

Running Head: THE INADEQUATE TROOP LEVELS TO COMBAT THE GLOBAL WAR

The Inadequate Troop Levels to Combat the Global War on Terror
MSG Steven Raines, MSG Jaime Nunez-Acosta, SGM Bobby Calderon,
MSG Michael Leach and MSG Chris Lopez
United States Sergeants Major Academy
Class 58
SGM Hector Gonzales
November 27, 2007

Abstract

Current troop levels are inadequate to sustain the current full-spectrum operations on the Global War on Terror specifically in Iraq and Afghanistan. Specifically, a larger Army would benefit soldiers by alleviating the current unit rotation demand thus creating less strain and lifting morale. The research conducted revealed that the United States in past conflicts has successfully maintained and financed a large deployed military force while sustaining a healthy economy stateside. Available secondary data from various government agencies illustrated current positive economic impact of the Global War on Terror on the US economy.

The Inadequate Troop Levels to Combat the Global War on Terror

The current United States military troop levels are inadequate to maintain full-spectrum operations in the current Global War on Terrorism. The deployments into the different theaters of operations worldwide have stretched the US military to a critical breaking point. This need for a larger military force is more important than ever to defeat terrorism. Past history of prior conflicts has confirmed that the United States has successfully maintained a very large fighting force and maintained economic stability. This evidence combined with current economic data and statistics illustrate that the United States can maintain a larger military force, meet deployment requirements, and maintain a healthy prosperous economy simultaneously.

Personnel Statistics Past and Present

Past Troop Levels During Wartime Operations and Post War Demobilization

Whether the Army needs more Soldiers to fight our country's conflicts or is current force structure adequate is an ongoing debate. Politically the Army has increased troop strengths during wars and demobilized afterwards. However, the Global War on Terrorism demands a larger Army to engage and sustain multiple operations as well as providing homeland defense and civil support.

Political and military analysts have produced various documents and data that support the need for larger ground forces. These documents also pose many scenarios to support their ideas. However, there are others that feel the current force structure is adequate to conduct current operations and continue to provide security for the country as well as respond to worldwide contingency operations.

In order to determine the appropriate troop strength requirement for the Army, reviewing troop strengths during our nation's conflicts in the past will assist in determining that number

and also answer the question to why the Army demobilized after these wars. When considering the overwhelming evidence provided, it supports a compelling argument for a larger Army.

Past Conflicts

World War II, Korea and Vietnam. The amount of Soldiers in the Army during World War II was 8.3 million in 1945 (Stewart, 2004, p. 118). After the war was over the Army started demobilizing and reduced the number of Soldiers to 684,000 by 1947 (Stewart, 2004, p. 201). In 1950 just prior to the beginning the Korean War the Army's strength was 591,000 Soldier (Stewart, 2004, p. 211). However, during the war this number would grow to 1.5 million (Stewart, 2004, p. 257). Once again after the war the Army reduced troop strengths to 861,964 by 1956 (Stewart, 2004, p. 288). Vietnam and Korea had about the same number of active duty US troops. At the height of the conflict there were 1.57 million troops (Stewart, 2004, p. 373) on active duty. This war lasted around 10 years making it one of the country's longest conflicts up to this point in history. However, after the war the US reduced troop strength to 785,000 (Stewart, 2004, p. 373).

Cold War and Desert Shield/Desert Storm. During the Cold War era and through the end of Desert Storm the Army maintained an active force of around 780,000 (Stewart, 2004, p. 403). However, at the end of the Cold War and shortly after the end of Desert Storm the Army would reduce its strength to 535,000 (Stewart, 2004, p. 403). The military and political strategy for Desert Storm was completely different from World War II and Korea. The United States deployed there as a liberating Army to liberate Kuwait from the presence of the Iraqi Army. The US had no intentions of occupying Iraq and serve as a stabilizing force. After the end of Desert Storm and the Cold War the Army reduced its strength to the lowest it had been in years, with an

end strength of 480,000 (Stewart, 2004, p. 454). These things need to be considered when determining the adequate number of troops to combat our current wars.

With the increase of Soldiers for war the country has various reasons for implementing a reduction in the force after war. It is common knowledge that money drives the train and without a doubt it was one of the biggest contributing factors for demobilization. The success the Army had in Granada and Panama indicated that it could deploy with a relative small force and complete the mission. Desert Storm further validated the country's investment in advanced technology, superiority, and ability to deploy with a relative small Army in relations to previous wars and decisively defeat the enemy using overwhelming conventional firepower. Also after the fall of the Soviet Union the Cold War threat was over. The country was for the most part at peace and there was no reason to retain a large Army.

Reasons for Demobilization

During the demobilization after World War II, Korea and Vietnam the Army stopped the draft and allowed those drafted to depart. However, after Desert Storm the Army initiated three methods to reduce the force while at the same time providing the Soldiers who departed with some type of compensation.

The Army implemented the voluntary separation incentive, special separation bonus and the early retirement plan to reduce the force between 1992 and 1997. These demobilization programs assisted the Soldiers by providing them with monetary compensation upon their departure from the military. More than 139,000 Soldiers participated in these programs.

Threat

The evidence provided supports why the nation needs to maintain a larger Army as it fights this Global War on Terrorism. An analysis of previous wars provides an analogy and

supports the need for more troops. During World War II and Korea the Army had over a million Soldiers on active duty. After these wars part of the Army remained in Europe and Korea as an occupying force. US Forces currently remain deployed to these areas today. No doubt troop levels have reduced significantly in these two areas; however, the fact remains significant forces remain there. The Army used a large number of Soldiers in Vietnam with really a net result of nothing. This demonstrates a need for a large standing Army to withstand the duration of a long conflict and to fight an insurgency war.

The true analogy to all this is the Cold War versus the Global War on Terrorism. What is the difference between the two? During the Cold War era the Army retained force strengths of over 780,000 Soldiers to defend against a nuclear attack from Russia and to fight a conventional war. The small numbers of deployed troops throughout the world served on peacekeeping missions and at times in minor conflicts like Grenada and Panama. The only major conflict at the end of the Cold War was Desert Storm.

Projected Strength 2011

Currently the active Army strength is 512,000 (Tice, 2007), that is expected to grow to an end strength of 547,000 by 2011(Tice, 2007). This war is much more volatile and covers a much larger area that requires ground troops than the Cold War. However, the US currently has 283,000 less Soldiers to combat a true enemy. This enemy can arise from anywhere. During the Cold War we had very little to worry about when it came to an insurgent attacks on the country. The nation was gearing for a full-scale war with another conventional force. Currently the Army has Soldiers deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan fighting insurgency wars with Squads and Platoons. Conventional weapons yield little results. The Army needs boots on the ground. There are other countries within the Middle East like Pakistan and Lebanon that are unstable and pose a

threat to stability in the region. However, do not forget about Iran and the instability it brings to the region.

Currently with fighting two insurgency campaigns in two different countries this has put a strain on our under strength Army. The Army has Soldiers that have deployed to theater three times with some units preparing for a fourth rotation. This war on terrorism has truly tasked the American Soldier. The current surge of Soldiers will reduce the rotations in and out of theater but it is not enough to reduce the number of hardship rotations to other parts of the world.

Afghanistan and Iraq are not the only hardship rotations that our Soldiers face. Yes these two are much more stressful on Soldiers but Soldiers continue to rotate in and out of other countries on dependent restricted tours. In reality, a Soldier could rotate out of Iraq, with less than 12 months dwell time rotate to Korea, Bosnia, or Kosovo, and then return only to rotate back to Iraq. Everybody seems to focus on the Soldier and the numbers that needed to maintain an adequate rotation in and out of the box. However, one cannot lose sight of the full spectrum battlefield as it continues to grow in size and duration. As it grows so should the Army.

Recruiting

The United States is entering its seventh year fighting global terrorism. The U.S. Army is scattered around the world and is heavily involved in Iraq and Afghanistan with more than 150,000 Soldiers in the theater of operations. What would happen if the US goes to war with Iran or North Korea on short notice? Can the United States Army, the world's finest, with its current strength of 515,000 Soldiers fight and win those wars? The answer is probably no. The Army Reserve and the Army National Guard have picked up some of the burden, but they also have experience very serious strains with back to back deployments to Iraq or Afghanistan for the first time in their history.

The Army has had to take some drastic measures to maintain sufficient troops in uniform to accomplish its mission. One measure is the Stop-Loss program that involuntarily retains Soldiers beyond the contract expiration. Soldiers from the Army Reserve have challenged this program in federal court because they allege that keeping them on active duty for a longer period of time puts their civilian jobs in jeopardy and severely put strains in family relationships. A Federal Appeals Court in San Francisco, on May 13, 2005 denied their petition to abolish the Stop-Loss program. The Pentagon recommended that the Army increase its strength from 515,000 to 547,000. In order to accomplish this goal, the Army will need to recruit new Soldiers or convince those on Active Duty to stay. A review what the Army is doing to accomplish its retention goals will assist in understanding the matter.

Recruiting Standards

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which ensures that all individuals are treated equally before the law with respect to civilian employment, does not apply to the military. The Supreme Court decisions can be summarized in these words from Goldman V. Weinberger:

“The military is, by necessity, a specialized society (separate) from civilian society....The military must insist upon a respect for duty and a discipline without counterpart in civilian life in order to prepare for and perform its vital role. The essence of the military service is subordination of the desires and interests of the individual to the needs of the service. The history of the courts deferring to the judgment of military leaders on matters affecting the Armed Forces are one of the most consistently upheld principles of constitutional law. Furthermore, serving in the military is a privilege and sometimes an obligation, conferring neither the right to serve nor the right to avoid service”.

For the above reasons the military does not accept just any person who wants to join because it must adhere to very strict standards and qualifications. Contrary to popular believe the Army has been very successful on meeting its recruiting goals in this time of war. For example, for fiscal year 2006 the Army mission goal was to bring in 80,000 new recruits but only recruited 73,400. According to the former secretary of the Army, the Honorable, Francis J. Harvey, this was within 2 % of the average recruitment each year for the past 10 years. The Army also has historically exceeded its yearly retention goals more than making up for the recruitment shortfall.

Age. By federal law the minimum age for enlistment is 17 (with parental consent) and the maximum age is 42(Just changed from 35)

Citizenship. By law you must be a U.S. Citizen to become a commissioned officer, but this isn't true for enlisted Soldiers, as long as someone is a legal permanent resident with a "greencard" they can enlist; there are however, accelerated citizenship procedures for non-citizens on active duty.

Bonuses. The Army has increased first-term reenlistment bonuses to as high as \$40,000, and as high as \$150,000. The Army also offers members a \$2,000 bonus for each new member they help enlist.

Waiver. Relaxing some of the waiver requirements may make it easier for the Army to meet its Recruiting goals. LTG Michael Rochelle, the Army's Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, stated that the waivers review was necessary. Now, he said, many recruits, arrested as juveniles, for youthful indiscretions-minor fights or theft, are forced to get waivers even if they were never convicted of a crime. According to Mr. Philip Gold on his book "The Coming Draft", the Army on fiscal year 2005 granted 11,018 waivers of one kind or another, up from Fiscal 2004's 9,300 waivers. Of these 630 were from serious criminal misconduct, including "aggravated assault,

robbery, vehicular manslaughter, receiving stolen property and making Terrorist threats”. (Gold page 58)

Draft

Conscription ended in the United States in 1973. Bringing back the draft would solve the Man power problem of the armed forces, but on this day and age, given the unpopular war in Iraq, the reluctance of congress, it seems unrealistic. In 2003 Representative Charles B. Rangel tried to introduce a bill to bring back the draft; his bill was Defeated 2-402. A similar bill has been introduced in 2007 called the Universal National Service Act of 2007, but it has not received a hearing or been scheduled for debate. The implementation of a mandatory draft would also help share the load of the nation’s defense among all social classes.

Larger Army Produces Less Strain on Society

Troop Rotation

We are entering the seventh year of this Global War on Terrorism. We have Soldiers going Through their third, fourth or fifth deployment to Iraq or Afghanistan and the stress imposed not only on the Soldier’s family but to the U.S. society as a whole is immeasurable. Clear evidence that the active army is too small is how heavily we are relying on the Reserve and the National Guard components. We have to realize that the Soldiers in those two components are citizen-Soldiers. They did not sign up to be on active duty for a long period of time. Many of these weekend warriors have lost their jobs and have had to close down their businesses. Therefore, other Americans working for these businesses have also lost their jobs.

Impact of Conflicts on the US Economy

Vietnam War

The United States wanted to stop communism from spreading and believing it had the sole responsibility for global peace the United States decided to get involve with Vietnam War by supporting France. This involvement began an economic myth that some believe created a strong impact on the economy of the United States. In 1953 the United States gave the French Union Forces 385 million in aid and in 1954 the U.S. Appropriated 400 million for the French, these additional funds were apart from the regular Indochinese military assistance program for weapons and equipment during that time. Furthermore the United States transport planes from the U.S. Air Force transported French troops from France to Indochina during an emergency in 1954. Under the Military Assistance Program, under the 1954 Agricultural Trade and Development Act (public Law 480) and under the Mutual Security Appropriation Act 1955 an additional 700 million was provided to the French. These early years from 1953 to 1965 the United States economic aid for Vietnam was about 2.4 billion. This does not include the cost of the U.S. military personnel in Vietnam, averaging 650 troops from 1954 to 1960 and 773 to 1000 troops in 1961. This amount represents only 0.04 percent of the GNP and 0.53 percent of the national defense spending. This did little to impact on the U.S. economy. In fact the economy was growing, the unemployment rate was falling, and there was almost no inflation. When the U.S. started to build up the troop levels in Vietnam, the economic drain of the war started to mount up for United States but it still had the economic strength to continue. The cost of the Vietnam War impacted on President Johnson's "Great Society Plan" by suffering budget cuts and the anti-war sentiments and distrust with the government caused consumer confidence to go to a very low level. Congress and the president were at odds on taxations until the congress cuts a deal with the president on government expenditures and taxes. Then President Johnson raised taxes to support the war but also to save his domestic social programs.

The Gross National Product (GNP) and the Gross Domestic Product (GDP)

In the 1960s the Kennedy and Johnson Era wanted to stimulate the economy, reduce unemployment and establish a strong economy on the international level. National income accounts rose to 52 billion in 1963 or 9.1 percent of the GNP. From 1965 to 1966 the GNP leapt by 8.5 % in nominal dollars. In 1966 the potential GNP was growing at approximately 4% and the actual GNP grew at 5.4 %. But the deficit in the fiscal year budget for 1966 rose to 3.8 billion from 0.6 billion and the calendar year budget in the national income accounts rose to a deficit of 0.2 billion from a surplus of 1.2 billion. Finally the high employment budget also dipped into a deficit of 3.6 billion from a surplus of 1.0 billion. The initial impact of the war on the GNP of 10 billion in 1966 rose to about 25 billion in 1967 and 1968, but falls to only 3 billion in 1969. By 1969, then most of the impact of the war is over. Economists who have studied this period have disagreed on how much the Vietnam War truly impacted the economy. According to the Budget of the United States Government: Historical Tables Introduction Fiscal Year 2008, the decline of the defense spending as a percent of GDP commenced in 1971 and the Vietnam War started to dwindle down. Furthermore spending on human resources programs grew during the 1970s due to the development of the Social Security program and other longstanding income support programs, such as Medicare and Medicaid. The total spending increased as a percent of GDP, averaging 20% during the 1970s (reflecting, in part, the substantial increase in grants to State and local governments during the 1970s). Since receipts were averaging 18% of GDP during that decade, the result was chronic deficits averaging 2% of GDP (The Budget, 2008). Even though the Vietnam War was ending, the economic crisis was continuing into the 1970s which some blame it on the Vietnam War. The true impact will never be known due to the

administration economics policies implemented at that time have been question on how truly it impacted on the economy.

The National Defense Budget

The Kennedy administration began one of the most rapid military buildups in peacetime and they planned increased spending on the Polaris and Minuteman missiles to reduce the alleged missiles gap. The five years spent on this project cost about 17 billion dollars. President Kennedy was undecided about Vietnam, rejecting a large scale U.S. intervention, but reluctant to pull out entirely. On the advice from his advisors President Kennedy allowed the troop buildup of advisors to continue. By the end of 1963 the total for military personnel in Vietnam was 16,575 at a cost 25,000 per soldier with an annual cost of 414 million. The motivation for the national defense spending was not due to Vietnam but the policy designed to close the alleged missile gap between the Soviet Union and the United States. The amount spent on Vietnam up to 1965 was about 700 million and most likely did not play a significant role in affecting the U.S. economy. The cold war had more to do with national defense budget and combined with domestic program expenditures created a budget deficit which shot up inflation. By the end of 1965 nearly 200,000 troops were in Vietnam and by the middle years it grew to 536,000. The United States economy showed that it could handle the war and the troop level build but peoples distrust with government cause law makers and the administration to make some economic blunders to appease the people. Another problem during the Vietnam War was the estimated cost for the fiscal year. This was consistently underestimated and threw the economy off course. The underestimating became worse instead of better. (Campagna, 1991)

Conflict Duration and Total Costs

The financial burden of the war started in 1953 with economic aid to the French and on August 1964 occurs when President Johnson received congressional approval for the Tonkin Gulf Resolution that gave the president wider powers, taking advice from his advisors; he used this power to start the build up of troops in Vietnam. As the number of troops started to go up in Vietnam so did the financial drain of the war started to increase. During 1964 to 1973 the United States sent 3 million troops to serve in the Vietnam War and the United States spent between 111 billion to 120 billion on the war. The war, the cold war situations and the new domestic social programs during that time impacted the federal budget creating a large deficit. The actual budgetary costs of the war are easiest to define and record but not without controversy. The true actual cost for war is debatable due to the official estimated costs. Seldom mentioned, the different types of equipment used from stock not counted as cost and the amount given to France in the early 1950s. The Vietnam War revealed that political will as much as material strength is an influential factor in the outcome of conflicts. (Campagna, 1991)

Desert Storm/Gulf War 1990-1991

Operations Desert Shield/Storm commonly referred to as the Gulf War had a little if any significant positive impact on the United States Economy when compared to the current Global War on Terrorism (GWOT). At first start to the build up for the Gulf War, one probably wondered if the US would be able to handle the cost of the war, especially after coming out of Operation Just Cause in Panama. 59% of Americans felt that the U.S. should go into the war and defend our freedom; 78 % felt that the nation could not defend all or most of the nations (Wicker, 1991). Others may have looked at the number of troops that it will take to complete the mission. With then a military numbering well over 600,000, the cost alone to support the military

was a potential nightmare waiting to happen. No one could see that the conflict would last seven months. Of course with this being 15 years ago, prices of goods were far cheaper and the number of allied nations supported the United States stance in the situation. However, the number of military personnel was far greater than it is today, but the military was not as stretched as it is today, thus not placing a potential bind on the economy of the United States.

The Gross National Product (GNP) and the Gross Domestic Product (GDP)

According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) (2004), the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in the third quarter of 1990 (August when troops started deploying to the gulf region) was \$5,803.1 trillion dollars. At the conclusion of the war (February, the first quarter of 1991), the GDP was not much change from the start (\$5,888.0 trillion). More than likely, the change was probably little due to the length of the conflict and the help from other nations to finance.

The National Defense Budget

The National Defense Budget during the length of the Gulf War estimated around \$400 billion dollars in 1990 and around \$370-390 billion at the end of the war in early 1991. The budget at the height of the build up to the Vietnam War in 1959 estimated around \$434 billion dollars and \$290-\$306 billion dollars at the end of the war in 1975 (Bolton, 2005). One thing is of significance in both wars, the budget was higher at the beginning of both wars than the end. This contributed to forecasting by those who were in positions of higher authority looking out at how much it would cost to get troops and equipment to the destinations needed; the end cost could contribute to the economy stabilization and money is set aside for any wartime expenditures.

Conflict Duration and Total Costs

Operation Desert Shield/Storm lasted seven months with combat operations lasting as little as one month. The total cost of the war was estimated at \$61.1 billion U.S. dollars but all of

this was did not come from the United States. The United States received most of the monies from other nation states. For example, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and other Persian Gulf states gave \$36 billion dollars. Germany, Korea, and Japan gave a little over \$16 billion dollars (Horan, 1997). The services however spent a total of \$7.2 billion dollars of a 10.6 billion dollar which was 63 percent of the monies received from allied countries (GAO, 1993). With over 500,000 U.S. troops and 160,000 coalition troops, the U.S. ended the war only paying \$7 billion dollars (Horan, 1997). With this in mind, this greatly helped out the U.S. economy because it did not have to spend as much and commit a vast amount of resources to support the war. Though the United States did not have to spend that much on the war, other allied countries paid for most of the bill. Prior to the start of the war, the U.S. economy was declining and the events of the economy had pushed President Bush's ratings down because tax hikes were on the verge but did not happen until after the war. The raised taxes were not because of the Gulf War thus, the war, again, did not have a negative affect on the U.S. economy.

Cost Comparison between the Vietnam War and the Gulf War

The cost of the Vietnam War was absolutely more costly than the Gulf War. There are a number of factors as to why this is. The duration of the conflict is probably the greatest factor. The Vietnam War lasted over 15 years; the Gulf War lasted seven months. The amount of economic support from other nations is a factor as well. Over seven allied nations backed the United States with either military, economic or "in kind" resources (resource such as sealift and airlift, fuel and an estimated dollar amount of over \$54 billion) (Horan, 1997), which helped the U.S. in support of the war. The Gross National Product (GNP) at the start of the Vietnam War 9.4 percent of the GDP (\$506.6 billion, 1959) and at the end of the war in 1975 was at \$4.5 billion dollars. At the start of the Gulf war, the GNP was 5.2 percent of the GDP in 1990

(\$5,735.6 trillion) and at the end of the war the GNP was 4.6 percent of the GDP in 1991 (\$5,930.4 trillion) (CRS, 2003). Time and resources probably played a vital role on the way the GNP and GDP differed from start to finish in both wars. The total cost of the Vietnam War was about \$518 billion dollars (Doyle, 2007). Surprisingly, there were only over 36 thousand more U.S. troops serving in Vietnam than the Gulf War but again, the factors of time, aid from other countries and the economic stability of the U.S. economy weights heavily on the cost.

Global War on Terrorism 2001-Present

The current global war on terrorism, specifically Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom (Afghanistan) has brought a new meaning to US government spending. Political figures and government officials share different opinions. Even with these differing views, the fact is the United States spends only a fraction of its Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on its military. Despite the arguments by economists and politicians that the United States can not afford a long drawn out campaign, the statistical data proves otherwise. The cost of the war has escalated to billions of dollars with no end in sight but along with that observation, the US GDP has also risen impacting the economy in a positive way. US military personnel are in over 150 countries around the world. Along with the incredible cost of supporting 150,000 troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and a military troop surge of over 70,000 over the next 5 years, these numbers are incomprehensible to the average American which leads many to form pseudo-opinions of the economic impact of the War on Terrorism on the US economy. The data provided will prove that the United States economy can financially support a much more significant troop increase and to deploy its soldiers in different campaigns while having minimal negative impact on its economy.

Gross Domestic Product

The Bureau of Economic Statistics (2007) tells us that the Gross Domestic Product is the output of goods and services produced by labor and property located in the United States. According to the Bureau (2007), the US Gross Domestic Product figures for 2006 were over 13.2 trillion dollars. The 2007 second quarter GDP figures were 13.7 trillion. The National Defense Budget, calculated from the nations prosperous GDP and a continuous growing economy of 500 billion between 2006 and 2007, provided the US Military with much needed resources in all areas of operation. A concern for many taxpayers is the deficit of our government. According to Senator Jon Kyl (2007) (R-AZ), our remarkably strong and growing economy, if we maintain our current pro-growth economic policies and exercise modest spending restraint, the federal budget will be balanced by 2012 without raising taxes on hardworking American families.

National Defense Budget

The National Defense budget statistics totaled around 624 billion during 2006 and 2007 National Defense figures were at 655 billion. Consider the US National Defense portion of the 2006 and 2007 GDP and GNP is only 4% of the total. With these statistics the numbers actually show a small percentage spent for the military. This brings into perspective the incredible size of the economy of the United States.

Since the GWOT began in October of 2001, the question that many economic analysts ponder is if there will ever be an end to the war and the amount the US is spending to maintain full spectrum operations. The total amount from FY 2001 through FY 2006 was 502 billion with the administration asking for another 93 billion for FY 2007 and 142 billion for FY 2008. While the analysts worry about the US economy, the facts are the economy at the present time is stronger than ever. At the start of Operation Iraqi Freedom on 19 March 2003, the Dow Jones

Industrial dropped to under 9,000. Currently, as of 5 November 5, 2007, the Dow Jones Industrial Average is consistently over 13,000 which, is higher now than at anytime in history.

Cost Comparison between the Gulf War and the Global War on Terror

The costs of the Gulf war were extremely minimal in comparison to the current Global War on Terror. Time is a consideration when viewing the Gulf War because of the shorter duration than the GWOT and along with the amount of allied support from various nations. The US funds its own in the GWOT.

In the final April 1992 report to Congress on the cost of the Gulf War, statistics ranged from 61 billion to as high as 71 billion (Horan, 1997). With a US force totaling more than 500,000 and coalition forces numbering in the vicinity of around 160,000 (Horan 1997), the seven month deployment began on 7 August 1990 and lasted longer than the actual combat operations that began on 16 January 1991. The big difference between the Gulf War and the GWOT is that the Gulf War had much more international support from the United Nations and nations such as Saudi Arabia, Japan, and Germany. Much of the support was in the form of cash and 'in-kind support. The in-kind support was in the form of fuel, food, water, local transportation, and facilities (Horan, 1997). The total contributions from all participating countries came to more than 54 billion total pledges (Horan, 1997). The actual amount received was 52.9 billion. The United States final costs ranged in the area of 7 billion (Horan 1992). This figure was less than 12% of the total US cost and less than half of the financial contributions from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait (Horan, 1992). The figures are more substantial in the War on Terror.

According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO, 2006) report to Congress, the 2006 Global War on Terrorism allocated funds was 93.5 billion. The GAO reported that as of

June 2006, which was 75% of the year completed, the United States Military reported only having obligated 55% of the total funds available out of the 93.5 billion (GAO, 2006). This amount divided by the total National Defense expenditure of 624 billion equals to 15% of the National Defense. Taking into consideration the 2006 GDP figure of 13.1 trillion, divide that number into the 93.5 billion dollars allocated for the Global War on Terror, the troop surge in Iraq, and the GWOT number accounts for .7% of the total GDP. That is less than 1% of the GDP. The GAO report (GAO, 2006) and analysis reported that the obligations and forecasts of the military costs for fiscal year 2006 suggest that the rates of obligation for military personnel, operations, and maintenance were within fiscal year 2006 GWOT funding levels. The report also stated that significant amounts of multiyear procurement funds would likely remain available for use in fiscal year 2007 (GAO, 2006).

Different Points of View

Adequate Troop Levels

The United States does not need a larger army at this time. The Army has 515,000 Soldiers on active duty at the moment and that should be big enough to fight two wars simultaneously with two third world countries. The Army has Soldiers deployed on 150 different countries. Does this dilute the man power? Of course it does. The Army needs to prioritize what wars, in what country, are more important and concentrate on those, otherwise how big is big enough? If US Army personnel are going to be fighting for the next ten, twenty years, does that mean that the US needs an Army of two million Soldiers?

Less Quality Recruits

While the recruiting commands of the US Forces accomplished their respective recruiting missions for 2007, government officials frowned upon the US military lowering recruitment

enlistment qualifications. One area affected was the recruitment age increase to 42 years of age. Another change eased on potential recruits with law violations. This made them eligible to enlist with a waiver. This change interpreted as a sign of recruiting failures only added to the already growing concerns that the recruits enlisting today are of lower caliber and that the US military is lowering its standards to meet mission.

Increased Government Spending

The US economy is the strongest in the world but it is not invincible. There are many so called experts and economists within the United States that feel that the war is too expensive for us to keep funding it. Many Democratic Congressional leaders including House Speaker Nancy Pelosi are also opposed to the War on Terror. Last Fiscal Year the democrat congressional leaders helped propose a Defense Budget with a timeline for troop withdrawal attached, that the President of the United States vetoed.

Conclusion

In closing the United States has relied on a larger military to fight our conflicts. After World War II and Korea we remained as an occupying force. Then again in Vietnam we fought a completely different enemy and retained a sizable Army afterward. Justification for a larger Army was evident by the threat that the cold war was projecting. The adversaries we face in the Global War on Terrorism are very unpredictable and capable of striking anywhere. Our commitment to success as the insurgency and counter insurgency conflict continues so should the support of the troops. The only way to do this is to increase the Army troop strength as it continues this persistent conflict. K. Preston, the Sergeant Major of the Army, shared that in order to stabilize troop rotations and complete the addition of six BCT we need a bigger Army (Guest Speaker, November 7, 2007).

The cost of supporting a large troop buildup and simultaneously sustaining full-spectrum operations on the Global War on Terror would cause minimal financial strain on the world's wealthiest nation. The latest business news released earlier in Nov 2007 stated that during the month of Oct 2007, there was an increase of 166,000 new jobs in the United States. "More than 7.4 million jobs were created between August 2003 and February 2007 and Workers' wages grew faster than they did during the economic recovery of the 1990s" (Kyl, 2007, para.3). The DJIA (Dow Jones Industrial Average) continues to climb above 13000 and even passed the 14000 mark in October 2007. These figures and reviewing past data provide evidence that the US economy is increasing because of the positive impact the mass US troop deployments have had on our economy and any future increases easily funded due to our robust economy while reducing budget deficits.

As the world's most powerful and wealthiest nation, the United States of America has a moral obligation to protect itself, citizens, and allies from the terrorists of the world who wish to annihilate its people, government, economy, and world influence. The statistics in this study support the fact that the United States of America currently has an inadequate amount of soldiers to support its war on terror. The study of past conflict data supports the fact that the United States can successfully accomplish an increase and maintain full-spectrum worldwide operations and maintain a healthy economy.

References

- Blinder, Alan S. “*Economic Policy and the Great Stagflation*” (1979)
- Bolton C.M. Jr. (2005). “2005 SLCC, DOD Budget Authority by Presidency.” Retrieved August 23, 2005, from http://www.asc.army.mil/docs/briefings/slc_2005
- Campagna, Anthony S. “*The Economic Consequences of the Vietnam War.*” (1991)
- The Budget of the United States Government: Historical Tables Introduction Fiscal Year 2008, <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/usbudget/fy05/histint.html>
- Conetta, C. (2007). No Good Reason to Boost Army, Marine Corps end Strength. *Common Wealth Institute*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from <http://www.comw.org/pda/0701br20.html>
- Clayton, James L. “*The Economic Impact of the Cold War*” (1970)
- CRS Report for Congress “Defense Budget for FY2003: Data Summary. Information taken from The U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved March 29, 2003, from <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organizations/9665.pdf>
- Gold, Philip. The Coming Draft; “The Crisis in Our Military and Why Selective Service Is Wrong For America”. 2006
- Hoffman, F. (2007). A Strategic Rationale for Land Force Expansion. *Foreign Policy Research Institute*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from <http://www.fpri.org/enotes/200703.hoffman>
- Horan, F. (1997). “*How much did the Gulf War cost the US?*” Information taken from Conduct of the Persian Gulf War, The Final Report to the US Congress by the US Department of Defense; April 1992; Appendix P. http://people.psych.cornell.edu/~fhoran/gulf/GW_cost/GW_payments.html
- Kagan, F. (2007). The Case for Larger Ground Forces. *The Stanley Foundation*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from <http://www.comw.org/qdr/fulltext/0704kagan.pdf>

Kyl, Jon. (2007). Budget and Tax Issues. *Legislature Centers*. Retrieved November 20, 2007, from http://kyl.senate.gov/legis_center/budget.cfm

Military May Ease Standards for Recruits. News Release by Lolita C. Baldor posted November 06, 2007 from http://news.aol.com/story/_a/military-may-ease-standars-for-recruits

Stewart, R. (Eds). (2004). *American Military History* (Volume II). Washington, DC. Center of Military History.

Taylor, Leonard B. “*Financial Management of the Vietnam Conflict, 1962-1972*” (1974)

Tice, J. (2007, October 15). GAO says Army BRAC moves could face delays. *Army Times AUSA Special Report*, p. 18.

United States Bureau of Economic Analysis, Gross Domestic Product New Release. Retrieved November 15, 2004, from <http://www.bea.gov/newsreleases/industry.gdpindustry/2004/>

United States Government Accountability Office (GAO). (2006). Global War on Terrorism Fiscal Year 2006 Obligation Rates Are Within Funding. *GAO 07-76 Report to the Congressional Committees*. November 2006. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d0776.pdf>.

Vietnam War, The. (2007, November) “*Wikipedia: The free encyclopedia*” (2007). Retrieved November 6, 2007 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vietnam_War.

Vietnam War and the American Economy. (2006) Retrieved from <http://www.historycentral.com/sixty/Economics/Vietnam.html>

Wicker, T. (1991, June 8). In the Nation; What Kind of Order? *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html>