



AUSA BACKGROUND BRIEF



No. 47

February 1993

THE NATURE OF THE GLOBAL THREAT AND RELEVANCE TO ARMY MISSIONS

Contents

Overview.....	1
Introduction.....	2
Discussion.....	2
Regional Overviews.....	3
Europe.....	3
Asia and the Pacific.....	5
Middle East and Africa.....	7
Latin America and the Caribbean.....	10
Relevance to the Army of the Global Threat.....	11
Summary.....	13
Endnotes.....	15

OVERVIEW

The threats to United States interests and world leadership during the balance of the century range from regional ethnic and cultural conflicts, to drug-trafficking, the proliferation of conventional military weaponry, high technology weaponry in the hands of potential adversaries, and weapons of mass destruction. Sensitive humanitarian, peacekeeping and enforcement operations will be mounted as well as a full range of conventional military operations.

Regional instabilities will warrant continuous monitoring. U.S. military forces will have to remain at a high state of combat readiness and be able to react rapidly to keep local crises from escalating. Joint and combined operations will be the norm, with the ground elements playing the major role of providing the decisive blows to destroy enemy capabilities, to keep adversaries apart or to intervene to save a nation from other manmade and environmental calamities.

INTRODUCTION

U.S. National Military Strategy and the Army's strategic role have been affected profoundly by global changes. The Soviet threat, the basis of U.S. defense planning for more than 40 years, is gone. In its place, the United States finds a latent but dangerous international environment characterized by regional instability and political, ethnic and economic uncertainty.

The increasingly dynamic nature of today's new security environment — the change in U.S.-Russian relations, weapons proliferation, the growth of Third World military capabilities and the variety of threats facing the United States — accentuates the unique and vital role of America's Army in the overall national security of the United States.¹ Rather than deterring the massive military might of a hostile global superpower, America's Army now faces new challenges.

The fundamental objective of America's armed forces are twofold: to deter aggression and, should deterrence fail, to defend the nation's interests against any potential foe. Deterrence remains the primary and central motivating purpose underlying U.S. military strategy — a strategy founded on the premise that the United States will provide the leadership needed to promote global peace and security.

In the post-Cold War era, the United Nations, as mediator and impartial arbiter, is assuming increased importance. According to Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Secretary General of the United Nations, "A new chapter in the history of the United Nations has begun. ... [It] is suddenly at the center of international efforts to deal with unresolved problems of the past decades as well as an emerging array of present and future issues."²

Somalia and former Yugoslavia are the most current battlegrounds reflecting the United Nations' new responsibilities. Cambodia, El Salvador, Liberia, Mozambique, Sudan and South Africa also represent serious challenges for the United Nations.

While emphasizing and supporting multinational operations under the auspices of international bodies such as the United Nations, the United States must retain the capability to act unilaterally when and where U.S. interests dictate. This strategy is, in many ways, more complex than the containment strategy of the Cold War.³

DISCUSSION

The Cold War is over. The major military threat to the United States (the former Soviet Union) has receded, and the danger of war in Europe and of U.S.-Soviet Union nuclear war have diminished greatly. Yet, the end of the Cold War confronts the United States with new challenges.

With the disintegration of the former Soviet Union, internal crises prevail and the possibility of large-scale civil disorder exists within the republics of the former Soviet empire. Russia and some of the other republics still have the capability to strike the United States with weapons of mass destruction. Thousands of nuclear weapons remain in Belarus, Kazakhstan, Russia and Ukraine. Because many of the nations that have or are acquiring weapons of mass destruction are led by

“megalomaniacs, strongmen of proven inhumanity, or weak, unstable, or illegitimate governments,”⁴ the potential for proliferation of these weapons is an issue of major U.S. concern.

New dimensions to the problem of proliferation caused by the breakup of the Soviet Union include:

- the selling of Soviet nuclear materials and weapons in the international marketplace;
- a potentially dangerous “brain drain” of scientists and engineers associated with Soviet weapon programs from the Soviet republics — individuals who could be tempted to sell their expertise to Third World countries seeking to acquire or improve weapons of mass destruction.

Beyond the borders of Russia and the other Soviet republics lie other challenges to peace, international order and U.S. interests:

- The United States continues to face the threat of nuclear-armed missiles from China.
- More than 20 nations have or are acquiring weapons of mass destruction that include nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and related delivery systems. Many of these arsenals are (or will be) in the hands of unstable and unreliable governments.
- Communist regimes remain in place in Cuba, China, North Korea and Vietnam.
- The potential for conflict remains high in the Middle East and South Asia.
- Several nations with space-launch capabilities could modify those launches to acquire a long-range ballistic missile capability. India, Israel and Japan have developed space-launch vehicles that, if converted to surface-to-surface missiles, are capable of reaching targets in the United States. Brazil has a space-launch vehicle under development that is expected to be test launched within the next five years.⁵

REGIONAL OVERVIEWS

Europe

Prospects for further arms control reduction between the United States and Russia and the other former Soviet republics, economic integration, and political consensus in Europe have never been greater. Unlike the violent splintering of the former Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia's 1 January 1993 breakout into two countries - Slovakia and the Czech Republic - is progressing smoothly. But the process of revitalizing former communist states and resolving resurgent nationalist and ethnic hatreds presents problems for a smooth and promising future for Europe. The key to European peace and prosperity is the stability of Russia and its integration as a full partner in a future pan-European environment.

Russia

The threat to the United States of a deliberate attack from Russia has all but disappeared for the foreseeable future. The capabilities of Russian strategic forces are being significantly reduced due to arms control agreements, economic pressures and political changes.

The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START II), for example, to which former U.S. President George Bush and Russian President Boris Yeltsin agreed, could dispel fears of a devastating nuclear first strike and put America and Russia “at the threshold of a new world of hope.”⁶

Currently pending Senate ratification, START II would reduce U.S. and Russian nuclear stockpiles to a maximum of 3,500 warheads each, while completely eliminating land-based missiles with multiple warheads — the backbone of the former Soviet strategic forces. But without the cooperation of Ukraine — one of the two most powerful republics of the former Soviet Union (Russia being the other) and now the world’s third largest nuclear power — START II may remain little more than a promise of nuclear peace. Until Ukraine approves START I, Russia will not ratify the new START II agreement.

Ukraine has 176 former Soviet strategic missiles that are slated for destruction under an earlier agreement, START I, but has yet to ratify that agreement because: (1) Ukrainian nationalists are urging President Leonid Kravchuk to retain some nuclear weapons as a hedge against Russian expansionism; and (2) government officials insist that Ukraine needs as much as \$1.5 billion in aid to pay for removing nuclear weapons from their country.

Assuming START II is ratified, the Russians will dramatically alter the composition of their strategic forces. They will shift from a heavy reliance on land-based, multiple warhead intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) to a force relying primarily on submarines, bombers and single-reentry vehicles ICBMs. But even with these reductions, Russia will retain a viable strategic force well into the 21st century. Further testing and deployment of ICBMs and submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) cannot be discounted. Thus, as long as there is the possibility that a new, hostile regime could emerge in Russia, the nuclear weapons remaining in Russia and the other republics are of major concern to the United States.

Underscoring this concern is the fact that the strong central government of the former Soviet Union had an excellent nuclear command and control system which provided high assurance that an accidental or unauthorized launch was very unlikely. This system, however, was not designed to anticipate the breakup of the Soviet Union and the fragmentation of political and military authority that has occurred within the former Soviet republics.

Bosnia

The 8 January 1993 murder of Bosnia’s Deputy Prime Minister Hakija Turajlic symbolized the inadequacy of present international efforts to counter Serbian-sponsored violence in the former Yugoslavia. The Geneva peace talks may be unlikely to establish an acceptable peace between the warring factions. If this is the case, to stop the violence in Bosnia will require greater international involvement. Any hope for a peace settlement in Bosnia may require a guarantee by the United States and its allies; and pressure will certainly grow to do something. Scenarios for possible U.S. and allied intervention in Bosnia include:

- enforcing the “no-fly zone”;
- expanding the relief operation with air cover;
- arming Bosnians;

- using ground troops to deter attacks on ethnics Albanians in Kosovo province;
- forming safe havens within Bosnia.⁷

Asia and the Pacific

Positive developments are underway in this area. The rapid economic growth, evident in the 1980s, is being matched by strengthened democratic institutions. Japan is beginning to recognize its increased political and regional security obligations in the post-Cold War environment. But the potential for instability and conflict in Asia and the Pacific remains. China's economic reforms have not been matched by political freedoms; the selling of Chinese weapons to other countries is a matter of concern to China's neighbors and to the United States. North Korea's leadership, militarized society and quest for nuclear weapons are also of major concern. Hostilities along the Indo-Pakistani border could trigger a ballistic missile exchange once development programs underway in both countries are complete. The potential for violent instability in evolving democracies such as the Philippines could present new challenges to U.S. interests.

Cambodia

Cambodia may be a test case of the United Nations and its ability to adapt to the new demands of the post-Cold War. In towns and villages throughout much of Cambodia, an unprecedented and fragile experiment is being carried out by the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC).

The original mission of UNTAC, to monitor the demobilization and disarming of warring factions, has been abandoned. The human-rights component of UNTAC's mission, however, is spreading important ideas. If the May 1993 democratic elections can be held, despite growing threats from the Khmer Rouge and the Cambodian People's Party (a communist organization), UNTAC will have provided the Cambodian people a chance to move toward a more representative government. But even with the outcome of a successful election, a United Nations presence must remain in Cambodia to offer continued security to the people against political terror. Also, international aid must continue and a national army must be built to defeat the Khmer Rouge.

China

Buoyed by a strong economy which grew 12 percent in 1992, China is making far-reaching improvements in its armed forces. The military equipment China is acquiring from Russia and other countries may upset the balance of power in Asia by the year 2000. According to Paul Beaver, publisher of Jane's Defense Weekly in London, "China is moving away from a regional power to a regional superpower."⁸

The Chinese military is being upgraded in almost every area. Improvements include:

- purchasing 26 advanced Su-27 fighter planes from Russia;
- developing aerial refueling for the Su-27s and for its bombers, thus increasing the ability of

the Chinese armed forces to threaten Taiwan and Vietnam, or to control the South China Sea;

- considering the acquisition of an aircraft carrier - either through purchase from Russia or building its own;
- developing a variety of ships: the Jiangwei class of frigates, the Luhu class of destroyers, and a vastly upgraded version of the older Luda class destroyers;
- acquiring improved radars and missile-guidance systems from Russia;
- negotiating the purchase of Russian S-300 missiles (similar to the U.S. made Patriot missile);
- working on a new model of its main tank.⁹

In addition to these developments, there is mounting intelligence that China may be selling weapons to Myanmar (Burma) in exchange for the right to establish naval facilities and listening posts on islands off the Burmese coast.¹⁰ There also have been reports that China, despite its pledge not to do so, may have secretly delivered M-11 missiles to Pakistan in November 1992.¹¹

The growing strength of the Chinese military would not be a major concern if China had not had border disputes with at least seven neighbors and, over the last 30 years, fought border wars or skirmishes with India, the former Soviet Union and Vietnam. Even today, China continues to threaten to use military force to recover Taiwan and claims the entire South China Sea, including many shipping routes that carry oil from the Middle East to Japan.

The fact that China has the capability to attack U.S. territory, forces and interests cannot be taken lightly. The Chinese have deployed a small force of nuclear-tipped ICBMs, some of which are aimed at the United States, and a small force of intermediate-range ballistic missiles, many of which could be targeted against U.S. forces and allies in Asia. China plans to update this force with new missiles.¹²

India

The violence between Hindus and Muslims that began on 6 December 1992 after Hindu mobs destroyed a 16th-century mosque in northern India, and continues, has resulted in wide-spread religious rioting and clashes with security forces throughout India. To date, about 1,200 people, many of them in Bombay, have been killed.

Japan

The U.S. trade deficit with Japan — nearly \$50 billion in 1992 — is at almost record levels and placing increasing pressure on both countries. An additional problem is finding, in the post-Cold War era, the right security role for the Japanese — as a member of the United Nations Security Council, as United Nations peacekeepers, and as a nation once again able to exercise military power — in a way that will not reawaken fears elsewhere in Asia.

North Korea

There is serious concern about the status of North Korea's nuclear efforts. These concerns extend beyond the Korean peninsula. If North Korea acquires nuclear weapons, the probability for

stability in northeast Asia becomes questionable. With nuclear weapons, North Korea could put these weapons and the technology that produced them into the international marketplace. North Korea has for many years invested heavily in its military and depends on exports for much of its hard currency. North Korea has sold Scud missiles to several Middle East countries and a modified Scud, with greater range, to Iran and Syria.

Pakistan

After a history of military rule, Pakistan's nascent democracy is being severely tested by economic problems, persistent violence, corruption, deep disillusionment among the people and power struggles among its leaders. Many Pakistanis fear the democratic experiment that began in 1988 with the election of Benazir Bhutto as prime minister may be in danger of collapsing.

President Ghulam Ishaq Khan, for example, conceded in his most recent address to parliament that "democracy is still merely a form of government for us and has not become a way of life."¹³

U.S. interests in maintaining stability in Pakistan, a country with 110 million people, centers around one overriding factor — its potential nuclear capability. A Pakistani official conceded in 1992 that Islamabad has the components and know-how to assemble at least one nuclear bomb.¹⁴ With India also believed to have a nuclear weapons capability, South Asia is an area where potential nuclear rivals confront each other. Thus, there is reason for U.S. concern.

Another reason to maintain stability in Pakistan is that the country serves as a potential moderating influence on Muslim Asia. With a half-dozen Muslim-populated states having established their independence in the former Soviet Union, Pakistan can serve as a relative constructive model compared to that of neighboring Iran. But with the recent death of General Asif Nawaz, army chief of staff and one of the ruling troika — none of whom has trusted or appeared to like the others — a power struggle between Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif and President Khan may further threaten Pakistan's fragile democracy.

Philippines

Indications are that the collapse of communism in the former Soviet Union has caught up with the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) and its armed wing, the New People's Army (NPA). Weakened by infighting and increased defections, the CPP seems headed toward self-destruction.

Notwithstanding a growing rift over the questions of strategy and ideology, and a strength that has declined to fewer than 12,000, the NPA is larger than any other communist guerrilla force in the world (except, perhaps, the Khmer Rouge) and still presents a threat to the government of President Fidel Ramos.

Middle East and Africa

These two areas have been least affected by positive global changes in the international security environment. Ongoing Arab-Israeli negotiations are a hopeful sign. In the oil-rich Persian Gulf,

struggle for influence continues among Iraq, Iran and Saudi Arabia. Operation Desert Storm has temporarily deflated Iraq's ambitions, but Saddam Hussein's defiant actions could lead to further U.S. and coalition military operations against Iraq.

Because of its limited air and cruise missile strikes against Iraq in January 1993, the United States has received criticism from some of its Persian Gulf War allies, to include Russia and some Arab countries. Iran has made no secret of its ambitions to reemerge as a preeminent regional power as it spends \$2 billion a year to buy conventional weapons, mainly from Russia and China; builds a nuclear, chemical, biological weapons arsenal; and develops its naval forces.

The end of superpower competition has removed a major source of instability in Africa, but the lasting effects of political repression and economic mismanagement will be worsened by the continuing spread of HIV-AIDS and ecological devastation. African problems — poverty and unchecked population growth — increasingly will compete with other regional concerns for international attention. The politics and conflict associated with food shortages in Somalia and chronic drought in Ethiopia are but two examples. Sudan is the most dire example of the next Somalia. Civil wars in Angola, Liberia and Mozambique require careful attention.

Algeria

The Algerians have almost completed building a nuclear reactor bought from China. The secrecy of the purchase and Algeria's failure to accede to the nuclear nonproliferation treaty are reasons for concern.

Libya

Libya has produced and stockpiled as many as 100 tons of chemical agents, continues to shop throughout the world for an alternative source of longer-range missiles, and continues its support for a variety of terrorist or insurgent groups worldwide.¹⁵

Iran

Four years after the end of its eight-year war with Iraq in 1988, Iran continues to rebuild its armed forces, the strongest in the Persian Gulf region. Iran has turned to Argentina, Brazil, China, North Korea, Pakistan and Russia as major arms suppliers.

With the ability to put 500,000 men in the field and the capability to counter Iraqi air power, Iran is placing its priority on acquiring strategic weapons, nuclear reactors, surface-to-surface missiles and light bombers. Iran is also seeking four nuclear power plants - two from China and two from one of the former Soviet republics.¹⁶

With the sale of two Kilo-class submarines (at a cost of \$750 million), Russia has helped Iran gain a naval edge in the Persian Gulf. These submarines can cruise in the deep waters just outside the Straits of Hormuz and threaten the large volume of oil traffic using the narrow straits.¹⁷ To counter this threat, several gulf countries are ordering new submarines and surface submarine-hunter vessels, thus further intensifying the arms race in the volatile Persian Gulf region.

The actions described above are overt moves by Iran. More serious is the war of subversion, discussed below, that Iran is waging throughout the moderate Arab world: ¹⁸

- Egypt: Islamic terrorists are randomly killing foreign tourists in an attempt to stop Egypt from gaining foreign currency.
- Lebanon: Hezbollah, Iran's Lebanese subsidiary, remains the only independent militia in the country.
- North Africa: Iran is supporting Islamic fundamentalists trying to bring down moderate regimes in Algeria and Tunisia.
- Sudan: Preoccupied with Somalia and the Balkans, the West has taken little notice that Iran has become the predominant influence in Sudan, the largest country in Africa.

Iraq

Iraq has again assumed center stage within the international community by a wave of recent incidents (culminating in limited U.S. and allied military operations against Iraq) that began with Saddam Hussein's positioning anti-aircraft missiles in a United Nations-declared "no fly zone." Other incidents were the banning of United Nations aircraft carrying inspectors and relief supplies in and out of Iraq and two military incursions into a United Nations-controlled site ceded to Kuwait to retrieve weaponry (including four Silk-worm surface-to-surface missiles) left behind during the Persian Gulf War and impounded by the United Nations.

Saddam Hussein's next military challenge could be more audacious than those conducted to date. He could, for example, launch a ground attack against the Kurds in the north or the Shiites in the south. U.S. and allied airpower would probably be unable to stop these attacks; if this was the case, ground troops would be required.

Saddam Hussein has adopted a long-term "cheat and retreat" strategy of driving a wedge between the U.S.-led coalition that carried out Operation Desert Storm and the overextended United Nations. Despite any "peace and disarmament package" he might pledge, Saddam Hussein will remain a threat to the stability of the region until removed from power.

Somalia

In a country with no government, no civil institutions, and no law and order, the military aspect of the U.S.-led humanitarian relief effort (Operation Restore Hope) has progressed smoothly. American forces have secured a number of famine areas for relief convoys; airlifts and food distribution points have been established. More food is getting to the Somalis and most of the "technicals" (Somalis who ride atop machine gun mounted trucks) have moved into the countryside. In Mogadishu, U.S. marines and soldiers are keeping an intermittent peace between warring clansmen.

Now that U.S. military forces are being withdrawn from Somalia, the hard part is yet to come: the rehabilitation of a country that lacks the most basic building blocks of a modern civil society.

Syria

Syria is attempting to acquire from China and North Korea, as well as from Western firms, an improved chemical and/or biological capability and continues to provide support and safe havens to groups that engage in international terrorism.¹⁹

Latin America and the Caribbean

From a stability standpoint, Latin America may have benefitted the most from the changing global security environment. Soviet instigation of revolutionary movements in the region has ceased and Cuban support has dwindled. The United Nations was instrumental in the peaceful resolution of the insurgency in El Salvador. Democracy and free-market economies are gathering strength in Latin America. A major problem in Latin America continues to be drug trafficking, which corrupts local governments, subverts judicial processes and distorts economies. Nowhere is this more evident than in Peru. The future of Cuba, especially the possibility that its steady deterioration could lead to local and regional instability, is a matter of concern.

Colombia

Guerrilla warfare perpetrated by factions of the National Liberation Army (ELN) and Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) undermines the political evolution of Colombia. Coupled with the massive drug production which takes place in nearly inaccessible areas of the countryside, the government of President Gaviria has a long way to go to bring some form of normalcy to Colombia.

U.S. military support of the Colombian armed forces in their war against the drug lords continues. However, the system of bribes and payments to the peasantry will undermine the operations to destroy the factories and interdict trade routes. The continuing demand for drugs from the U.S. makes drug-trafficking lucrative and worth the risk for the cartels and others who can be bought.

Cuba

With an economy that incorporates the worst features of both the East bloc and the Third World, 1993 promises only hardship for Cuba — the world's last bastion of "proletarian revolution."

In 1992, Cuba's trade with its former communist partners dropped to seven percent of its former value; its imports plunged to an estimated \$2.2 billion from \$8.1 billion in 1989, a decline of 73 percent.²⁰

Although there are cries heard in Cuba of "down with Fidel Castro," there is no sign of the 66-year old leader's exit from power. While repressive police policies have prevented the emergence of mass opposition to Castro, experts agree that his time in power is limited. They disagree on how that end might come. A military coup could spark a civil war, as could a sudden popular uprising, or Castro's death could set off a power struggle. Any of these scenarios could generate a refugee flood to the United States much larger than the anticipated Haiti situation.

In the meantime, the United States, sensing a chance to succeed where it has failed for 30 years, is attempting to deepen Cuban's isolation by tightening its economic embargo. The embargo is intended to prohibit the growing business being done with Cuba by American subsidiary companies abroad.

Haiti

With the promise of a more liberal immigration policy, thousands of Haitians, desperate to escape one of the hemisphere's poorest and most repressive countries, are building boats and planning voyages to Florida.

Estimates on the exodus of Haitians in the coming months range from 15,000 to 180,000 people. Such an influx of people will severely tax the infrastructure of South Florida where ongoing post-Hurricane Andrew efforts to reconstruct areas, feed and house thousands continue.

Peru

Peruvians elected a new president in 1990. To revitalize the economy, protectionist laws and policies were changed which, though unpopular, were considered necessary. The legislature was dissolved in 1992 and martial law imposed to regain control of the nation from its heritage of corruption and bribery. The country has been under the intimidation and threat of the Shining Path guerrilla organization for many years. It and other guerrilla groups are closely linked with the thriving drug trade operatives which finance their operations.

The terrorist activities of the guerrillas are on the increase and carrying the fight to rebels and drug producing organizations is increasingly difficult. U.S. antidrug assistance and military assistance is being provided on a limited basis.

RELEVANCE TO THE ARMY OF THE GLOBAL THREAT

The U.S Army is the primary ground element of America's armed forces. While the power to deny or destroy is possessed by all the military services, only the Army has the power to exercise direct, continuing and comprehensive control over land, its resources and its people.

In the emerging security environment described above, three realities remain. First, while the end of the Cold War has signaled a dramatic improvement in the prospects for peace, security and economic progress, the United States still lives in a very troubled world with danger, uncertainty and instability in many regions. It is a world where crises, war and challenges to U.S. vital interests will continue to be very real possibilities.

In the aftermath of Operation Desert Storm, a number of regional military forces came to recognize the importance of acquiring lethal and sophisticated weapons. Thus, the pursuit of high-technology weapon systems from major arms exporters and the expansion of indigenous production capabilities is likely to be the main focus of regional acquisition efforts for the remainder of the 1990s and beyond.

In a world that is more lethally armed, more unstable and more uncertain, America's Army must continue to be well-trained and maintain an overwhelming modernization advantage to ensure land force dominance over potential adversaries. Of importance is the size and composition of the Army: the smaller America's Army becomes, the more modern and technologically overmatching it must be.

Second, much of the world continues to look to the United States for leadership. Because America has enduring cultural, political and economic links across the Atlantic and the Pacific and within the Western Hemisphere, old friends and allies view the United States as a stabilizing force in vitally important regions. New friends look to the United States for inspiration and security and see America as a model for democratic reform.

The third reality of the emerging security environment is that although geography provides the United States a unique defensive shield that is not shared by many other nations, U.S. national security is critically linked to events and access abroad. Thus, the United States must maintain the strength necessary to influence world events, deter would-be aggressors, guarantee free access to global markets and encourage continued democratic and economic progress in an atmosphere of enhanced stability.

A review of current headlines underscores significant trends underway that will continue to make the world a dangerous place. Nationalism with its violent overtones has resounded where it once was hushed. The former Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, for example, are being torn apart by ethnic and nationalist fervor.

Another significant trend that bears close scrutiny is the tendency of groups or nations to resort to violence in pursuit of their own goals. This trend is affirmed by the steady recurrence of terrorism, drug-related violence, insurgency, and internal repression and external aggression. These factors pose an explosive mix of social, demographic and military trends that could present a distinct and serious challenge to U.S. interests requiring decisive military action.

The global arms bazaar, without Cold War ideological constraints, is another trend that is making the world more dangerous. According to Lieutenant General Ira C. Owens, U.S. Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence, "It is functioning as a robust and deadly free market, which is leading to a new round of spiraling arms purchases in some of the most heavily armed and unstable regions of the world."²¹

Another critical component of the new global security environment that has a significant impact on the Army's systems modernization plans is technological change. General Owens said further, "Global technological capabilities and developments must replace former Soviet standards as the yardstick for U.S. systems development."²²

In a world that is experiencing an increasing number of weapon producers and a growing demand for high-quality weapon systems, countries with the necessary military infrastructure and economic resources will move toward smaller, high-tech, more lethal forces. Reality is that countries with money, given current international marketing activities, can buy and field a high-tech military force in a very short period of time.

Those countries that pursue low-tech systems will have the capability to field some advanced systems in limited, specialized areas such as precision-guided munitions or sophisticated air defense systems. Others, not able to acquire or assimilate higher technologies, will retain large conventional land forces for internal security purposes.

The proliferation of technologies and weapons will make future battlefields more lethal and present a more difficult standard for America's Army. Of grave concern is the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them — a threat that is clearly on the horizon. It is estimated that by the year 2000, at least 15 developing nations will have the ability to build ballistic missiles and eight of these nations either have or are near to acquiring nuclear capabilities. Thirty countries will have chemical weapons and 10 will be able to deploy biological weapons as well.²³

The emerging global security environment, including its technological component, affects the Army's future force, materiel and doctrinal developments. The disappearance of the monolithic Soviet threat has required the Army to reassess how it defines and represents the threat to support the Army force development process.

The old Army threat model was straightforward. America's Army developed doctrine and trained, equipped and modernized itself against a single worst-case threat standard. Today, this model is no longer valid.

Now, the Army considers a range of regional threats and global technology standards with an emphasis on representative issues seeking to portray types of threats, rather than trying to predict who will do what and when. This approach provides the flexibility required for the Army's force planning process while allowing the level of detail necessary to provide adequate threat support for a range of contingencies.

SUMMARY

Despite the end of the Cold War and the subsequent relaxation of U.S.-Soviet tensions, the United States continues to face serious challenges for the remainder of the 1990s and beyond.

Many countries have developed weapons of mass destruction; others are acquiring the capability to develop these weapons. The possibility exists that some nations may use these weapons in regional confrontations, thus threatening U.S. interests abroad.

For the foreseeable future, the United States must be ever watchful of those nations hostile to U.S. interests, that have or attempt to acquire weapons of mass destruction, ballistic missiles, and delivery means to threaten the United States.

During the Cold War, the Soviet Union and its surrogates posed the principal threat to U.S. interests and objectives. But with the collapse of East European communism, the demise of the Warsaw Pact, ongoing changes within Russia and the former Soviet republics, the reshaping of U.S.-Soviet relationships and a reduction in Soviet conventional military power, the U.S. security agenda is being rewritten.

Economically and technologically, the United States is facing stiff competition from Japan and Germany. Elsewhere, threats to U.S. interests range from the enmity of nations like Iraq and North Korea to pressures from friends and foe alike to reduce U.S. presence around the world.

The redefinition of the U.S. threat in the post-Cold War era is accelerated by the emergence and intensification of both new and historical regional quarrels. U.S. efforts to promote regional stability and to enhance the spread of democracy will continue to be challenged by insurgencies, terrorism, drug trafficking, and weapons proliferation.

Within the new security environment one thing is clear: U.S. security "... is best guaranteed by a clear-eyed assessment of the global challenges that face [the United States] regardless of their origin."²⁴

The Army is continually refining its assessment of the nature of potential future threats. This process involves studying the development of trends, assessing threat technologies, monitoring regional flashpoints and analyzing intentions and capabilities of nations or groups with goals inimical to U.S. interests.

The continuing threats to U.S. national interests are cause for prudent concern and include:

- the eventual disposition of the nuclear weapons and technicians of the former Soviet Union — the fragmentation of the USSR has left nuclear-armed missiles located on the territories of Russia, Byelarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan;
- the inventory of conventional military equipment in Russia and the other republics which comprise the Commonwealth of Independent States;
- regional instability and wanton criminal behavior by local despots and fanatics as currently reflected in the former Yugoslavia and Somalia;
- weapons and technology proliferation which greatly enhance, in a short period of time, a country's threat capabilities;
- ethnic, religious and cultural strife, as recently demonstrated in India;
- drug trafficking;
- renegade states such as Iran, Iraq, Libya and North Korea;
- terrorism;
- poverty and population growth in Third World countries;
- environmental degradation.

Because of the emerging nature of the global security environment, threats to U.S. interests can arise suddenly, particularly in regional crises. America's Army must, therefore, be adaptable and remain a versatile, deployable, lethal and expansible force. It must continuously hone its skills to have the capability to deter and, if necessary, defeat decisively, with minimum U.S. casualties, threats wherever they originate.

ENDNOTES

1. Colonel James B. Motley, *Beyond the Soviet Threat: The U.S. Army In A Post-Cold War Environment*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, Lexington Books, 1991, PP.24-25.
2. *Foreign Affairs*, Winter 1992/93, p. 89.
3. Department of Defense, "National Military Strategy of the United States," January 1992, p. 6.
4. Dr. Lawrence K. Gershwin, "U.S. Interests Threatened for Next 20 Years from Mass Destruction Weapons," *ROA National Security Report*, January 1993, p. 24.
5. Gershwin, p. 24.
6. *New York Times*, January 11, 1993, p. A16.
7. *Newsweek*, December 28, 1992, p. 37.
8. *New York Times*, January 11, 1993, p. A1.
9. *New York Times*, January 11, 1993, p. A8.
10. *New York Times*, January 11, 1993, p. A16.
11. *New York Times*, January 15, 1993, p. A16; *The Washington Post*, January 2, 1993, p. A16.
12. Gershwin, p. 23.
13. *The Washington Post*, January 10, 1993, p. A23.
14. *The Washington Post*, January 10, 1993, p. A23.
15. Gershwin, p. 26.
16. *The Washington Post*, October 2, 1992, p. A40.
17. *Newsweek*, November 9, 1992, p. 6.
18. *The Washington Post*, January 1, 1993, p. A19.
19. Gershwin, pp. 25-26.
20. *The New York Times*, January 12, 1993, p. A6.
21. Lieutenant General Ira C. Owens, "Revolution in MI," *Army*, October, 1992, p. 165.
22. Owens, p. 165.
23. Dick Cheney, "Secretary of Defense, Annual Report to the President and the Congress." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, January 1991, pp. ix-x.
24. Dick Cheney, Secretary of Defense, "Military Forces in Transition." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, September 1991, Preface, p. 3.

Additional reference materials:

1. Department of the Army, "Army Focus," September 1992.
2. Department of the Army, "The Army Modernization Plan, Volume I," January 1993.
3. Department of the Army, "The Future Threat: Third World Technology Proliferation," undated.
4. Department of the Army, ODCSOPS Briefing, January 19, 1993.
5. Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Joint Military Net Assessment," March 1991.
6. Department of Defense, "National Military Strategy of the United States," December 9, 1992.

(This *Background Brief* was prepared by Colonel James B. Motley, USA Ret., PhD, an AUSA Institute of Land Warfare Research Fellow, and the ILW staff.)

###