

A Brazilian



U.S. Army (Iad A. Browning)

Strategic Outlook

By LUIZ PAULO MACEDO CARVALHO

The end of this millennium will go down as the era that witnessed the collapse of the Berlin Wall, the demise of the Soviet empire, and the termination of the Cold War, a period characterized by the repudiation of totalitarianism, the resurgence of democracy and nationalism, the awakening of the Pacific, and the geopolitics of economic blocks. Ruptures and changes have resulted from the clash of fragmentation and globalism. The Old World became a battlefield with the breakup of the former Yugoslavia, while Czechs peacefully separated from Slovaks. The escalation of ethno-nationalist violence,

compounded by religious fundamentalism and international terrorism, has no respect for borders. Narcoterrorism, underscoring the impact of organized crime on urban centers afflicted by migration, has emerged as a new social threat. The predominance of market economies and strengthening of trading blocks are cause to rethink the traditional concept of sovereignty.

Decline in the strategic importance of the nations of Latin America in the face of geopolitical quirks, except for the Caribbean, has turned them into outcasts. This has forced them to compete, without much hope, for a place among the megablocks with

transnational economic power. Thus, the heterogeneous freight train of Latin

America, lacking national reserves and foreign investment, lies motionless in the station of underdevelopment awaiting a mighty locomotive to pull it into the terminal of modernization. In the meantime, Latin America imports capital goods and technology and is an exporter of raw materials and cheap manufactured goods. It is also an attractive market. In Central and South America, a range of border disputes, the Malvinas, and multilateral interests in Antarctica contribute to political instability. In the Caribbean, the agonizing swan song of the Castro regime can already be heard.

The decline or collapse of nation-states can be anticipated with the formation of regional, continental, and extra-continental blocks or conglomerates. Paradoxically, there is a strengthening of nation-states in search of national identity as they witness the inability and lack of resources on the part of international organizations to resolve their disputes. This suggests that nation-states are too large to settle small controversies, yet too small to settle large ones.

The new international order still lacks clear definition, yet one finds no shortage of friction or threats to security. There is an assumption that no solutions exist without U.S. support, at least in the short term, although it appears that reason may prevail over might as we enter a new century.

A Cold Peace

Alternating periods of war and peace have been a feature of world history. Each generation perceives war as a solution to continuing conflicts, many fueled by self interest or a desire to reign over other men. The 20th century has been scourged by professional politicians who have failed to use reason to reduce tensions that caused two world wars. Since the fall of Rome, 75 percent of the deaths attributed to war have occurred in this century.

The end of the Cold War created a wave of euphoria based on the supposition that the threat of a nuclear holocaust was finally averted, leaving

Colonel Luiz Paulo Macedo Carvalho, Brazilian Army, is director of the Brazilian Geography and Military History Institute and the Brazilian Army Library.

mainly limited regional or local armed conflicts. **Augusta/Sikorsky helicopter.**

But the reality of the ensuing years has been a series of unexpected events: the Persian Gulf War, massacres in Somalia, armed conflict in Sudan, renewed fighting in Angola and Mozambique, the return of guerrillas in Namibia, ethnic disorders in South Africa, cease-fire violations in the eastern Sahara, separatism in Assam, Punjab, Kashmir, and Timor, chronic strife in Cambodia, continued carnage in Lebanon, civil war in Afghanistan, brutality in Bosnia, Russian genocide in Chechnya, further instability in El Salvador and Nicaragua, crisis in Haiti, border disputes between Ecuador and Peru as well as Colombia and Venezuela, clashes between Armenians and Azerbaijanis and Georgians, Abkhaz and Ossetes, Hutus and Tutsis, Kurds and Turks, Tamils and Sinhalese, and Israelis and Palestinians, and others. The world faces a torrent of conflicts even if they are legacies of the past.

The Gulf War did not eliminate the threat of conflict in an important strategic area, given the national interests of the "group of seven" (G-7)—Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, and United States. Moreover, the international community has responded differently to each threat that has emerged, showing no consistent strategy for peace after the Cold War. One reason is that present conflicts differ from those for which their forces were traditionally prepared. Another is that the world is undergoing a great transformation, and the international community has yet to redefine its role, thus generating mistrust among weak and less developed countries.

Today's insecurities are worsened by a range of uncertainties virtually unknown to previous generations. Numerous contemporary internal conflicts are a legacy of colonialism since the borders of half of the U.N. members were arbitrarily imposed by the colonial powers. Thus, it should come as no surprise that separatist and irredentist movements have surfaced.



Eduardo Pesce

In reality, the post Cold War era will be known by a specter of violent disaggregation of states that may lead to war. Unless the international community identifies and courageously faces the roots of conflicts resulting from noncompliance of individual human rights, disrespect towards racial identities, and sovereignty of national

the new world order assumes continuation of global military apartheid—disarmament of weak states in favor of the G-7

states, world violence as a whole will not diminish, and humanity will fail to correct its dangerous course.

Much has been said about disarmament, and progress has admittedly been made; however, development and production of modern weapon systems continues, especially in the industrialized northern hemisphere. Billions of dollars are still being spent in the sale of weapons from the First to the Third World. Other than the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention specifying the destruction of production facilities, no existing treaty calls for either dismantling or converting weapons plants. The new world order assumes continuation of global military apartheid—

that is, disarmament and reduction of the armed forces of weak states in favor of the G-7 nations which, under the pretense of U.N. sponsorship, would assure collective security. This could pose serious threats to the concept of national sovereignty.

Despite stabilization or reduction of nuclear arsenals, existing stockpiles still have enough power to annihilate all life on the planet. Moreover, no nuclear powers promise total elimination of atomic arsenals; yet they assume the right to prevent others from mastering the complete cycle of atom disintegration even for peaceful ends, since possessing nuclear weapons confers political and military status in diplomatic negotiations. Moreover, conventional weapons stockpiles are growing and proliferating which promotes instability. Europe is the most militarized region, in contrast to the Third World where unresolved conflicts fuel arms races in which 60 percent of the hardware comes from G-7 countries, a practice inconsistent with their advertised disarmament policies.

The image of blue helmets as global policemen is questionable. The General Assembly, which is dominated by many new and insignificant countries, has its decisions contested by the

great powers; likewise, the veto power of larger countries on the Security Council raises suspicion among smaller states. Moreover, lack of a permanent budget for peace operations, combined with growing debt and late contributions by numerous member states, exacerbates crises. Complicating matters is article 2 of the Friendly Nations Charter, which does not confer the authority to intervene in matters that essentially fall under the internal jurisdiction of a state. It is becoming

international law does not justify foreign intervention in internal matters

increasingly difficult to distinguish between internal and international conflicts and predict their repercussions. The concept of self-determination collides with that of humanitarian action.

The interpretation of international law, even in the face of serious human rights violations, does not justify foreign intervention in internal matters. Thus, even though it has never been stated absolutely, sovereignty becomes more important in terms of the rights and duties of states. Hence, it is no surprise that some alleged foreign intervention in weak states is not universally accepted. In the future, nations will be hard-pressed to justify such practices.

Finally, peacekeeping requires above all that peace be achieved, since powerful states only resolve questions pertaining to their interests, confirming La Fontaine's adage that the best reason is always that of the strongest. The days of amateurism are gone. Both diplomats and politicians have not been realists. The credibility of the United Nations will be compromised if conflicts are resolved for the economic and political interests of world powers or multinational corporations, to the detriment of universal principles of respect for human dignity. Such suspicions are based on the decisions taken by the Security Council, an organization that ignores human rights violations when convenient or uses them to justify interventions.

It is illusory to expect the United Nations to prevent every limited conflict from assuming violent and large-scale proportions. Deterrence alone, through effective employment of a powerful force when necessary, will guarantee the right of mankind to live in peace and liberty.

Future War

After both world wars, new international orders appeared with the creation of the League of Nations in Geneva (1919) and the United Nations in San Francisco (1945). The victors became keepers of the peace based on a balance of power. With the end of the Cold War, the United States emerged as the sole superpower, although it has shared this role with other G-7 members.

Accordingly, great wars will only be fought by more developed states. In other words, as we reach the end of the millennium, only the United States has the ability to fight and sustain a total nuclear war, a fact that in itself makes such an occurrence unlikely. Otherwise, full-scale conflicts between Third World countries would be avoided or resolved by U.S. predominance or G-7 global power, using the United Nations as a tool, or by international economic sanctions. If diplomatic negotiations or economic pressures fail, then a U.N.-sponsored force would be employed with the consent of the Security Council. However, such coveted universal peace remains far from a reality.

Scientific and technological breakthroughs in the coming decades will produce significant material developments which will change the nature of warfare, with profound implications for the structure and the employment of armed forces.

- State-of-the-art, high precision conventional weapons must replace nuclear weapons of similar destructive power, without their malignant and devastating consequences.

- The line distinguishing nuclear and conventional weapons will disappear.

- Automated, computerized, high precision weapon systems will be available, carrying more powerful explosives and highly penetrating munitions and possessing electronic components and target acquisition

and targeting equipment capable of processing data at incredible speeds.

- Microelectronics will allow the further development of invisible weapons of extreme automatic precision. The main limiting factor will be the high cost.

- The art of war will undergo profound changes.

- Vertical coordination will gain greater importance: ground forces, traditionally supported by aircraft, will trade roles and support air operations. Consequently, the role of naval air forces will be reconsidered.

- There will be no need to find and totally destroy enemy combat, political, and economic power—or to break enemy will by employing massive ground forces and occupying its territory.

- Precision attacks against previously selected targets, using stand-off strategic weaponry, will reduce casualties and collateral damage but lead to disintegration of an enemy political system because of severe damage to industrial and power facilities, communication centers, transportation networks, and populations. Such weapons will not distinguish civilians from soldiers.

- Electronic warfare and intelligence will become especially important.

- Operations will be considerably shortened.

- Command, control, and communications (C³) will be extremely valuable.

- Air defenses will have to be modernized to counter invisible high precision weapon systems, undetected even by radar under adverse weather and visibility conditions.

- The computer will dominate the battlefield; accordingly, victory will lean toward the side with effective information systems, operated by highly qualified specialists in data processing, that exceed enemy command and control capabilities.

- Data automation will eliminate excessive manpower and require well-trained personnel in relatively smaller numbers.

- Aircraft will give way to unmanned aerospace vehicles.

- Smart weapons will replace conventional and nuclear ones. However, nuclear weapons might be used in desperate situations, which will attract new members to the atomic club with comparatively primitive systems and limited stockpiles.

- Combined operations will reach their apex through increased aerospace and naval power.

- Space will be a decisive factor.

Most states cannot stay abreast of the scientific and technological developments as applied to the art of war



Exército do Brasil

To address the appropriate role of the armed forces in society, it is necessary to know how they are institutionalized. This requires a knowledge of their lawful missions—in other words, their constitutional role and goals. Generically executable missions are permanent in almost all armed forces and are only distinguished by the political and ideological connotations imposed on them by their legal role.

The role of the armed forces is a function of the regime and the times; hence, it varies with political fluctuations. While in some nations military expression is institutionally adapted to one party or the personal power of a discretionary ruler, in democratic states the law normally decrees that the armed forces guarantee a regime legitimized by popular representation. Their role therefore changes only when a new group assumes power and sets a new course. Examples include passage of the Tzar's forces to the Soviets and their return to the Russian nation; democratic transformation of Nazi and socialist military institutions into a reunited Germany; the greatness of the military role in the United States and Britain; and the tumultuous history of many Ibero-American regimes.

When a people achieve the level of nationhood and create the state, one of its essential traits is maintaining independence and ensuring that national will is not subjected to any outside powers. The state also underwrites the supremacy of internal order—interpreted as the inherent power of the state to impose itself on the other institutional powers within its territory.

In keeping with Brazilian constitutional tradition, article 142 of the current constitution states that the armed forces are permanent and regular national institutions and destined for the defense of the homeland, the guarantee of constitutional powers, and the maintenance of law and order. This role is consistent with the nation's level of political evolution. But maintaining law and order is not within the scope of the armed forces in some countries.

which forces them to accept the new order imposed by the larger powers. Weaker states can only fight limited or regional small wars, using conven-

despite international peacekeeping, there is no justification for converting Third World armed forces into militias

tional weapons or old nuclear and chemical weapons to counter the power of the strongest countries.

For some time, an astonished world will witness hostilities among emerging nations that risk peace. The new international order—in which any military institution unable to take part in an unrestrained arms race is viewed as a national guard or militia dependent on the great powers under the shield of international organizations— anxiously awaits a new strategy.

Armed Forces

Although the world may be less dangerous politically, it is more complex economically and faces greater risks of conflict. Great wars may be averted, but fierce economic competition warns of dangers arising from a widespread loss of control which degenerates into armed conflict. Thus,

despite the contributions of international organizations to peacekeeping, there is no justification for converting Third World armed forces into militias.

No outside system can suppress all the tension afflicting unjust societies that lack the means to maintain order and secure their place on the world stage. Hungry, ignorant, and socially inferior combatants cannot resist the onslaught of developed and better trained adversaries. Without good health and education, no armed force will be able to ensure respect and stability among states.

Years ago, Adlai Stevenson stated at the United Nations that we do not envision a world devoid of conflict. Regardless of how war evolves in the new world order at the dawn of the next century, the universal and enduring role of armed forces remains constant: to deter aggression, defend the homeland, and guarantee law and order both internally and externally. Thus the role of the armed forces must be consistent with the goals of society in general. Militaries are extensions of the societies to which they belong, which is why they are national institutions. Any disharmony between the armed forces and society can hamper stability, liberty, and social peace.



U.S. Navy (Catherine T. Hogan)

Defense of the homeland means integrating and protecting national territory and democratic institutions of the representative regime, federation, and republic from aggression, be it internal or external, overt or covert. The guarantee of constitutional powers specifies providing security to the executive, legislature, and judiciary so they may conduct their legal responsi-

the first inviolable commitment of the armed forces is defense of the nation

bilities, independently and harmoniously, free from any type of pressure. The guarantee of law and order is summarized as enforcing respect for established legal norms or those derived from them, which puts the armed forces in a peculiar position. Even if the law did not prescribe such a role, society would find it difficult to accept the military being impassive in times of chaos. It would be illogical and utopian for the state to forego the use of force in the face of an external or internal threat. The old aphorism that the armed forces should be a giant mute only finds acceptance among the ill-intentioned. The incapability of speech is an organic handicap that must not become a military attribute.

The first inviolable commitment of the armed forces is defense of the nation—its moral and material patrimony, territorial integrity, political-economic independence, and institutions. Second, the military is required for the collective defense of the American continents against aggression. Hemispheric stability resides in the preservation of peace from north to south. Finally, the armed forces are the instrument for meeting the international commitment to maintain world peace among nations. These three objectives summarize the basic missions of Brazilian military institutions.

Without hampering missions established by constitutional decree, the armed forces carry out activities of military interest in scientific-technological, economic, and social areas where there is a lack of participation from the private or governmental sectors. They also support civil defense in disaster relief, emergencies, or humanitarian assistance.

During a seminar on "Army Education Policy for the Year 2000" held under the auspices of the Brazilian army staff and including military personnel and civilians from the First World, there was unanimous consent that the generic roles of armed forces consist of defending the homeland, participating in multinational forces to

support collective security, and providing relief assistance in catastrophes and emergencies. It has become clear that in all countries the military forms the basic element of coercive organization that serves the law.

Resting on the shoulders of the armed forces—on their structural efficiency, training, and respectability—is social peace in the international arena and national prestige in the commonwealth of nations. Hence, they are material safeguards of both the existence of a sovereign state and the achievement of its goals. It is on their power that the status and self-determination of the state rely in national and international crises. Thus, we cannot accept the notion of entrusting the defense of the state to alliances or third parties, nor rely on mercurial decisions by international organizations to assure national integrity.

Regardless of whether the world feels less threatened in the aftermath of the Cold War, the military is less dispensable than ever in the new world order. It is a permanent national institution whose roles—originating in the constitution—remain universal and largely unchanged and cannot be relegated to militias, other states, or international organizations. Were this not so, the principles of sovereignty and self-determination, the foundation of international law, the declaration of human rights and duties, and the U.N. charter would be compromised. **JFQ**

An extended version of this article was published in the Portuguese-language edition of *Military Review* (vol. 75, 3rd quarter 1995, pp. 35–44) under the title of "O Papel das Forças Armadas no Século XXI." JFQ is grateful to Coronel Alvaro de Souza Pinheiro, Brazilian Liaison Officer, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center, for providing this English translation.