective is universally compatible with any devices to read

If you ally craving such a referred **The Army And Homeland Security A Strategic Perspective** ebook that will pay for you worth, acquire the enormously best seller from us currently from several preferred authors. If you want to witty books, lots of novels, tale, jokes, and more fictions collections are next launched, from best seller to one of the most current released.

You may not be perplexed to enjoy every book collections The Army And Homeland Security A Strategic Perspective that we will certainly offer. It is not concerning the costs. Its practically what you craving currently. This The Army And Homeland Security A Strategic Perspective, as one of the most functioning sellers here will completely be in the course of the best options to review.

Right here, we have countless books **The Army And Homeland Security A Strategic Perspective** and collections to check out. We additionally have enough money variant types and plus type of the books to browse. The up to standard book, fiction, history, novel, scientific research, as capably as various further sorts of books are readily easy to get to here.

As this The Army And Homeland Security A Strategic Perspective, it ends taking place inborn one of the favored book The Army And Homeland Security A Strategic Perspective collections that we have. This is why you remain in the best website to see the incredible ebook to have.

Eventually, you will very discover a new experience and carrying out by spending more cash. yet when? complete you recognize that you require to get those all needs taking into consideration having significantly cash? Why dont you attempt to acquire something basic in the beginning? Thats something that will guide you to comprehend even more in this area the globe, experience, some places, behind history, amusement, and a lot more?

It is your categorically own epoch to work reviewing habit. in the course of guides you could enjoy now is **The Army And Homeland Security A Strategic Perspective** below.

This paper concludes that the Department of Homeland Security should leverage the expertise of the military and the Army in particular in developing a joint-interagency doctrine for Homeland Security. The paper will first provide an overview of the context in which doctrine has an appropriate place in the process of developing policy and guidance regarding Homeland Security and the role of the military. The paper will make the case through examples and analysis that the military and the Army have developed an expertise in areas with direct application to Homeland Security. Further the paper will show how this expertise and the attendant doctrinal implications provide opportunities for efficient development of a joint- interagency doctrine for Homeland Security. By acknowledging that doctrine development in a Joint and/or Homeland Security environment is not a new idea the paper will discuss the subtlety in making the transition from existing DoD doctrine to developing a doctrinal template for the Department of Homeland Security to guide its interagency operations. The application of our Armed Forces within the states and territories of the United States is far from intuitive. The challenges of defending the country against assaults within the homeland are much more complex than engaging our enemies on foreign soil. Likewise, the introduction of the militarys appreciable capabilities in response to disasters Today, the developing global economy, the revolution in information technologies, and other advances of technology have added new dimensions to the homeland security paradigm. Recent events both at home and abroad, and especially the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, have demonstrated the emergence of this current complex threat situation and highlight America's growing vulnerability in the domestic arena. The seriousness of this latest incident beckons one to ask what steps the U.S. government should take to prevent future tragedies like these from happening. While the FBI and FEMA have lead agency responsibilities for crisis management and consequence management, respectively, many suggest an increased role for DOD in homeland security—especially Army units—who have the forces most capable of responding to biological and chemical terrorism, possibly the Nation's greatest threat. But in terms of responding to homeland

emergencies, the Posse Comitatus Act severely limits the involvement of regular military forces during federal emergencies, even when they may be the most adequate organization to respond to such incidences. This book examines DOD's role in Homeland Security and the viability of the Posse Comitatus Act when viewed through the rubric of the current threat environment. By exploring DOD's historic role in the defense of the U.S. homeland and the advent of the Posse Comitatus Act—its history, application, and weakening over the last couple of decades—the book seeks to determine if regular Armed Forces (and specifically the active Army) should play a more significant role in the homeland security mission. In this book, the author acknowledges the significance of the Posse Comitatus Act in American history as an evolution of the Nation's long-standing fear of standing army involvement in domestic affairs, but posits that in today's strategic and domestic environment in the U.S. the Act has limited application or impact. By focusing on changes to the Act brought on by the growth of military involvement in the War on Drugs since the 1980s, and expanding use of military forces in other domestic support operations, the author suggests a growing irrelevance of the Posse Comitatus Act. Then, examining the domestic policy of three allied nations—Israel, Canada, and the United Kingdom—the author shows how these democratic nations have more clearly defined procedures for employment of military forces for domestic security matters, better interagency coordination, and a greater reliance on unity of command during times of crisis. This book uses the “FAS” test as evaluation criteria, as proposed in Joint Pub 3.0, Appendix B (The Estimate Process), which assesses the feasibility, acceptability, and suitability of strategy to ensure that elements of U.S. national security are not in danger. The author concludes that given the current threat environment, the Posse Comitatus Act is at best a relic in great need of revision. He adds that Posse Comitatus is one of several factors limiting the development and execution of effective homeland defense doctrine in America; a doctrine that must be combined arms, joint, interagency, coalition and multi-dimensional in nature, in order to adequately succeed in defending the homeland today. Amongst several options for change, the author argues that at a minimum, the Act should be revised to facilitate the full use of DOD capabilities for domestic defense in cooperation with other federal agencies. The author also contends that in order to maximize the Nation's ability to prepare for, prevent, deter, and respond to attacks on the homeland, DOD must consider expansion of the Army as part of its transformation efforts by creating dedicated homeland defense forces. This report addresses the many conceptual, programmatic, and practical issues associated with an emergent mission area for the U.S. Army and Department of Defense (DoD) called "homeland security" (until recently the mission was known as "homeland defense"). At the most basic level, the report seeks to provide Army and other DoD audiences with an introduction to, and overview of, four of the five homeland

security task areas, and the various organizations at the federal, state, and local level that the Army and DoD may need to interface with under different circumstances. More ambitiously, it seeks to define homeland security in a concrete way and to provide the necessary background and conceptual and analytic constructs for wrestling with the key issues and choices the Army will face as the mission area matures. The research reported here was initiated as homeland security was emerging as an issue of policy concern and was conducted during Fiscal Year 1999, a year in which the Army and Department of Defense considered but had not yet resolved many key homeland security-related issues. These include a definition of homeland security, the key task areas that constitute homeland security, and the programs and capabilities needed to respond to these various threats. In a similar vein, the broader federal government enacted or refined numerous programs to combat terrorism and weapons of mass destruction and to mitigate the threat to critical infrastructure. A N UNSPOKEN STANDARD of the Armed Forces has always been, "When the nation is least ready, we must be most ready." While that rings clear as far as warfare is concerned, it is not nearly so when it comes to the realm of domestic security. In spite of strategies that continue to espouse homeland security and homeland defense as "job one," woefully few in the Department of Defense have studied the issues, the intricacies, and the nuances that necessarily surround the use of the military in the domestic environment. Our military's leadership understands intuitively that there are differences in the way that we can respond "over here" as opposed to "over there." But the majority of our forces have not devoted the type of thinking to those vital distinctions as is most often associated with other aspects of our military's employment. As 9/11 drifts from the personal to the historic, the need to focus on these issues seems to have faded. Since its beginning over 360 years ago, the role of the Army National Guard has been a dual one. This duality manifests itself in state and federal functions. These dual functions should not impede the Guard's ability to play a significant role in homeland defense. Because of the terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001, the role of the Army National Guard in homeland defense should be fully explored. This study examines the threats to the homeland and the role the Army National Guard in protecting the nation from these threats. Part I of the 2014-2015 Army War College's Key Strategic Issues List (KSIL)-Army Priorities for Strategic Analysis-asks: "Given the growing importance of homeland defense, what would be the benefits and drawbacks of realigning the [National] Guard under the department of Homeland Security to enhance domestic security and disaster response, while retaining utility for overseas missions in support of the Department of Defense?" (pg. 10). This monograph details our efforts to research and evaluate the perceived benefits and drawbacks of realigning the National Guard under the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). We begin with a brief review of the relevant literature shaping the current policy and doctrinal approach to military

civil support (CS) operations, including a summary of laws and strategic guidance relevant to the discussion. We then note the important distinctions between homeland security (HS) and homeland defense (HD) and the military role in each context. The seam between HS and HD provides a conceptual basis for discussing the roles and responsibilities of the National Guard, the DHS, and the Department of Defense (DoD) within domestic security and disaster response operations. After evaluating the National Guard's role in each of the above contexts, we briefly discuss the realignment of the United States Coast Guard (USCG) within the DHS as a proxy for comparison of a similar realignment of a military-style entity under the DHS. The study concludes by listing and discussing the potential benefits and drawbacks of a National Guard realignment under the DHS and then makes five short recommendations in summary of the research effort. Looks at the military and law enforcement agencies that report to the Department of Homeland Security and examines their role in protecting the United States against terrorism. One of the most profound evolutions of the National Guard occurred following the release of the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review. It redefined the role of the National Guard from a strategic reserve to an operational reserve. This leadership decision dramatically increased the responsibility of the NG. NG personnel and equipment have rapidly become exhausted and unserviceable. Units are forced to cross level equipment and personnel to fill shortages in support of deployed units. The net effect of this increased responsibility may have a deleterious effect on the overall national security of the United States. An organization constitutionally established as the primary homeland security force must have the operational reserve role clearly defined. Conversely, what military organization executes the role of strategic reserve in the Guard's absence? The question is not if the NG can support an operational role, but what are the sacrifices to homeland security? The military and political leadership must be willing to consider reduced deployment times, enforcement of the ARFORGEN process, continued aggressive recruiting, retention campaigns, and focusing federal and state authorities toward increased civic involvement for homeland security. This is an enormous financial undertaking especially in times of economic crisis. It is however, a critical issue requiring the focused attention of the military, the political leadership and citizenry of the United States in order to provide the best alternative for securing the borders of our nation and our way of life from the potential threats in the 21st Century. Protecting the American homeland is now a critical priority for the nation, and steps are under way to improve the capabilities of civilian organizations throughout the country. The role of the U.S. military, and especially the Army, is to be prepared to make up for any deficiencies in these capabilities, as it has in domestic emergencies throughout our history. Since the 2001 terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the Army has taken critical steps to improve its capabilities for homeland security (HLS). The question is whether more should

be done to hedge against the risk that these capabilities may not be sufficient, given future dangers and risks. This report explores ways in which the Army in both its active and reserve components could respond today by conducting more specialized HLS training, by improving its responsiveness for domestic emergencies, and/or by augmenting certain types of its capabilities, and then suggests a hedging strategy the Army could adopt. This report would be of interest to anyone concerned with how the nation will defend itself against terrorism and the U.S. Army's role in that defense. In the Army, this research was sponsored by the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans (G-3). It was conducted in the RAND Arroyo Center's Strategy, Doctrine, and Resources Program. The Arroyo Center is a federally funded research and development center sponsored by the U.S. Army. This paper will analyze simulations to answer the following question: Is there a cost-effective simulation to assist training the Army National Guard (ARNG) for Homeland Defense (HLD) missions? Key to HLD training is the use of simulations as an essential component for leader and staff proficiency in preparation for those missions. Questions this paper explores: What is the difference between HLD and Homeland Security (HLS) and what are the HLD training challenges faced by the ARNG? What is the historical perspective of simulations? What are the policies that support simulation for HLD training? What are the definitions for live, virtual, and constructive simulations and why use constructive simulations for training? What research has been done to indicate that constructive simulation is an effective method of training? What are the capabilities and requirements for a Homeland Defense simulation? What are the current HLD and HLS training exercises? Are there readily simulations for HLD training? Why the PLOWSHARES experiment was important for HLD/HLS training. Finally, this paper will identify a specific constructive simulation that may best benefit and represent the greatest potential for ARNG Homeland Defense training. Homeland security as defined within the existing security strategy framework requires the United States its territory its people and its interests to be adequately protected. Leaders within the United States have for decades attempted militarily to ensure national security through forward basing and power projection delegating homeland security to a secondary role. However the events of 11 September 2001 may have permanently changed how we must think about protection of the homeland. The concepts of homeland security and homeland defense are extremely complex intertwined and demand coordinated use of all the instruments of national power both at home and abroad. Within this context there is a fundamental question that remains unanswered. How should the Army fulfill its homeland security role while continuing to meet the requirements of forward presence global engagement and war fighting? This paper addresses this issue by presenting the different definitions of homeland security and homeland defense analyzing current security strategy documents and examining the Department of

Defense's current force sizing construct. The paper also reviews the components of the Army and what they have contributed to homeland security since 9/11 considers various recommendations by prominent think tanks and finally proposes a course of action for the future. It considers recommendations by the Hart-Rudman Commission the Gilmore Commission the Heritage Foundation a RAND Corporation Study and the Defense Science Board. After comparing and contrasting these alternatives the author recommends that the Army give the Army National Guard the primary responsibility for homeland security dedicate twenty regionally focused Army National Guard battalion size units to homeland security and dedicate regional United States Army Reserve units with inherent homeland security capabilities. This approach ensures that the nation's first priority of homeland security is adequately resourced. The interrelation between Homeland Security and National Defense began with the formulation of the National Security Strategy. This essay examines the military's role in homeland security and defense through an evaluation of the Homeland Security Strategy and its relation to the National Security Strategy. It provides an explanation of the interrelation between the two strategies and the military's roles in these strategies. It also describes the critical missions of homeland security and how the military interfaces with those missions. It also presents why the U.S. military must maintain its capability to engage in symmetrical encounters, while transforming its forces into units capable of conducting asymmetrical engagements. Balancing authorities and responsibilities within our federal system has been a matter of continuous debate since the earliest days of the republic. Its continued relevance is exemplified in our current national conversation over how to most effectively organize and operate for homeland security and defense. Crises and catastrophic events in our homeland require Americans from different organizations, jurisdictions, and functions to work together. Yet despite considerable national effort and resources devoted to developing and improving our collective response capabilities, effectiveness in working together-unity of effort-still seems to elude us. Achieving unity of effort is the central challenge to effective homeland response operations. No single organization, function, or stakeholder has all the necessary tools to respond completely to the wide range of crises that routinely occur, or could occur, in our homeland. Combining the assets, capabilities, expertise, and resources of multiple participants has proven to be exceedingly complex and difficult. Our homeland response capabilities are considerable, but they are dispersed across a patchwork of jurisdictions and functions. The challenge in homeland response operations is neither inadequate resources nor lack of capabilities, but rather in being able to bring them to bear at the right time and place, and in the right combination. Disasters in our homeland have enormous consequences. Regardless of cause or extent, they always hold the potential for significant loss of life, human suffering, economic dislocation, and erosion of public confidence in government. Given all

that is at stake, we must do better. There are certainly a number of ways to improve our results; this monograph proposes three specific ways to do so. First, enhancing our capacity for unity of effort requires more than simply devoting more resources and rhetoric to the problem. The challenge is more fundamental; it requires us to change the way we think about homeland response in order to establish the intellectual pre-conditions for unified effort. A second way to enhance our capacity for unity of effort is to ensure that national doctrine can be broadly implemented. A truly national homeland response doctrine system will function in an interagency, intergovernmental, multi-jurisdictional environment. Implementing it requires a new management structure that can also operate in the spaces between agencies and governments. A third way to enhance unity of effort is to remove barriers to employment of military capabilities for homeland response operations. Achieving unity of effort in homeland response is a complex challenge, among the greatest of our age. It is the single most important factor in our ability to plan for and respond effectively to disasters at home. We devote enormous resources to public safety and security at many levels. Our citizens surely have a right to expect that these resources will be well used by their leaders, elected and appointed. This means that we must find better ways to work together. It requires leaders and organizations at all levels to combine their efforts, resources, and capabilities to achieve complete and responsive solutions. It requires us to develop new ways of thinking about and managing homeland response capabilities, before disaster strikes. Although responding to terrorist attacks and other domestic emergencies is primarily the responsibility of various civilian agencies, the U.S. Army has always had a role to play in filling any gaps in civilian capability. Should the Army adopt a hedging strategy to meet the risks of future terrorist attacks and other emergencies? The authors lay out five possible shortfalls in civilian and Army capabilities and suggest five possible responses the Army can begin today to ameliorate future risks. They also estimate the costs, both monetary and political, of the responses. They conclude that the nation needs to decide whether to bear the costs today in order to hedge against future risks. In this thesis I examine the role of the National Guard in supporting current National Security and National Military Strategy. I argue that the global security environment has changed drastically since the end of the Cold War making "Homeland Security" a primary mission for the military, specifically the National Guard. Concurrently, the unprecedented number of overseas deployments to perform peacekeeping missions has severely affected the active Army's combat capability. I argue that the US Army has not embraced the requirements for "Homeland Security," focusing instead on maintaining its 10 active division force structure. To meet the needs of National Military Strategy, the active Army has instead relied on the reserve components to perform overseas peacekeeping missions. I argue that the National Guard has also looked to performing these missions as a method of institutional survival. Together, both

components have undermined the Constitutional underpinnings of the Reserve Component as a strategic reserve, to be mobilized in cases of "war or national emergency." I argue that making "Homeland Security" a primary federal mission of the National Guard, along with restructuring current combat, combat support, and combat service support ratios will allow the National Guard to support National Military Strategy and "Homeland Security." This book examines the Army's role in the war on terrorism; the Army's homeland security needs; the implications of increased emphasis on Asia; the Army's role in coalition operations; the unfinished business of jointness--the lessons learned from operations and how to prepare for the future; the Army's deployability, logistical, and personnel challenges; and whether the Army can afford its Transformation. These examinations are bracketed by an introduction, a description of the Army's place in the new national security strategy, and a summary of the authors' conclusions. "The topic of homeland security includes a broad array of missions and mission areas ranging from national missile defense to military assistance to civil authorities. The topic has recently attracted a great deal of attention due to the public's heightened awareness of the variety and nature of emerging threats and of the United States vulnerabilities to them. The Army Staff was assigned to investigate the Army's role in homeland security from a strategic, rather than a legal or procedural perspective. The author achieves this perspective by placing homeland security missions within the larger spectrum of operations. In so doing, he exposes potential problem areas--missions requiring more or different force structure than that already available--for further action by the Army. He also recommends that the Army consider alternative force-sizing metrics that include, as a minimum, the high-end homeland security identified in the study."--Summary. This paper will explore new Army requirements based on the September 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review's guidance. The paper is based on the assumptions that: (1) end strength may increase but only enough to fill Army authorizations (around 530 K) and (2) a draft is not politically acceptable at this time. In particular, the paper examines force structure requirements to support homeland security-related requirements in an extended war against terrorism. Questions this paper explores: What are the likely homeland security tasks the Army will be supporting? To better support civil authorities, do Army forces need to be apportioned to a yet-to-be-named CINC for homeland security? What are the legal impediments to providing this support (e.g., Posse Comitatus Act)? If apportioned, do units need a new METL that supports HLS missions? Finally, what are the force structure impacts, if any? This paper will show that the Army should apportion forces for homeland security and give them new missions, force structure, and doctrine. However, the Army, which includes the Army National Guard and the U.S. Army Reserve, faces a conundrum because it must also retain its focus on fighting the Nation's land battles--the unique capability the Army provides the nation. Homeland security functions will

likely be assigned to the Army National Guard but the National Guard must still retain a critical role in reinforcing or augmenting active forces during sustained land combat. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to recommend doctrinal changes and a new force-sizing construct that would help the Army meet both the requirements of homeland security and sustained land combat. History has often confirmed that it is not superior weapons but superior organizations that are the most effective factor in achieving military success. In light of this consideration, this work questions how the US military can best be reorganized to conduct military operations (as they are known in doctrinal terms) other than war. The Army After Next (AAN) Project and, more recently, the Army Transformation Study, Wargames, and Analysis Project have identified issues relating to homeland security. Over the course of five major wargames, a counterterrorism workshop, and a homeland security symposium, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) has brought together senior civilian and military personnel to wrestle with hard questions about emerging threats to the United States during the period 2015 to 2020. The initial insights about homeland security emerged unexpectedly. Although the study of homeland security was not a primary area of interest for TRADOC, all wargames and workshops were partially designed to examine specific research questions relating to this topic. This report analyzes four wargames, a counterterrorism workshop, and a homeland security symposium, all conducted between 1996 and 2000, in an effort to better understand and prepare for future warfare. At the time the games were conducted there was a lack of clarity concerning both the future threats to the homeland and the evolving role of the Army in homeland security. Indeed, within the various agencies of the U.S. government there continues to be a lack of uniformity in definitions for such terms as homeland defense, homeland security, weapons of mass destruction, crisis management, consequence management, combating terrorism, counterterrorism, and antiterrorism. While some progress has been made on these fronts, there remains a need to build a consensus within the U.S. government concerning all aspects of homeland security. Part of this consensus must include the definition of key terms associated with this mission area. Finally, such a review must explicitly state the assumed limitations imposed by U.S. law and policy, and how those differences might affect the decisionmaking process in the event of a declared war against an adversarial regime. There is role for the Army in homeland security. That role is one of support to civil authorities at local, state, and federal levels. The events of 11 September 2001 were the catalyst to start a process of developing a formal approach to securing America's homeland. Trying to define what homeland security means to each agency and governmental entity is important to determine the security tasks the Army will support in this arena. Once the definitions are in place - Army forces, which can best support homeland security, more clearly fall out. In a likely outcome, the Army National Guard will assume the greatest share

of the Army's contribution to domestic security. To do so the Army National Guard must change to assume the new role in homeland security. Currently, the Army National Guard is not able to meet the traditional role of supporting the active forces, as well as, fulfill the support role to civil authorities in homeland security. In the process of transformation by reducing support to the Active force and focusing on homeland security, the Army National Guard will optimize the Army's commitment in homeland security. Any change to the National Guard will take political action, which means, in the final analysis, politics will determine a final homeland security role for the Army. Homeland security encompasses five distinct missions: domestic preparedness and civil support in case of attacks on civilians, continuity of government, continuity of military operations, border and coastal defense, and national missile defense. This report extensively details four of those mission areas (national missile defense having been covered in great detail elsewhere). The authors define homeland security and its mission areas, provide a methodology for assessing homeland security response options, and review relevant trend data for each mission area. They also assess the adequacy of the doctrine, organizations, training, leadership, materiel, and soldier systems and provide illustrative scenarios to help clarify Army planning priorities. The report concludes with options and recommendations for developing more cost-effective programs and recommends a planning framework that can facilitate planning to meet homeland security needs. It is quite possible that after the events of 11 September 2001, the roles and missions of the Department of Defense in the area of Homeland Security are destined for change. This monograph provides an examination of the legal, and traditional aspects of Homeland Security in the U.S. and the current framework for managing a domestic Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) incident. Understanding the past roles and missions of the DoD in regard to Homeland Security are relevant as the Office of Homeland Security (OHS) formulates a comprehensive national strategy for Homeland Security. Throughout the Nation's history, the American public has consistently equated Homeland Security with the Armed Forces. Immediately following the 11 September attacks there was confusion among many in the U.S. government as to which federal agency was responsible for Homeland Security. Several key members of the Senate Armed Services committee expressed concern over the current security framework and the DoD's supporting role in domestic Homeland Security. This monograph addresses these issues through an examination of the DoD's (Armed Forces) historical role in the defense of the nation as well as its role in domestic support operations. The monograph begins with a brief analysis of the emerging threats that the United States faces, and offers a proposed definition for Homeland Security. This is followed by an examination of the evolution of legal considerations when employing federal military forces in a domestic support capacity. It addresses the Posse Comitatus Act and recent refinements to the Act that circumvent its

provisions in instances of clearly identified threats to the Nation's interests. The second chapter includes an analysis of Civil Defense and the DoD's participation in past Civil Defense missions. A chronology of Civil Defense in America is included beginning with post World War I activities up through the present time. This analysis illustrates that in time of crisis, when the public feels vulnerable, they look to the DoD for security. The monograph outlines the current DoD supporting role to both the FBI for Crisis Management and to the FEMA for Consequence Management during a WMD incident. The monograph argues that the current system is adequate and the DoD should not be designated as the LFA for WMD incidents. The monograph recommends the creation of a new Commander-in-Chief (CINC) for Homeland Security. This CINC should also be charged with the responsibility of developing the campaign for, and executing the global War on Terror. Additional recommendations include some minor changes to both Joint and Army doctrine in regard to Homeland Security. It also recommends that the DoD maintain a receptive attitude towards new domestic missions, advocating the temporary execution of non-traditional missions. The confluence of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack and the U.S. Army's historic role to support civil authorities has resulted in substantial new challenges for the Army. To help meet these challenges, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research and Technology requested the National Research Council (NRC) carry out a series of studies on how science and technology could assist the Army prepare for its role in homeland security (HLS). The NRC's Board on Army Science and Technology formed the Committee on Army Science and Technology for Homeland Security to accomplish that assignment. The Committee was asked to review relevant literature and activities, determine areas of emphasis for Army S&T in support of counter terrorism and anti-terrorism, and recommend high-payoff technologies to help the Army fulfill its mission. The Department of Defense Counter-Terrorism Technology Task Force identified four operational areas in reviewing technical proposals for HLS operations: indications and warning; denial and survivability; recovery and consequence management; and attribution and retaliation. The study sponsor asked the Committee to use these four areas as the basis for its assessment of the science and technology (S&T) that will be important for the Army's HLS role. Overall, the Committee found that: - There is potential for substantial synergy between S&T work carried out by the Army for its HLS responsibilities and the development of the next generation Army, the Objective Force. - The Army National Guard (ARNG) is critical to the success of the Army's HLS efforts. 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. This paper will explore new Army requirements based on the September 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review's guidance. The paper is based on the assumptions that: (1) end strength may increase but only enough to fill Army authorizations (around 530 K) and (2) a draft is not politically acceptable at this time. In particular, the paper examines force structure requirements to support homeland security-related requirements in an extended war against terrorism. Questions this paper explores: What are the likely homeland security tasks the Army will be supporting? To better support civil authorities, do Army forces need to be apportioned to a yet-to-be-named CINC for homeland security? What are the legal impediments to providing this support (e.g., Posse Comitatus Act)? If apportioned, do units need a new METL that supports HLS missions? Finally, what are the force structure impacts, if any? This paper will show that the Army should apportion forces for homeland security and give them new missions, force structure, and doctrine. However, the Army, which includes the Army National Guard and the U.S. Army Reserve, faces a conundrum because it must also retain its focus on fighting the Nation's land battles--the unique capability the Army provides the nation. Homeland security functions will likely be assigned to the Army National Guard but the National Guard must still retain a critical role in reinforcing or augmenting active forces during sustained land combat. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to recommend doctrinal changes and a new force-sizing construct that would help the Army meet both the requirements of homeland security and sustained land combat. "With the exception

of attacks by ballistic missiles, the continental United States was long held to be virtually immune from attack. For Americans, wars were something that took place in other countries. In the future, that may not hold. But while strategic thinkers agree that homeland defense needs greater attention, there is less consensus on the precise nature of the threat. The author disagrees with the commonly-held assumption that the main threat to the American homeland will come from terrorism inspired by U.S. leadership of globalization. He contends that the architects of the American strategy for homeland defense need a broader perspective that includes a wide range of existing or potential threats."--Summary.

Shortly after the events of September 11, 2001, the U.S. Army asked the National Research Council (NRC) for a series of reports on how science and technology could assist the Army meet its Homeland defense obligations. The first report, Science and Technology for Army Homeland Securityâ€"Report 1, presented a survey of a road range of technologies and recommended applying Future Force technologies to homeland security wherever possible. In particular, the report noted that the Army should play a major role in providing emergency command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (C4ISR) capabilities and that the technology and architecture needed for homeland security C4ISR was compatible with that of the Army's Future Force. This second report focuses on C4ISR and how it can facilitate the Army's efforts to assist the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and emergency responders meet a catastrophic event. The historical basis of the current National Guard began in the days of the colonial militia. One of the primary roles of the militia, as well as the modern National Guard, is homeland defense. However, in 1907 the National Guard formally added the mission of providing the primary combat reserve forces to the Army, thus, formally establishing a dual role of homeland defense under the auspices of the governor, and a combat reserve of the Army under command of the president. This work concentrates on the dynamic of restationing current units to better serve the governor in homeland defense and security, while remaining competent in the federal mission of providing combat forces to the Army. In general, changes to force structure are not recommended, only possible restationing of current and limited future force structure options are presented. The force structure discussion centers on the emergency support functions most requested, leaving the reader to study the variables of implementation. Potential roles and missions of the National Guard as the primary military response agency in domestic crises are briefly covered. Some recommendations are discussed in respect to the current security environment. The major discussion of true force structure changes is in respect to the state SDFs. These forces may be used to eliminate the need for long term use of National Guard soldiers in this role. Finally, recommendations for functional unit types and observations on unit density are made in a general manner. Several conclusions concerning the current Military

Support to Civil Authorities activities of the National Guard are made along with recommended changes. Topics and references include homeland defense (JP 3-28), defense support of civil authorities (JP 3-28), Army support of civil authorities (ADRP 3-28), multi-service DSCA TTPs (ATP 3-28.1/MCWP 3-36.2), DSCA liaison officer toolkit (GTA 90-01-020), key legal and policy documents, and specific hazard and planning guidance: wildland fires, wind storms, earthquakes & tsunamis, floods, winter storms, chemical biological radiation nuclear (CBRN) events, and national special security events (NSSE), plus more. *** Find the latest edition of this book and the rest of our series of military reference SMARTbooks at the publishers website: www.TheLightningPress.com *** The topic of homeland security includes a broad array of missions and mission areas ranging from national missile defense to military assistance to civil authorities. The topic has recently attracted a great deal of attention due to the public's heightened awareness of the variety and nature of emerging threats and of the United States vulnerabilities to them. The Army Staff was assigned to investigate the Army's role in homeland security from a strategic, rather than a legal or procedural perspective. The author achieves this perspective by placing homeland security missions within the larger spectrum of operations. In so doing, he exposes potential problem areas--missions requiring more or different force structure than that already available--for further action by the Army. He also recommends that the Army consider alternative force-sizing metrics that include, as a minimum, the high-end homeland security identified in the study.

us0-cdn.onlineradiobox.com