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NonLethal Defense II Conference

Robert J. Bunker
Adjunct Professor, California State University, San Bernardino, California

The American Defense Preparedness Association held its NonLethal Defense II Conference 6 to 7 March 1996 in Tysons Corner, Virginia. The conference was sponsored by the US Atlantic Command (USACOM) in conjunction with the US Army, US Marine Corps, Office of the Secretary of Defense Office of Munitions, National Institute of Justice, Department of Energy, and Oak Ridge and Sandia National Laboratories. Colonel John Alexander, US Army, retired, the former program manager for Nonlethal Defense at Los Alamos National Laboratory, chaired the conference, which was divided into three sessions: "The Experience Factor," "The Requirements Equation" and "Implementation Initiatives and Challenges."

More than 250 government, military, law enforcement, industry and foreign embassy representatives attended, including the Honorable H. Allen Holmes, assistant secretary of defense, special operations and low-intensity conflict; Thomas M. Perdue, principal assistant deputy under secretary of defense, advanced technology; David Boyd, director, science and technology, National Institute of Justice; Marine General John J. Sheehan, USCOM commander in chief; Air Force Lieutenant General Lloyd W. Newton, assistant vice chief of staff; Marine Lieutenant General Anthony Zinni, commander, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force; and retired Army General Carl Stiner, member of the Advanced Research Projects Agency/Defense Science Board.

Conference participants drew the following conclusions:

- Law enforcement and peacekeeping operations are fundamentally the same, which explains why many nonlethal weapons being developed and fielded are considered dual-use weapons that can be used by both military and law enforcement personnel.
- In Somalia, some factions orchestrated events, such as nonlethal demonstrations, to make the United States look bad in the media or to get us to use our training against ourselves. In one instance, women and children were moved into a town. The women had hidden weapons under their skirts to give to local militia forces who infiltrated Mogadishu. Nonlethal weapons would give US commanders flexibility in confronting such situations.
- Because tear gas agents linger for months in confined environments, such as prisons, pepper spray is the preferred riot control agent.
- Army nonlethal weapons requirements are based on the premise that a lethal capability will never be sacrificed for a nonlethal capability. The safety of US soldiers is paramount.
- New rules of engagement (ROE) are needed for nonlethal weapons. In the past, nonlethal weapons use has been based on ROE for lethal force. A seamless transition between nonlethal and lethal force that allows the US military more flexibility in peacekeeping operations is needed.
- The US Coast Guard would be a natural nonlethal operational bridge between the Department of Defense (DOD) and civil law enforcement agencies because of its unique position as a dual-operations-based armed service.
- Assessing nonlethal weapons battle damage is difficult. It is impossible to tell if an opposing tank is faking a "soft kill." Practical warfighting experience suggests that advancing tank crews will fire on potential threat vehicles to ensure they do not pose a threat.
- Nonlethal weapons are viewed as critical tools that can be used across the operational spectrum because of the additional capabilities they provide. Given growing environmental security concerns, the United States is becoming increasingly responsible for post-battlefield cleanup.
- Although nonlethal weapons have great potential, they are underfunded. Future funding levels are uncertain.

In a Strategic Forum paper titled "Other Military Operations and Technology" released in November 1995 by the National Defense University, US Navy Rear Admiral Gary Wheatley, retired, states that nonlethal weapons have "generated considerable interest in the media and elsewhere; however, it is not a panacea and should be viewed as a two-edged sword . . . the concept of nonlethal weapons is misunderstood and has created expectations both in the media and the public that cannot be met. The popular view of nonlethal weapons has the expectation of no casualties. The reality is an attempt to avoid fatalities. This difference between expectations and reality may account for the public outrage expressed at police use of stun guns, or potential use of blinding lasers." DOD has since issued a statement against the use of blinding lasers.

Wheatley further states that "nonlethal weapons are not replacements for lethal force, and the use of nonlethal weapons should not prevent the use of lethal force if needed."

Tri-Service Environmental Technology Workshop

The US Army Environmental Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, hosted a Tri-Service Environmental Technology Workshop 20 to 22 May 1996 in Hershey, Pennsylvania. The workshop provided a training forum for exchanging environmental technology strategies, initiatives and demonstrations. A plenary session was followed by mature technology sessions in the soil, water, air, weapon systems and innovative applications areas. The workshop was open to Army, Navy, Air Force and Department of Defense personnel; other federal agency and contractor personnel; and academia and industry participants. For workshop highlights, call Sonya L. Herrin, Science and Technology Corporation, at (804) 865-7604, fax (804) 865-721 or e-mail: herrin@stnet.com.