

Running head: THE TRANSFORMATION IS A MUST IF THE UNITED STATES WILL

The Transformation is a Must if the United States Will Remain a World Power.

Case Study and Argumentative Essay

H100

SGM Jose Rogers

Army Transformation: Transformation or Overhaul

The United States of America is the most powerful nation in the world in the world but must change to meet the ever changing battle field of today and of the future. The United States needs to focus on winning the next war in a rapidly changing world.

## Table of contents

- I. History
- II. Transformation Background
- III. Different Mindset
- IV. Resistance to Transformation
- V. The Plan
- VI. Conclusion

### Abstract

Many of our intellectual weapons for peace keeping are out of date, as our army, and armies all over the world are racing to meet the needs of the of the new millennium. Not only do countries need to prepare themselves to win wars, they also must be sufficient in military strength to deter war. Though transformation cannot happen overnight, even while there are still hostile countries with large conventional armies, the United States is in the process of transforming. With today's changing political environment, America must transform its fighting force to meet the challenges of the explosive political world. With today's asymmetrical warfare, smaller fast deploying, quick reacting forces are needed to combat the world wide threat of unconventional enemies. The days of large, heavily equipped armies standing face to face in combat are passed.

The transformation is a must if the United States will remain as a world power.

#### History of Military Transformations.

There have been conflicts between men as long as man has been in this world. As man has evolved so have his weapons and as weapons continue to evolve, war tactics have to adapt to the technology. Though technology has changed warfare, warring countries until fairly recently, still had to depend on large, heavily equipped armies that literally faced each others and inflicted mass casualties on one another. Attrition was the strategy to break the enemy's will to fight.

There have been changes in warfare (Lind, 2004); the first was from mid 1600s to mid 1800s. This was the era where battles were formal lines and column tactics. This is also where uniforms, rank structure, and battlefield order began in the military culture. As technology progressed on the battlefield, line and column tactics became obsolete and often downright suicidal.

This was followed by the next generation of warfare, which was perfected by the French Army during WWI. Centrally controlled firepower was synchronized, using detailed, specific plans and orders, for the infantry and artillery (Lind, 2004). Personal initiative was discouraged because it disrupted the synchronization. Military order in battle as well as discipline was still important. In a way, the United States Military still uses this tactic in its armor training.

What followed was as a result of WWI and perfected during WWII by the German Army. This warfare was not based on firepower, but speed and surprise. The plan of attack was to get to the enemy's rear and collapse them from the rear, isolating the front. It was the end of "lines;" warfare became non-linear. This tactic, commonly called "Blitzkrieg" or maneuver warfare, was used until the Vietnam War. The changes in tactics were changes in doctrine. Transformation began again during the Vietnam War where armor had its limitations and "Air-mobile" became

the tactic to get troops to battle. But after Vietnam, armed forces once again became larger and more heavily equipped to meet the needs of the Cold War. These changes in warfare were not actually true transformation, just changes in strategy or doctrine.

Driving many of the changes was the advancement of factory production, which changed peoples' lives. Agrarian societies became urban societies, altering family life, religion, culture, politics, business, values, leadership and technology. Change these social, technological, and cultural elements all at once and you create not just a transition, but a transformation in society, with its own political and military requirement (Toffler & Toffler, 1993).

### Transformation Background

It appears now that the U.S. - Soviet nuclear stalemate of the past few decades actually served to stabilize the world after the 1950s. With the two countries sharply divided, each knew where they fit into the global system. This did not stop conflicts in their territories and Third World locations because they (U.S. and Soviet) continued feeding them arms, assistance, and their ideology. Between 1997 and 2006 there have been 34 major military conflicts in the world. The result of the two different cultures would lead to some of the worst blood shed without the use of large heavily equipped armies. In the past the Army let technology set the strategy but under transformation, the Army strategy is dictating the technology. The strategy for military transformation is a vital component of the United States' overall defense strategy on the Global War on Terrorism.

### A Different Mind Set

President George Bush said, "What's different today is our sense of urgency – the need to build this future force while fighting a present war. It's like overhauling an engine while you're going at 80 miles an hour. Yet we have no other choice The Department of Defense (DOD)

Office of Transformation categorizes this necessary process in one of three ways: “how we do business inside the department, how we work with interagency and multiagency, and how we fight.”

In order to transform “How We Do Business,” the DOD is adopting procedures such as adaptive planning to improve the response to future needs. This tactic is beneficial not only for allocating resources more effectively, but also in acquiring them more efficiently, enabling smoother functioning throughout the organization. Maintaining streamlined operations requires leadership to adapt new technologies to mesh with concepts within their organizations while also eliminating practices that are contradictory to the company’s goals.

“How We Work With Others” is being transformed within the DOD by improving interagency coordination as well as enhancing relations with all levels of government. The anticipated result will be a more cooperative response system, improving the agency’s capability to carry out seamless operations.

The DOD must also transform its methodology of integrating active duty military with National Guard and Reserve forces, and all of these with external partners, when we employ military power, that is, “How We Fight.” Beginning with an analysis of threat, technological potential, and subsequent strategy, transformation will involve developing joint war-fighting concepts for future conflicts. The full range of military capabilities, from organization to leadership training, asset utilization to personnel management, must be engaged in the process.

#### Resistance to Transformation

After the fall of the Soviet empire, predictions of lasting peace began. Groups of western intellectuals (including Americans) began to argue that the shape of tomorrow would essentially be by economic, not military, warfare. They now contend that nations are becoming so

economically inter-dependent, that they are becoming less likely to fight one another. Adding to their argument is the fact that there has not been any democratic country that has gone to war against another democratic country. As the number of democracies increases, the less likely there will be another world war. Wars of the future will be as in the recent past: local wars in remote areas.

Another problem for the transformation is to get military leadership to accept change. The military is notoriously stubborn to adapt new concepts in war-fighting. Despite the complexity in warfare, military organizations have maintained a similar structure and organizational mindset towards fighting. As Carl von Clausewitz wrote, “military operations will have more friction in the future. The military has to adjust its institutional character and structures to accommodate these new challenges,” (Kem, 2006). The Army’s needs for the next five to ten years can be predicted but with the rapidly changing war environment, the Army’s needs are more difficult to assess. Transformation will require long term projection but must be flexible. Congressional approval and funding for long term guesses and speculation will be difficult to get.

### The Plan

The path for development of three key elements: the legacy force, the interim force, the objective force (Kem, 2006). The legacy force centers on major weapon systems that the Army has in the inventory today (such as Abrams tanks and Bradley fighting vehicles) known as the heavy force. The Army plans to continue upgrading the heavy force which will be the Army’s main war-fighting force in the foreseeable future. The interim force will use available technology to re-equip brigade-size units to adapt them to meet many of the Army’s missions. They will be able to deploy more quickly than heavy forces but will pack more combat punch, mobility and

soldier protection then light forces. The objective force is the science and technology arena. The goal is to blend heavy, light and interim forces with fighting vehicles that are lighter and more protective than the vehicles of today.

### Conclusion

When the military has changed in the past it has only addressed the fighting force. Today, most experts agree that the military will not fight alone but with coalitions, requiring a more comprehensive transformation. No longer will single-service missions be the norm, but more will become joint, integrated and cross service operations. The Army's transformation is taking the military completely apart and putting it back together while still in operation. The Logistics Modernization Program, for example, which has streamlined the processes of forecasting and acquisitions, is an example of the Army's commitment to total transformation; it has resulted in improved distribution, leading to more efficient supply lines, ultimately reducing theater footprint. Transformation will be continuous and changing as new technology is introduced. This is a necessity to keep the United States as the leading world power.

Reference

- Chizek, J. (2003). *Report for Congress: military transformation: intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance*. Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress
- Jablonsky, D. (2001). *Army Transformation: a tale of two doctrines*. Parameters. Retrieved 02/18/2008 from [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m0IBR/is\\_3\\_31/ai\\_78803079](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0IBR/is_3_31/ai_78803079)
- Kem, J. (2006). *Military Transformation: ends, ways, and means*. Retrieved 02/18/2008 from <http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/apj/apj06/fal06/kem.html>
- Lind, W. (2004). *Understanding the fourth generation War*. Retrieved 02/18/2008 from <http://www.antiwar.com/lind/index.php?articleid=1702>
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. (2007) Retrieved 02/20/2008 from <http://yearbook2007.sipri.org/mini/>
- Toffer, A. & Toffler, H. (1993). *War and Anti War*. Boston, Little, Brown, and Company.