

---

# Collective Security

By

The Honorable Dick Cheney  
Secretary of Defense

[The following is an extract from the *Annual Report of the Secretary of Defense to the President and Congress*, February 1992, pp. 15-19.]

## INTRODUCTION

As we move into the post-Cold War era, we must recognize that our alliances remain profoundly important. Working with countries that share our fundamental values and security concerns helps to protect vital U.S. national interests, and collective security arrangements are an essential component of the U.S. national security strategy. Our security alliances provide a clear demonstration of our commitments, help to deter potential aggressors, enhance regional stability by lowering the levels of armaments and the potential for conflict, reduce expenditures, and reassure allies that they do not have to rely solely on their own resources in order to protect themselves from external threats. In these ways, our alliance relationships provide an essential underpinning for freedom, democracy, and economic development based on market principles.

Our security relationships take many forms, depending on the nature of the shared interests. They include industrial base and weapon development cooperation, overseas basing and access agreements, demonstrations of military capability to deter regional threats, training to enhance defense capabilities, and where necessary joint or combined deployment of military forces. Such arrangements facilitate communications and interoperability with allied military forces, are essential for forward presence, support our crisis response capabilities, and defend our mutual national interests.

## ALLIANCE AGREEMENTS AND DEFENSE RELATIONS

The United States has security agreements with many countries around the world including seven formal alliances (See Table). In addition, we have other less formal arrangements. The vital importance of these non-treaty relationships was demonstrated by the cooperation and assistance provided to the Coalition during the Persian Gulf crisis, which reflected the positive success of decades of effort to build cooperative security relationships with many countries in the region and around the world.

Cooperation makes it possible to reduce duplication with and among allies and thus conserves scarce defense resources. The U.S. armed forces have unique capabilities, which can enhance the security of our allies. It is equally true that some of our allies maintain assets that can make a significant contribution to a coalition effort. Alliance arrangements have made possible host-nation support and other arrangements to share the mutual defense burden, which reduce the cost of forward presence on the U.S. taxpayer and make it possible to reach agreements on sharing responsibilities and roles with allies and friends.

---

## FORMAL U.S. ALLIANCES

- The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Alliance
- The Australia-New Zealand-United States (ANZUS) Treaty (U.S. obligations to New Zealand currently are suspended as a result of New Zealand's decision to ban U.S. nuclear-powered and nuclear-capable ships from its ports)  
  
The Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan
- The Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and Republic of Korea
- The Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines
- The Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (which remains in effect on a bilateral basis with Thailand)
- The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (the Rio Treaty)

NATO continues to provide an indispensable foundation for a stable security environment in Europe. It is adapting creatively to the revolutionary changes in the European security environment brought about by the demise of the Warsaw Pact and the end of the Cold War. This process, launched at the London Summit in July 1990, reached a new milestone at the NATO Summit in Rome this past November. There, the alliance agreed on a new strategic concept that encompasses both cooperation with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the concept of defense and dialogue. While NATO is maintaining the integrated military force structure to meet the need for collective defense, the new strategic concept calls for those forces to be more flexible, more mobile, and multinational in character.

The United States believes that the emergence of a distinct European security identity within the context of transatlantic relations is compatible with NATO. For this reason, the United States is prepared to support arrangements needed for the expression of a common European security and defense policy. The United States and its alliance partners endorsed at the NATO Rome Summit of November 1991 a complementary European security architecture consisting of NATO, the CSCE, the European Community, the West European Union, and the Council of Europe. Although complementary, the summit declaration confirmed that NATO should remain the primary focus for consultation with our European allies and for the formulation of policies regarding the security and defense commitments of NATO members. In addition, the United States continues to seek agreements with its NATO allies to achieve equity in sharing the costs of roles, risks, and responsibilities of the common defense.

The United States will continue to work with allies in East Asia and the Pacific to sustain bilateral security arrangements. In 1991, the United States and Japan agreed on a new host-nation support arrangement under which Japanese contributions will cover all foreign labor and utility costs. By 1995, Japan will be paying more than 70 percent of our stationing costs, excluding military salaries. The value of the cost-sharing agreement with Japan will be about \$17 billion over the next five years. No other ally pays as much as Japan in support of our forward-based forces.

---

Despite the recent unprecedented "Agreement between North and South Korea on Reconciliation, Nonaggression, and Exchange," the Korean Peninsula remains, for the moment, the most likely scene for the eruption of conflict in Asia. The North Korean nuclear weapons development program poses the most dangerous threat to peace in the region. North Korea remains under the autocratic control of a communist dictator. U.S. forces deployed on the peninsula act to deter North Korea, but should hostilities erupt the United States remains committed to fulfill its treaty obligations for the defense of the Republic of Korea. The Republic of Korea's host-nation support contribution has grown between 1989 and 1992 from \$45 million to \$180 million. South Korea is also moving to assume the leading role in its own defense.

Following the successful conclusion of the war in the Persian Gulf, the United States has pursued expanded defense arrangements with the Gulf States that will better address the security needs of the region when implemented. The primary objectives of these arrangements are to deter future aggression in the region and, if deterrence fails, to be in a better position to respond to a crisis than we were in August 1990. U.S. interests in the area necessitate international cooperation based on the principle of collective security with the nations of the region, as well as with our Western allies. Towards that goal, the United States recently signed defense cooperation agreements with Kuwait and Bahrain; these agreements are in addition to the long-standing agreement with Oman. We continue to explore similar arrangements with other friendly countries in the region.

Access to facilities in the nations of sub-Saharan Africa made an important contribution to the Coalition effort during Operation DESERT STORM, both for the United States and for the other Coalition forces. Such access would have been even more important had the conflict been prolonged. The nations with whom the United States has formal and informal access agreements (which include Djibouti, the Gambia, Kenya, Liberia, Senegal, and Seychelles) face enormous problems. Failure of the Western nations to promote stability in Africa could result in disruption in the production or distribution of strategically important resources and could reduce access to facilities important to regional contingencies.

The United States cooperates with countries in Latin America to promote our common security and democratic consolidation. Over the past decade, nearly all nations in Latin America have made substantial progress towards democracy and free markets, but a notable exception is Cuba, where an isolated ruler continues to adhere to a discredited communist ideology.

Recognizing that national security and economic security are indivisible, the United States has signed trade and investment framework agreements with the overwhelming majority of Latin American countries under President Bush's Enterprise for the Americas Initiative. In addition, Latin American military officers and civilian executive branch officials are being trained in the United States to plan, program, and organize defense budgets. The United States is working to make the region safer by encouraging full adherence to the Treaty of Tlatelolco (concerning nuclear nonproliferation), International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards, and guidelines of the Missile Technology Control Regime.

The Panama Canal Treaty and the Treaty on Permanent Neutrality of and Operation of the Panama Canal provide for a partnership between the United States and Panama in operating and defending the canal. We are proceeding on a schedule to transition to full Panamanian control of the canal in 1999.

## **INTERNATIONAL DEFENSE COOPERATION**

The Department of Defense considers international defense industrial cooperation to be a significant element of the U.S. acquisition process. By taking advantage of the growing

---

technological capabilities of our allies, we can make more efficient use of scarce defense resources. Allies have unique capabilities of value to the United States, and joint projects can provide stability in production through sales, coproduction, cooperative development, and logistic support efforts. This cooperative approach promotes modernization, reduces research and development expenses, improves access to technology, and makes it possible to achieve economies of scale. These economic relationships with allies strengthen the U.S. defense alliance relationships with them.

The importance of cooperative weapon development programs will grow. Tighter alliance defense budgets will reduce the resources available for weapon development and procurement. At the same time, the technological capabilities of our allies should continue to grow. Accordingly, such cooperation will remain an integral aspect of our overall defense acquisition strategy.

## **OVERSEAS BASING AND ACCESS**

The United States needs overseas bases to sustain its forward presence and to provide facilities for regional contingency operations during periods of crisis. Our successes in the Persian Gulf were due in no small measure to our access to overseas bases. Foreign bases enhance deterrence, contribute to regional stability, and facilitate rapid response by U.S. forces.

The end of the Cold War and the evolving capabilities of our allies make it possible to significantly reduce our forward-based presence. During the next few years, we will make substantial cuts in the number of personnel now stationed in Europe and the Pacific. For this reason, we have closed many of our overseas bases and will continue this process as we draw down our forward-deployed forces.

The United States also will continue to require access arrangements in key locations around the globe. Maintaining an adequate level of presence overseas is essential to the maintenance of our alliances in Europe and Asia. The United States will continue to develop access arrangements to support deployment of U.S. forces over the full range of conflict. In addition to overseas basing, our naval and long-range air forces provide flexible and responsive access to those regions where basing is not feasible for military, political, or economic reasons.

Although U.S. forces are being withdrawn from the Philippines, the United States will maintain a strong, visible presence in Southeast Asia. The Government of Singapore has agreed to permit expanded U.S. military access to existing Singaporean facilities in a move that is indicative of a new approach to maintaining U.S. presence in the region—a network of access agreements in lieu of permanent bases.

## **SECURITY ASSISTANCE**

Security assistance directly supports U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives in the dynamic post-Cold War international security environment. The military component of security assistance, implemented by the Department of Defense in accordance with policies established by the Department of State, has as its principal components the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) program, the Foreign Military Financing (FMF) program, and the International Military Education and Training (IMET) program. Also included are special authorities which provide for emergency drawdowns of defense inventories and the Excess Defense Articles program.

The FMS program is the government-to-government channel for U.S. defense sales to allies and friends. Defense sales strengthen collective security by enhancing the self-defense capabilities of allies and friends, promoting interoperability between U.S. and foreign military forces, and establishing close and productive military-to-military relationships. The FMF program finances

---

defense purchases by more than 50 countries in support of U.S. foreign base and access rights, Middle East peace and stability, counternarcotics efforts, and democratic development.

The IMET program is a low-cost grant aid program that provides military education and training to over 5,000 foreign military and civilian defense personnel from over 100 countries each year. In addition, IMET exposes future leaders of many foreign defense establishments to American values, regard for human rights, and democratic institutions. With the end of the Cold War, IMET has been expanded to provide education for military and civilian officials from some former Warsaw Pact countries. The IMET program is one of the least costly and most effective programs for maintaining U.S. influence and assisting foreign countries with their development of self-defense capabilities.

The contribution of security assistance to the Coalition forces' success in the Persian Gulf War attests to the important role it will play in responding to such threats in the future. In Saudi Arabia, much of the military infrastructure that enabled the rapid build-up of a formidable Coalition was built under FMS programs. Robust and long-standing security assistance relationships helped establish and preserve base and access rights that were highly important to the success in the Gulf.

The United States proceeds with FMS only when they support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States, such as regional stability and economic development. Consistent with this long-standing U.S. policy, President Bush launched his initiative to obtain the agreement of four other major foreign supplier nations to establish guidelines of restraint to help prevent destabilizing arms transfers to the volatile Middle East/Persian Gulf region.

The U.S. ability to most effectively utilize security assistance, however, is impaired by declining resources and reduced flexibility. Funding for FMF has declined steadily since FY 1984. At the present time, the percentage of FMF funds earmarked by Congress for a particular program has increased from 49 percent in that year to 86 percent in FY 1991. As a consequence of these two trends, disproportionate reductions must be imposed on the majority of recipients. We are concerned that these trends, combined with other restrictions and requirements which prevent, delay, or complicate the use of security assistance, impede our ability to respond to challenges in particular countries or regions.

## **SUPPORT FOR PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES**

The changing international security environment and renewed prominence of the United Nations have increased the scope of the U.N.'s peacekeeping efforts and widened the potential for greater U.S. participation and support for peacekeeping operations. U.S. law provides for U.S. armed forces participation in U.N. peacekeeping forces, with the cost of such participation normally borne by the United Nations. U.S. military officers have served in U.N. peacekeeping missions since 1948, but more than half of these officers are in positions created only within the last year with the formation of peacekeeping missions in Kuwait/Iraq, the Western Sahara, and Cambodia. The Defense Department also provides logistic support and planning expertise to the United Nations, and has provided assistance to other peacekeeping operations where the United Nations is not involved in the Middle East and Africa. These activities, undertaken in close cooperation with the Department of State, support U.S. foreign policy objectives for the peaceful resolution of conflict; reinforce the collective security efforts of the United States, our allies, and other U.N. member states; and enhance regional stability.

## **HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE**

For the past seven years, the Department of Defense has conducted humanitarian and civic assistance programs in support of broader U.S. foreign policy objectives. Our assistance,

---

provided to more than 75 countries worldwide, has enhanced military-to-military relations, improved relations with the people of several countries, and made a major contribution to the relief of human suffering. This assistance takes many forms, including donation of excess food, clothing, and medical supplies, construction of schools and roads by U.S. military personnel, foreign disaster assistance, and the transportation by U.S. military aircraft of privately donated humanitarian cargo.

During the past year, the Department of Defense demonstrated anew its ability to respond rapidly to humanitarian disasters in Africa, Latin America, Asia, Eastern Europe, and even the former Soviet Union. Operation PROVIDE COMFORT, which provided timely assistance to refugees in northern Iraq, and Operation SEA ANGEL, which facilitated disaster relief in Bangladesh, were examples of the contribution of the Department of Defense to urgent humanitarian needs. These accomplishments were in addition to ongoing activities worldwide, especially in Latin America and the Pacific area. Although the ability of the Department of Defense to provide humanitarian assistance is extremely limited under current law, except in support of the United Nations, the Department has made effective use of its capability to support humanitarian efforts.

## SUMMARY

In a dynamic and uncertain world, we will continue to depend on strong alliances and collective security arrangements. The post-Cold War international order will be shaped in part by the collective efforts of the United States and its allies. Alliances provide a framework for long-range planning and crisis response. Ongoing security ties make it possible to develop working relationships critical to successful cooperation in times of crisis. Because it can take years to develop strong security ties among nations, it may not be possible to rebuild or create relationships in times of crisis.