Has the United States Army Military Intelligence Corps Effectively Evolved in Order to Deal with Today's Threats to US National Security in a Changing Global Environment?

Robert Rivera

New Jersey City University

Table of Contents

Table contents 2

Chapter One 4

Background to the Study 4

Statement of the Problem 4

Objectives of the Study 5

Broad Objective 5

Specific Objectives 5

Scope of the Study 5

Research Questions 5

Limitations 6

Chapter Two: Literature Review 7

Introduction 7

How it was Developed/Conceived. 7

How it Expanded/Contracted Since its Inception 9

How the Current Structure Compares to Pre 9/11 16

Chapter Three: Research Methods and Methodology 18

Introduction 18

Research Design 18

Study Population 18

Sample Size 18

Data Collection Tools and Procedures 18

Data Analysis and Presentation 18

Ethical Considerations 19

Chapter Four: References 20

Chapter One

1.0Background to the Study

The United States adopts a rapidly changing security measures in the new environment. The country is relocating its focus on the opportunities and strategic challenges that will determine its future among other nations. Some of the challenges include rising of new centers of power and technologies. The world has also grown more unpredictable, volatile, and in some occasions more hostile to the United States. The partners and allies of the US in the different parts of the world face the same security threats due to their support of the America policies on global insecurity. Violence and unrest in the regions create an environment that is sectarian and extremist that threats the safety of American citizens in the regions. The current threats have evolved creating an imbalance in the air, sea and land domains of warfare. Cyber crimes have also created a new risk in security matters considering that new technologies in terms or software and hardware are being established to counter measures put to fight insecurity (Charles, 2005).

1.1Statement of the Problem

In addressing the changing strategic environment, the United States mainly relies on its comparative advantages to influence and curb insecurity scenarios. The advantages include its economic strength, its sturdy network of partnerships and alliances, and its military technological edge and human capital. The military perspective provides the opportunity on what took place in the previous generations and what is expected of the coming centuries. The approach will require incomparable security agility in how the country security agencies prepare, shape, prepare and posture measures to curb insecurity at the local, national and international levels. The United States Army Military Intelligence Corps has

taken the necessary steps to facilitate how each strategy is to be implemented to protect the citizens at the different regions of the country and world (Don & David, 2002). **Has the United States Army Military Intelligence Corps effectively evolved in order to deal with today's threats to US National Security in a changing global environment?**

1.2Objectives of the Study

1.2.1Broad Objective

The broad objective of this study will be to identify the areas in which are affecting security and the manner through which the government can implement to protect the citizens. The study will also provide areas that can be implemented towards the improvement of laws and adhering to the already set up legislations that protect citizens in curbing insecurity challenges and protection of the citizens and the country in general.

1.2.2Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this study will include:

1. To find out the already set up organs in the US towards protecting citizens in the country and how they relate to the global environment.
2. To find out whether the laws established have the capability to protect the different bodies of intelligence and services
3. To find out the loopholes or challenges that are present the given security bodies before and after the 9/ii incidence.

1.3Scope of the Study

The research seeks to address the different measures put in place by the United States Army Military Intelligence Corps to tackle security matters in the country threatened by terror attacks in the current changes in the environment.

1.4Research Questions

1) How was the United States Army Military Intelligence Corps developed/conceived?

2) How has this Organization expanded/contracted since its inception through today?

3) How does the current structure compare to pre 9/11 staffing, policy, and organization?

1.5Limitations

1 Lack of mutual aid from the state intelligence bodies and service providers since most of them will be hiding their national secrets under the notion of national security.

2 Budget constrains because the research will involve travelling expenses and printing of questionnaires

3 Response asymmetry: this may result in inaccuracy since most office on realizing that a research is being carried out may give responses that do not reflect the true situation on the ground in the name of protecting the national secrets of any intelligence body.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

2.0Introduction

The Military Intelligence Corps is one of the branches of the United States Army. Its history towards the development of the branch started in the eighteenth century. In the year 1885, the US Army established the Military Intelligence Division (MID) to handle its intelligence issues. In 1903, changes occurred and the Military Intelligence Division was positioned under a new general human resource in a superior position. In March 1942, the MID was then re-structured and recognized as the Military Intelligence Service (MIS). The new structure originally consisted of just 26 personnel to start its functions but was later expanded to a large number of 1,000 recruited personnel and civilians, and 342 officers. The new intelligence branch was tasked with the collecting, disseminating and analyzing of data and information for intelligence purposes (Charles, 2002).

The new branch initially included an administrative group, an operations group and a counter intelligence group. The three groups supported all the measures used to curb insecurity in the country at the time before the rise of global concerns was established in the years to come. In July1967, a number of security and intelligence organizations in the country were merged to form the military intelligence branch at the time. The United States Army Military Intelligence Corps base was established in 1971 at Fort Huachuca in Arizona. The region became the home of the military intelligence in the country. In 1977, another measure was taken where the merged military bodies recombined with the Army Security Agency and Army Intelligence Agency to become the US Army Intelligence and Security Command (Matthew, 2004).

2.1How it was Developed/Conceived.

In 1987, the United States Army Military Intelligence Corps was promoted as a division under the United States Army Regimental System. The entire United States Army Military Intelligence workforces are associated with the Military Intelligence Corps. The most important mission of the military intelligence in the United States Army is to provide accurate, relevant and timely support. The branch also harmonizes intelligence and electronic conflict support to operational, strategic, and strategic-level commanders in their respective units. The intelligence components produced are both for the Army use and for sharing across the national intelligence community in the different parts of the world (Brian, 2005).

It is estimated that approximately 3,800 civilian personnel and 28,000 military work forces are involved in intelligence duties that comprise the United States Army Military Intelligence Corps. Some of the key components of the branch include the following:

a) Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Intelligence (G-2). This office acts as the army's Chief Intelligence Officer. The responsibilities of the office include policy planning formulation, programming and management. The office also budgets, supervise staff members, evaluate and oversight the intelligent activities. It further coordinates the overall application of the major intelligence disciplines.
b) The United States Army Intelligence and Security Command. This is the main intelligence command unit of the branch. It is located at Fort Belvoir in Virginia.
c) The United States Army Military Intelligence Readiness Command. This is considered as the Army Reserve's intelligence command. The branch is also located at Fort Belvoir in Virginia.

d) The Excellence. This is the army school it conducts professional training for all the military intelligence employees in the country. It is located at Fort Huachuca in Arizona(Charles, 2002).

2.2How it Expanded/Contracted Since its Inception

For a proper security evolution to succeed, the organization must balance, update and integrate all the tools of intelligence within the country and coordinate with the allies and partner. The United States Army Military Intelligence Corps must maintain its usual superiority over other countries in relation to curbing insecurity and protecting citizens. Technology has created another monster, nuclear weapons, that force the country to enhance its nuclear disincentive capability (Michael &Michael, 2002). The organization prevents the security threats while continuing to facilitate its ability to defeat asymmetric terrorization, defend access to the international commons, and supporting partners. The organization encourages the investment in development capabilities and diplomacy and institutions that support the ideology in a way that harmonizes and strengthens the country's global allies and partners (John, 2003).

The United States Army Military Intelligence Corps intelligence capabilities must constantly evolve to recognize and illustrate asymmetric and conventional risks and provide the needed timely insight to fight insecurity. The ideas taken from the past are to integrate its strategy to homeland security with the broader national security strategy. The intelligence body is improving the incorporation of capabilities and skills within its civilian institutions and military institution. The idea behind it being that the two groups can operate seamlessly and complement each other in the different functions they will be handling(Dana, 2004). The organization is improving synchronized policy-making and planning and must build the

American's capacity in key areas where security challenges fall short. The need for such measures requires a close collaboration with the Congress for proper legislations on security matters and protocols made. An inclusive and well-planned interagency process boosts the United States Army Military Intelligence Corps to achieve integration of the efforts to execute and monitor policies, operations, and strategies. To instigate the effort by the organization, the national government merged the personnel of the Homeland Security Council and the National Security Council as a measure to reduce the flow of information to the minimal hierarchies as possible (Warren, Richard & Jamie, 2003). The merging took place but, work remains to encourage coordination across agencies and departments in the country that are considered with security. The new organization in the current scenarios of warfare facing countries has identified some steps that have either been expanded or contracted. The approach is to ensure effective alignment of resources with the national sand federal governments' security strategies, the evolving training and education of national security professionals so as to equip them to face the modern changing challenges, evaluating the authorities used and the means to comprehend and run aid schemes, and other programs and policies that strengthen coordination. Some of the areas affected since 1971 to date include the following:

a) Defense: The United States Army Military Intelligence Corps is strengthening America's military power to guarantee that it can prevail in the current wars. Some of the expansion made to deter and prevent insecurity threats against the United States includes expanding the interests, of the allies and partners; and it is also prepared to defend the country in an extensive variety of contingencies against the state and non-state actors. The organization constantly continues to re-balance the country's military

abilities to excel at stability operations, counterinsurgency, counterterrorism, and meeting the increasingly complicated security terrorization, while guarantying the organization is prepared to address the full range of armed services (Patrick, 2005). The balancing include planning for increasingly refined enemies, defeating and deterring hostility in anti-access regions, and protecting the country, and supporting civil personnel at home. The organization has also realized the important role played by men and women who volunteer in the America's All-Volunteer force for their service to curb insecurity in the country. The expansion of the organization to outsource from volunteer areas has shown tremendous adaptability, resilience, and capacity for innovation. The groups of persons provide the organization service members who are long-term resources on personnel aspect. The members will be worked on when the time comes to establish the need of succeeding and rededicating the organization to fight insecurity nationality and internationally. The measures for long-term services will mean that people are forced to provide care and support for wounded veterans, warriors, and the left military families in their areas of service in the country (Laura, 2003). The United States Army Military Intelligence Corps has also set on a path to apply sustainable deployment cycles among soldiers, and protects and enhances the long-term viability of the force through successful recruitments, retentions, and recognition of those who serve well in the specific areas. .

b) Diplomacy: Diplomacy is another aspect in the new generation of fighting insecurity. It is fundamental to the national security as a defense capability in the organization. The country's diplomats are considered the first people on the line of engagement. Diplomats listen to partners' suggestions, learn from allies on intelligence approaches,

build the respect needed for one another during wartime, and seek common ground for fighting insecurity. The new warfare environment has forced the organization to promote diplomatic approaches, develop experts, and support the United States Government towards working side by side to promote a common agenda in sharing intelligence (John, 2003). New skills are required to encourage effective relations to connect, convene, and mobilize international organizations and other government security interested bodies. The approach is also applied to non-state actors such as foundations, corporations, universities, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), faith-based organizations, and think tanks. These private bodies are increasingly having a distinct role to play on both development and diplomatic issues that relate to insecurity in the new environment of terror activities. The organization in support of the government activities has accomplished such goals in the diplomatic missions and work force through expanding the task force at home branches and abroad offices. The approach is primarily to support the increasingly global nature of the 21st century security risks in the country and other nations. By understanding such logistics, the organization further provides for the appropriate systems and mechanisms to employ and coordinate supporting programs. The systems will also facilitate the growth of the civilian expeditionary ability as required to assist the government on its different array of security issues.

c) Economic: The organization has realized that economic institutions are also critical gear of the national government's capacity to fight insecurity. The economic sustainable instruments offer the bedrock of sustainable national prosperity, growth, and influence. The Office of the Federal Reserve Board, the United States Trade

Representative Management and Budget, the Departments of the Treasury, Commerce, State, Energy, and Agriculture, and other institutions are vital institutions to the organization when it comes to fighting security threats (John, Lynn & Timothy, 2003). They help manage trade, currency, inflation, foreign investment, deficit, productivity, and national competitiveness within the region and at the international level. The organization has also expanded on the need to remain a vibrant current economic power so as to create a close relationship among and between emerging nations and developed nations. The idea behind such an approach is that the global economy requires partners and allies to trade for intelligence and business opportunities to curd insecurity challenges (Keith, 2002). America, like any other state, is a dependent of other overseas markets to trade its products and then maintain access to the scarce resources and merchandise from other nations. The finding of an overlapping joint economic significance within other countries and maintaining the economic relations are some of the key elements taken by the organization to concentrate on national security strategies in the new warfare environment.

d) Development: The organization also encourages development at the different sectors of the country. Development is an economic, strategic, and moral imperative. The United States Army Military Intelligence Corps is also focused on assisting some developing countries and their citizens to supervise security threats. The organization also intends to inform the new allies on how to reap for benefits of international economic growth, and setting in place democratic and accountable institutions that serve the basic human needs of the members (John, Lynn & Timothy, 2003). The realizations of an affirmative and aggressive development agenda in the 21st century

will commensurate resources in the respective areas. Also strengthening the global partners will assist the country to counter the global terror groups and stop conflicts; build a stable that will ensure security for all American nationals in the world. An inclusive worldwide economy with the new foundations of prosperity; advancement in human rights democracy will position the country to address the key global security challenges (Keith, 2002).The organization also assists the government in growing ranks of democratic, capable, and prosperous, countries that can be allies and partners in the years to come. The organization also plays a role in the expansion of the civilian progress capability; appealing with global financial bodies that influence the country's resources and advance its objectives. The organization further encourages the national and federal governments to pursue a development budget that is more likely to reflect its policies and strategies, but not the sector earmarks; and ensures that its policies instruments are in support of security measures to promote development objectives (Warren, Richard & Jamie, 2003).

e) Homeland Security: Homeland security as a role played by the organization traces its foundation to the historic and traditional functions of a given government. Some of the recognized roles in past included civil defense, law enforcement, emergency response, customs making, border patrols and immigration controls. After the 9/11 incidence, the organization took drastic steps and formed the Department of Homeland Security (Keith, 2002). The initial general functions of the government took a new urgency and organization to adapt to the changes in the terror new tactics in the global scene. Homeland security strives to adapt the traditional functions of security bodies to confront the new risks and evolving hostile cells of terror groups.

The expansion taken to curb insecurity matters takes both the government and the civilians' efforts to coordinate and appreciate their support. The organization encourages homeland security to approach security matters through a shared effort to interdict and identify threats; to deny any hostile group the capability to operate within the country's borders; to maintain an effective management of the physical borders; to maintain a lawful trade and travel practice into and out of the country; to dismantle and disrupt global terrorist groups; and ensure that there is national flexibility at the onset of any the threat and hazards identified. The efforts identified by the organization in collaboration with the Homeland Security branch must support a motherland that is secure and safe from any activity of terrorism and other threats and in which United States interests, way of life and inspirations can thrive (Brian, 2005).

f) Intelligence: The United States Army Military Intelligence Corps has mainly relied on the country's prosperity and safety in intelligence. The quality of the intelligence the organization and other related bodies collect, the analysis produced from gathered data, the ability to share and evaluate the information and data in a timely manner, and the ability to counter intelligence threats. The aspects of intelligence under the current systems established in the organization offer relevant strategic intelligence that forms executive decisions (Kathleen, 2005). The intelligence gathered supports the homeland security, local, state, tribal governments, the States troops, and critical national missions across the global scene. The organization is still working to improve the integration of the Intelligence Community and at the same time enhancing the capabilities of the Intelligence Community members to function properly on terror

concerns. The organization is also strengthening the country's partnerships with other foreign intelligence services across the world and still maintaining strong ties with its close allies and partners. The other step has also been to the continuous investment in the women and men of the Intelligence Community in the country (Douglas, 2005).

g) Strategic Communications: the organization has made changes in the communication channels involving security threats of terror nature in the new environmental security dispensation. Effective and strategic communications are important to the sustenance of international legality and supporting the policies aimed at curbing insecurity aspects in the world. The organization has promoted the alignment of the States' actions with its words as a shared responsibility that must be promoted by the practice of communication throughout national and federal governments. The government through the organization must also be more efficient in its purposeful communication and engagement (Rick, 2004). The approach will ensure that the government does a better job of understanding the opinions, attitudes, grievances, and concerns of the people in the elite and general groups. Such steps allow the country to convey credible and reliable messages, and to develop the necessary effective plans. The organization will also have a better understanding on how the actions taken for security measures will be perceived at the national and international levels. The organization also uses a broad range of systems for communicating with other foreign nationals (Douglas, 2005).

2.3How the Current Structure Compare to Pre 9/11

The 9/11 incidence in the US provided a challenge to the government in terms or terrorists threats unlike any other natural challenges that faced the country in the previous

years. The first step change in structure was how the White House officials addressed the nation in terms of security threats in case a new scenario arises. The Homeland Security department was upgraded to be fully functional and independent on security measures that require faster and immediate action. The office of the president offered the necessary financial support to the branch in terms of financial and staff personnel. The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) are required to share their information with the new agency to curb insecurity matters especially of terror magnitude. The Homeland Security was established by law to support the intelligence branch of the country to fight insecurity challenges (Keith, 2002).

Chapter Three: Research Methods and Methodology

3.0Introduction

This chapter deals with the methods and methodology that will be used during data collection.

3.1Research Design

The research will take the approach of qualitative nature. It will engage establishing US obligations towards protecting citizens as well as to find out whether the set legislations conform to international minimum requirements. In addition this research shall attempt to find solutions and recommendations on how the country can strike a balance between enhancing protection to the traders and consumers in relation to their civil and social rights.

3.2Study Population

This study will target different security bodies that acquire services and intelligence that relate to the established organizations in the country.

3.3Sample Size

An approximate number of 30 personnel in the security sector will be used.

3.4Data Collection Tools and Procedures

This research will involve the use focused group conducted researches with the aid of documented articles for data collection.

3.5Data Analysis and Presentation

Data collected from the security bodies study will be analyzed both electronically and manually by use of computers.

Data will be presented in form of descriptive design such as tables, pie charts and graphs.

3.6Ethical Considerations

The given respondents will be informed that information obtained from them will not be available to persons outside the study team and assured that no personal identification will be used for population.

The data collected will only be used for the study purpose. The information collected will then be destroyed after analysis of the study undertaken. This study will also be carried out only with the permission of relevant authorities.

Chapter Four: References

Charles Perrow (2005) "Using Organizations: The Case of FEMA," *Homeland Security Affairs*.

Charles Perrow (2005, March). "Organizational or Executive Failure?" *Contemporary Sociology*, 34

Charles R. Wise (2002), "Organizing for homeland security," *Public Administration Review*, 62

Dana Millbank (2004, March 22). "FBI budget squeezed after 9/11: request for new counter-terror funds cut by two thirds," *Washington Post*

Don R. Van Natta & David Johnston (2002, June 2). "Wary of risk, slow to adapt, FBI stumbles in terror war," *New York Times*

Donald F. Kettl (2004).*Systems Under Stress: Homeland Security and American Politics* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press,

Matthew Brzezinski (2004). *Fortress America: An Inside Look at the Coming Surveillance State* (New York: Bantam Dell Publishing Group

Michael Hirsh and Michael Isikoff (2002, May 27), "What went wrong," *Newsweek*

John V. Parchini, Lynn E. Davis & Timothy Liston (2003).*Homeland Security: A Compendium of Public and Private Organizations' Policy Recommendations*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation

Keith Bea (2002, July 29), "Proposed transfer of FEMA to the Department of Homeland Security," *Congressional Research Service*.

Warren B. Rudman, Richard A. Clarke & Jamie F. Metzl (2003).*Emergency responders:*

drastically under-funded, dangerously unprepared. Washington, D.C.: Council on Foreign Relations

Patrick S. Roberts, "Shifting priorities: Congressional incentives and the homeland security granting process," *Review of Policy Research*, 22, July 2005, 437-49.

Laura Blumenfeld (2003), "Former aide takes aim at war on terror," *Washington Post*,

John Mintz(2003, September 7). "Homeland Security is struggling," *Washington Post*,

Kathleen Tierney (2005), "The 9/11 Commission and Disaster Management: Little Depth, Less Context, Not Much Guidance," *Contemporary Sociology*, 34

Richard Sylves and William R. Cumming, "FEMA's Path to Homeland Security: 1979-2003," *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management* 1, no. 2 (2004).

Richard A. Clarke (2004), *Against All Enemies: Inside America's War on Terror* (New York: Free Press

Rick Shernkman(2004, February 26), "Think again: Whatever happened to Homeland Security?" Center for American Progress

Douglas Jehl (2005, October 15). "Little authority for new intelligence post," *New York Times*

Brian Ross (2005, March 9). "Secret FBI report questions al Qaeda capabilities," *ABC News*