



INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES

**National Security Dialogues on the
21st Century
Volume II**

Edward F. Smith, Jr., Project Leader
Rosser Bobbitt
Joel C. Christenson
John F. Kreis
Warren K. Olson
Edwin J. Pechous
John E. Rothrock
John C. F. Tillson, Jr.

September 2001

Approved for public release;
distribution unlimited.

IDA Document D-2518

Log: H 01-001941

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188		
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 01-09-2001		2. REPORT TYPE Final		3. DATES COVERED (FROM - TO) xx-12-2000 to xx-09-2001	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE National Security Dialogues on the 21st Century - Volume II Unclassified			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S) Smith, Jr., Edward F. ; Kreis, John F. ; Pechous, Edwin J. ; Tillson, John C. ; Olson, Warren K. ;			5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Institute for Defense Analyses 1801 N. Beauregard St. Alexandria, VA22311			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS ,			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT APUBLIC RELEASE ,					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT This document, produced under IDA's Central Research Program, collects the comments relative to national security made by a series of conference panels at various locations across the United States. These panels were drawn from a wide cross-section of American citizens. The objective was to hear from people with extensive backgrounds in national security policy making, as well as citizens who had little or no experience in the area, but who could articulate the views of the general public. Comments arose from discussions under six topics: The 21st Century Security Environment; National Will in the 21st Century; Traditional versus Non- Traditional Missions; Force Composition Size and Quality; Materiel and Equipment; and Leadership, Doctrine, and Character. This volume two adds three supplementary appendices covering conference panels that occurred after the completion of the main volume of the document.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS National Security; Post-Industrial Age; Globalization; Post-Cold War; Information Age					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:		17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON	
		Public Release	42	Fenster, Lynn lfenster@dtic.mil	
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified		19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER International Area Code Area Code Telephone Number 703767-9007 DSN 427-9007	
				Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98) Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39.18	

This work was conducted under IDA's independent research program. The publication of this IDA document does not indicate endorsement by the Department of Defense, nor should the contents be construed as reflecting the official position of that Agency. This document is intended to stimulate discussion of challenges that the Department of Defense and the U.S. national security community face in the years ahead. The contents represent the views of the authors.

© 2001 Institute for Defense Analyses, 1801 N. Beauregard Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22311-1772 • (703) 845-2000.

This material may be reproduced by or for the U.S. Government.

INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES

IDA Document D-2518

**National Security Dialogues on the
21st Century
Volume II**

Edward F. Smith, Jr., Project Leader
Rosser Bobbitt
Joel C. Christenson
John F. Kreis
Warren K. Olson
Edwin J. Pechous
John E. Rothrock
John C. F. Tillson, Jr.

PREFACE

This document adds three appendices to the primary volume of IDA Document D-2518, *National Security Dialogues on the 21st Century*, prepared under the Institute for Defense Analyses' Central Research Program. These new sections record the suggestions for a debate on future national security issues that were obtained from the ongoing conference series. The participants in two of these late conferences came from academic life: students at Washington, D.C.'s American University and at Purdue University's Krannert Graduate School of Business. The last group to meet drew from the professional staff in IDA's several divisions, and served to bring together people with diverse backgrounds, training, and experience to discuss the topics and methodologies developed throughout the seminar series.

The Executive Summary from the primary volume is repeated here to provide context for the current additions.

**NATIONAL SECURITY DIALOGUES
ON THE 21ST CENTURY
Main Volume**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Introduction.....	1
B. Summary of Insights.....	2
C. Debate Questions.....	3
 I. INTRODUCTION	I-1
 II. DEVELOPING THE METHODOLOGY	II-1
A. Background and Description	II-1
B. The Debates	II-2
1. The 21st Century Security Environment	II-3
2. National Will in the 21st Century	II-4
3. Traditional versus Non-Traditional Missions	II-5
4. Force Composition Size and Quality	II-5
5. Material and Equipment	II-6
6. Leadership, Doctrine, and Character	II-6
 III. ASSESSING THE OUTCOMES.....	III-1

Appendix A – Creating the Debate Framework
Appendix B – October 1999 Conference Results
Appendix C – January 2000 Conference Results
Appendix D – February 2000 Conference Results
Appendix E – March 2000 Conference Results
Appendix F – May 2000 Conference Results

Volume II

Appendix G – December 2000 Conference Results
Appendix H – February 2001 Conference Results
Appendix I – August 2001 Conference Results

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. INTRODUCTION

The turn of the century finds the U.S. as the sole superpower, but with its national security organization trying to build on the practices and habits that won the Cold War in order to embrace the evolving security environment. Over the last several years, the defense establishment has undertaken many efforts to address the complexities that will be associated with security planning in the 21st Century. The goal is to provide information to policy planners to help them determine the most prudent course for the U.S. to pursue in maintaining security, protecting our interests, and continuing as the world leader. For the most part, these efforts have addressed the wide range of opportunities and potential problems facing the nation in a fairly traditional context, focusing on the situation at hand but paying only marginal heed to situations that might occur. In order to obtain a crosscut of the views of the American people on a variety of national defense topics, the IDA team set out to find a selection of people to engage in an open discussion of their views on how national security planners might address the changing world.

Rather than duplicating or echoing the useful efforts that have already been done, we began a modest extension of the debate to emphasize the various new dynamics that will or might face our military and defense structures in the coming decades. Using an IDA-sponsored monograph to introduce the possible new dimensions of 21st Century conflict and utilizing facilitation techniques refined over the past five years by IDA in Eastern Europe and the CIS states, we have organized conferences from diverse groups at various locations throughout the country.

These conferences have added a new dimension to the national security dialog by spotlighting attention on those key issues that, for reasons of inconvenience, misunderstanding, or difficulty, do not get all the attention they deserve. Additionally, by reaching out to the local leadership in areas as diverse in outlook as Chicago and the Silicon Valley, the insight gained is broad and national. The completed conference schedule to date has included:

- 20 October 1999, Alexandria, Virginia – Opening Conference at IDA

- *6 January 2000*, Chicago, Illinois – Sponsored by the National Strategy Forum
- *8 February 2000*, IDA – Defense Science Study Group
- *8 March 2000*, San Jose, California – Sponsored by Silicon Valley Manufacturers Association
- *2 May 2000*, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania – Sponsored by Moravian College
- *6 December 2000*, Washington, DC – Sponsored by American University (Volume II)
- *23 February 2001*, West Lafayette, Indiana – Sponsored by the Krannert Graduate School of Business, Purdue University (Volume II)
- *9 August 2001*, Alexandria, Virginia – Sponsored by the Institute for Defense Analyses (Volume II)

B. SUMMARY OF INSIGHTS

The discussion that emerged from the various meetings and conferences has provided us with a wealth of insight. As we digested the input of the participants, the following issues worthy of serious attention have emerged:

- **Use of the military:** By and large, participants expressed little concern about using the military for numerous non-traditional deployments around the world so long as the intent was to support U.S. values, and critical national interests.
- **Forward Presence:** There is reasonable comfort level with U.S. forward presence, since the perception is that our economic interests are supported by a strong military presence and that we are a benign power.
- **Superpower leadership:** There is debate about whether the U.S. truly has a world leadership role or is merely the world's police force. At the center of the issue is choosing what is necessary to support U.S. values and interests.
- **Casualties:** The political and military leadership is too sensitive concerning losses in combat. As long as the leadership clearly explains the risks involved, that some risks are prudent, and does not go to the well too often, the people will follow. The public understands that combat is dangerous. If a major U.S. interest is at stake, some casualties will be tolerated but probably not indefinitely, or for foolish reasons.
- **Leadership:** There is concern that the selection process for senior leadership in the Services might be too traditional, and will not be able to adapt rapidly enough to the new age.
- **National consensus and cohesiveness:** There is concern, particularly outside the Washington Beltway, that internal, cultural, and ethnic diversity will

increasingly hamper future efforts to forge a commonly supported national security policy and strategy.

- **Isolation of the military from the mainstream of the society:** This is causing a lack of common understanding between military and civilians. It might also increasingly be excluding the most talented pool of young citizens from service.
- **Inability of the military to compete for talent across the board:** The groups tend to attribute this growing trend to economic and societal factors rather than internal service policies. They also support measures that would allow the military to compete for talent more effectively, and have suggested several specific measures to alleviate the problem.
- **Management structure:** There is concern as to whether the military can, will, or even should adapt its hierarchical system to the “flat” techniques that are propelling the successes of the new information age in the U.S. Most believe that radical changes to simplify the 23-grade structure of the military must be made.
- **Threat definition match with resource allocation:** There appears to be a consensus on the increasing peril of non-conventional threats, including rogue missiles. Resources appear to be primarily focused on support of the traditional two Major Theatres of War (MTW). Many participants believe that resource allocation should be more closely tied to threat, and that military planners might be too wedded to the past.
- **Public indifference:** Prosperous economic times and the absence of immediate discernible threats will continue to hamper leaders’ efforts to engage outside our borders to defend vital strategic interests. Energetic and enlightened national leadership appears the only way to break this cycle of lack of concern.
- **Education:** There was concern that the public is not well-educated concerning evolving national security issues. The focus on maintaining economic prosperity overshadows other aspects of security.
- **Jointness:** Many feel that the military is too stovepiped and needs to be more integrated among the Services, as is the current direction in the business community.
- **Acquisition:** There was a consistent theme that the acquisition system worked satisfactorily for the Cold War but probably is not appropriate for the situations the military will face in the Information Age. (Note: this includes all aspects associated with a new system – requirements, funding, R&D, production, and fielding.)

C. DEBATE ISSUES

To date, a variety of debate issues have taken shape. These issues are arranged according to the workshop topics, and are written in classic debate form, i.e., hypothetical statements for affirmative/negative debate. The objective is to collect those topics that the members of the several conferences believed to be the most important. They could then be used in different arenas to stimulate discussion and debate about the future direction of national security planning.

These issues are intended to provoke thought, not to place bounds on workshop discussions. Some have no answers, or at least no simple answers. For others, lively discussions could readily lead to entirely new questions, definitions, or discussions.

- **The 21st Century Security Environment**

- Resolved, the future of U.S. security in the 21st Century rests with vigorous enforcement of a “benevolent hegemony.”
- Resolved, economic globalism and humanitarian interventions will lead to the erosion and weakening of the nation/state.
- Resolved, reliance on alliances will supplant unilateralism and “Fortress America.”
- Resolved, the U.S. security structure is poorly prepared on the domestic front to handle the anti-democratic dynamics that could occur in the aftermath of an act of homeland megaterrorism.
- Resolved, the dialog between the U.S. security apparatus and the public necessary to build a credible, consensus-based policy is inadequate.
- Resolved, strategic power and effectiveness in the post-industrial age will be determined largely by decision superiority.
- Resolved, current security and military structures are not well designed to meet the challenges of the post-industrial age.
- Resolved, there is a need to revamp our resource allocation for defense.

- **National Will in the 21st Century**

- Resolved, the Gulf War and the dramatic rescue of Scott O’Grady redefined the level that the United States is willing to suffer in terms of casualties.
- Resolved, the American people have a good understanding and appreciation of the catastrophic threats facing the homeland in the 21st Century.
- Resolved, with leadership, a national consensus to support the sacrifices necessary to ensure security can be built.
- Resolved, national resolve is more than adequate to protect democratic institutions in the event of a catastrophic terrorist homeland attack.
- Resolved, the country is comfortable with an increasingly overarching role for the military in all aspects of security.

- Resolved, the military and civilian populations have increasingly divergent views on national security and national will.
- **Traditional versus Non-Traditional Missions**
 - Resolved, new threats in the 21st Century will require radically new force capabilities.
 - Resolved, the U.S. military will be required to play an increasing domestic role in homeland protection, including police and constabulary functions.
 - Resolved, the organization and priorities of the Reserve and National Guard require drastic changes to meet the challenges of the 21st Century.
 - Resolved, our strategy should focus more on preparation for non-traditional threats than on meeting the requirements of two major regional contingencies.
 - Resolved, non-traditional missions will dilute force motivation and purpose.
 - Resolved, CINCs in the 21st century must play an increasing regional “proconsul” role.
- **Force Composition Size and Quality**
 - Resolved, the size of the force in the 21st Century has to be tailored to meet necessary missions, not an arbitrary fiscal target.
 - Resolved, the current recruiting system for the all-volunteer force is inadequate to meet the challenges of the 21st Century.
 - Resolved, there is an increasing gap on essential values between the civilian populace and the uniformed military.
 - Resolved, the necessary changes in force composition resulting from new technologies are not being implemented.
 - Resolved, significant issues on quality and competence of the force are being treated on an *ad hoc* basis rather than with fundamental new approaches.
 - Resolved, the senior officer corps is unjustifiably large in relation to overall force size.
- **Material and Equipment**
 - Resolved, the research, development, and acquisition (RD&A) system is a failure in terms of its ability to provide the fighting systems we need for today’s world.
 - Resolved, the U.S. RD&A system is inadequate to provide the fighting systems we need for tomorrow’s world.
 - Resolved, RD&A should be placed under a single DoD authority with the capability of deciding how to spend and where to distribute the materials and equipment required.

- Resolved, more extensive outsourcing will resolve many of the current problems in the material and equipment procurement process.
- Resolved, today's U.S. defense industry is fully capable of meeting today's needs, and adapting quickly to meet tomorrow's.
- Resolved, the current military leadership is too attached to the weapons of yesterday to meet tomorrow's challenges.
- Resolved, expensive weapons are being effectively measured on a cost-effective basis.
- Resolved, our efforts to streamline the national security infrastructure must be even further divorced from the political process.

- **Leadership, Doctrine, and Character**

- Resolved, the senior military is unable to lead the junior military.
- Resolved, character in the force is and will remain the critical component of Leadership and Doctrine.
- Resolved, education will become more important than training in the information age force.
- Resolved, future military leaders will necessarily require broad-based political skills, an understanding of economic forces, and a true commitment to "jointness."
- Resolved, the current system of selecting top leadership from command-oriented generalists remains viable and adaptable for the 21st Century.
- Resolved, effectiveness of the force must take precedence over socially oriented goals.
- Resolved, our strategic evolution is in lockstep with our nation's post-industrial technical evolution.

APPENDIX G

**DECEMBER 2000 CONFERENCE RESULTS
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

APPENDIX G
DECEMBER 2000 CONFERENCE RESULTS
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Participants for this conference were students at American University, Washington, D.C. All of them were part of the Semester in Washington program that allows students from colleges and universities nationwide to spend time in the national capital. Included in this group were two students from Japan, one from Germany, and one from Colombia – a total of 22 young men and women. Dr. Jack Piotrow, American University professor, was the senior faculty coordinator. The student participants and the schools they normally attend are listed at the end of this appendix.

The group was divided into three sections, with each section addressing two of the six topics. At the end of each 1-½-hour period, the panels provided a short synopsis of their discussion and several questions that they believed warranted further debate. The comments of each of the panels are summarized below.

A. 21ST CENTURY SECURITY ENVIRONMENT

The students believed that democratic capitalism and the need of multinational corporations to secure and defend markets around the globe drive much of American foreign policy, as well as that of its allies. However, they seemed to believe that the Global Village and multinational corporations would have a moderating influence on the likelihood of future major international conflicts, rather than cause future wars.

The group concluded that both the American government and the electorate need to pay much more attention to asymmetric threats and homeland defense. They saw no major conventional threat emerging for several years (with the possible exception of a fight over Taiwan). They concluded that less should be spent on high-priced weapons platforms (specifically, aircraft, ships, and tanks), and that much more should be spent on hospitals, vaccine stockpiles, the protection of water supplies and other urban infrastructure, and the ability to deal better with weapons of mass destruction.

A foreign student from Latin America felt that U.S. foreign policy was colored by the need to secure sources of energy and to “make the world safe for Coca Cola.” She indicated during the walk back to the plenary session that her country was suspicious of U.S. drug war policies and that drug demand in the U.S. is the cause of much of the international drug problem.

The panel concluded that not only the Government but also the people of the United States should concentrate on security questions. In general, the people know very little about this subject. Specific topics that should receive attention include terrorist threats and activity, biological warfare dangers, and the fact that cities and local areas cannot cope with the potential damages that might be inflicted.

In light of the last issue, the panel believed military spending should be modified, to shift a portion to support of local areas that may face the difficult task of responding to severe damages, loss of life, and sickness or injury in the wake of attack. This group endorsed President Clinton’s prediction that it is only a matter of time until terrorists strike a major city.

Globalization was an allied issue the panel treated. The members concluded that the world no longer operated based on small, relatively local economies; we now have a global village, industries, and factories that serve large areas or regions. The United States is involved with many trading partners in this worldwide economy. As a result, economic integration means greater involvement with both our allies and our enemies or those who do not wish us well. We must have greater contact with each group.

B. THE NATIONAL WILL

This group explored the nation’s leadership qualities regarding the formation of a collective will to face threats, generally from abroad. They concluded that our leaders need to be in the forefront of informing the people of potential threats and their dangers; by doing so, the leaders [generally meaning the President] will rally public opinion when needed. Americans generally focus on day-to-day issues, not foreign conflict and dangers. The panel listed several reasons for effective leadership: military engagements must be explained well enough so people understand the reason for them, and a big war will not be acceptable without explanations; explanations must reflect a vital national interest.

Discussions then moved to the questions of the extent to which we as a people might define ourselves by perceived external threats. We saw ourselves as the opponents

of totalitarian nations, but they are now gone (at least those that can harm us). Now, do perceptions of threats help to define budgets? Do these threats help us to understand our position in the world and make clear to us our belief in our place in the world?

The group concluded that the most current threats are from terrorism and information warfare. They also voiced questions as to whether or not (or to what extent) our foreign policy should be reactive to problems, or proactive in trying to prevent problems. In this case, they could not define a way to understand which problems will become of major importance, or how one could put potential problem areas in some workable priority. Also, the panel members were uncertain how, if we were attacked, we would react to punish those guilty; in this regard, the question of the attack on USS *Cole* received considerable comment. Many panel members favored using extradition agreements to return terrorist perpetrators to this country for trial as preferable to open warfare. They were uncertain how to deal with a situation where the host country would refuse extradition.

The group noted at the outset that Americans love the notion of a no-casualty war, but believed that there is no such thing. They were not happy about the idea of losing American soldiers, but were certain that the nation could sacrifice lives if the cause were appropriate. One student, from Japan, commented that the discussion had so far turned on American soldiers, but that the group needed to contemplate how Americans would react to the loss of lives in the country with which we are in conflict. Our leaders must explain the needs of our interests in foreign regions, the problems, and conflicts we face. If that is done adequately, Americans will respond in a positive way to the potential of armed conflict.

Debate Questions:

- Should our foreign policy be centered on reacting to problems, or be proactive in trying to prevent problems from developing into serious, conflict-producing situations?
- If a problem such as an attack on a major American urban area were to take place, how do we react to punish the aggressor?

C. MISSIONS: TRADITIONAL VERSUS NON-TRADITIONAL

This group decided that terrorism is a primary threat, which requires a new role for defense in the 21st century. Clearly, locales are not prepared. Coordinating agencies need lines of communication to do their jobs and not conflict with one another. How we

will proceed to avoid or control panic during a complex contingency is a topic that deserves a good deal of attention and study at all levels of Government.

The group saw asymmetric threats as real and likely. They were particularly concerned about chemical and biological weapons, cyber attacks, and terrorism. Most were convinced that we had an imperfect national strategy that was poorly articulated and communicated to the public. In addition, they saw few problems in engaging the military fully in dealing with non-traditional threats, either legally or politically, and saw full public backing for such use of the military.

There was near unanimity that, in the use of the available resources, personnel, training, and leadership, there was far too great a tilt toward fulfillment of “traditional” missions, and far too little attention paid to get the wherewithal to meet non-traditional challenges. These students thought that too many groups and individuals had been delegated responsibilities to deal with non-traditional threats, and there was inadequate guidance and organization to facilitate a cohesive response, particularly on homeland defense. Many were uncertain of the wisdom of assigning the National Guard major responsibilities in the process, while others believed that this was the appropriate course of action to follow.

Debate Questions:

- What is the role of the military in a non-traditional role? How do we change training to meet the new roles?
- Is communication adequate between Government agencies? Do cities have enough resources to react and provide for an adequate reaction?
- What must be done in the information realm to prepare for dangers and potential attacks?
- How do we create security awareness of the population as a whole?
- What is the role of intelligence organizations in the information realm?

D. FORCES: LEADERSHIP, DOCTRINE, CHARACTER

Leadership grows from trust. When a leader can be trusted, the people will relate to what he or she wants to do. Honesty is an important element in the formation of trust; this means that we need leaders who are not engaged in “spinning,” but who deal with facts and situations honestly. These sentiments were prominent in the discussion, leading to the issue of how we organize national security forces and how we control them once set loose.

The second issue that concerned the panel was the question of how to draw the needed talent into the military, those who possess the intelligence and education to do the complex jobs needing to be done. Among the potential compensations were money, challenges suited to the level of people we wish to attract, and the offer of high-level positions at the outset if we are looking for qualified cyber-warriors or other people with special skills and talents.

We need good information about the world and our enemies to give us intellectual security that comes with knowing what is going on. We must make an effort to continue to find first-rate intelligence collection capabilities. Several members were just mystified as to how someone could plan and carry out a major operation aimed at our forces without our ability to detect it [in reference to USS *Cole*].

The panel also took up the question of how we might deal with a split in attitudes that we have an elite policy-making group of leaders who will order the military into difficult and dangerous situations, but who are not willing to serve or to allow their children to serve in those same situations.

Most of the panel (not all the members voiced a clear opinion on this point) were clearly of the belief that a leader, political or military, who sends forces into conflict must have the moral standing to allow him to demand that lives be lost. That leader cannot be a liar. When there are such leaders, the people and the military members can relate to them, and can respect them in demanding times.

Debate Questions:

- Where and how do we draw the line on what national security-related agencies (FBI, CIA, and military) might do to protect us?
- The nation needs better intelligence and an information-based military. How do we get this?
- Our military services require people who are educated and intelligent. How do we attract them to service?

E. FORCES: COMPOSITION, ORGANIZATION, SIZE, AND QUALITY

The group wrestled principally with whether the U.S. needed a large military force. It concluded that more important than force size were the quality and educational backgrounds of Service members. It concluded that perhaps the best means of attracting the right talent was through *contracts*, not conscription or universal service. In this manner, those who were interested in adventure, the military experience, or assistance

with education could choose for a period of time (perhaps as long as 3 to 5 years) to join one or more Services to obtain valuable experience and to serve their country.

None appeared interested in serving in the military themselves. Some had friends and family members who had gone through, or were still in, military academies. One had friends now in flight programs in Florida. She said those friends had goals, expected to be used in standard military ways, and did not join to do extensive peacekeeping missions. The group stated that recruiters must be of high integrity. They and their Service advertising campaigns must present an honest picture of likely Service assignments (today's student electronic grapevines are swift and unforgiving of deceit).

The group believed there would be a place (in fact, a need) for future leaders with strong technical backgrounds. This suggested that the military habit of 3-year tours and "ticket-punching" was antiquated relative to 21st century security needs because the military will require specialists as well as generalists – promising technical career paths must be provided.

This group spent considerable time discussing difficulties in competing for the best and brightest in a good economy. Many with degrees would rather go into business (Internet companies and IPOs are strong enticements). The anthropology student pointed out that some, however, would find the military attractive because they come from lower income homes and do not know all of the opportunities available. The group reiterated the above points in the plenum session.

Debate Questions:

- In attempting to attract people, can the practice of guaranteed assignments, either in terms of jobs or locale, or both, be made to work?
- How can the military Services act to improve quality of life, both for those in the Services and elsewhere in the country?

F. FORCES: MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT

Enemies know that they cannot fight us head-on and win. In the future, such countries or groups will resort to other weapons and tactics, including chemical and biological warfare. To meet this threat, we must shift research and development toward more technologically based weapons and defenses. Additionally, we need to educate the American people to understand the nature of the threat. R&D is vital to defense, and more resources should be expended to ensure that America retains its significant lead in weapons and battle capabilities. There should be significant collaboration domestically

in classified R&D, but there was some concern over joint research with foreign governments, even those closely allied with us.

Procurement has to be modernized, with the materials and equipment made for non-traditional tasks be given priority. Care should be taken not to procure very expensive conventional systems where cheaper, often commercial off-the-shelf items might do. There were considerable differences within the group as to how to maintain a viable defense production industry. Most participants thought a thriving industry would be fostered by elimination of cost-plus contracts, while others felt this was impractical.

The group also discussed using outsourcing [which they did not define] as a method for speeding and making more efficient weapon development and acquisition. Within the group, there arose a decided split in opinion. One faction believed that outsourcing could not be done without incurring far too many risks. The other faction believed that almost total outsourcing could be done, and that it should be undertaken quickly. In any event, the panel believed that outsourcing was necessary, and the resources needed to keep maintenance and sustainability at a high level must be delivered. Many felt that a slightly higher share of the budget for defense would be wise.

Debate Questions:

- How will the U.S. adapt to the threat of terrorism and asymmetric warfare while remaining able to deal with conventional warfare?
- How much more resources can we allocate to cities and locales?
- If we make substantial changes in our threat assessment and warfighting structure, how will other countries perceive these changes, and how will these countries respond in turn?
- How do we preposition logistics capability for contingency operations? And how will we provide for civil defense to meet this new threat?
- Can outsourcing speed weapon development and delivery, while cutting costs?

List of Participants:

Abrams, Adam	University of Texas at Austin
Calvert, Tommy	Tufts University
Carr, Thomas	Gettysburg College
Cortes, Maria	Santa Clara University
Dzialo, Krystyna	Franklin and Marshall College

Edelstein, Allyson	University of Vermont
Espinoza, Scarlett	Loyola University at Los Angeles
Friedman, Andrew	Boston College
Hinestroza, Veronica	University de Extermado
Johannes, Karin	Friedrich Alexandes Universidael
Keene, Kelly	Bradley University
Ketchum, Matthew	Stetson University
Kikuchi, Minako	University of Redlands
LaPalm, Jennifer	Adrian College
Martin, Jesse	Sweet Briar College
Nakano, Keiko	Tufts University
Pinckney, Colleen	Willamette University
Piotrow, Professor F. Jackson	American University
Rink, Rene	University of Nuemberg
Rose, David	Valparaiso University
Tkach, Justin	Whitworth College
Van Meir, Christopher	Santa Clara University

APPENDIX H

**FEBRUARY 2001 CONFERENCE RESULTS
WEST LAFAYETTE, INDIANA**

APPENDIX H

FEBRUARY 2001 CONFERENCE RESULTS

WEST LAFAYETTE, INDIANA

Participants for this conference were students at the Krannert Graduate School of Management, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana. A substantial number of the students were from foreign nations; about one-fourth of the group was women. In all, there were a total of about 140 participants. Dr. Alok Chaturvedi of the Krannert School was the senior faculty coordinator. Because of the large number of participants, we have no list of participants for this seminar.

The full group of 140 was divided into three sections, with each section further subdivided into four groups. Each group addressed only one of the topics: National Will; The 21st Century Security Environment; Forces: Leadership, Doctrine and Character; and Force Composition. At the end of each 1-½-hour period, a new section considered the topics. At the end of the day, the panels reassembled at the Krannert School Auditorium, and each of the leaders provided a short synopsis of his group's discussion and several questions that the group believed warranted further debate. The comments of each, as well as their major concerns that appeared during the discussion sessions, are summarized below. During the final plenum review, each group leader from the three sections presented his or her group's conclusions for that group's topic.

A. 21ST CENTURY SECURITY ENVIRONMENT

The first group voiced as its primary concern the issue of civil liberties. They believed that the ease of entry into private data and the revealing of information about people and relationships were potentially very dangerous. An important question to be decided is the depth to which government or anyone else may be allowed to go in these matters. The group also offered a belief that it is important to invest in education so as to advance people out of a state of deprivation. The group asserted that globalization is good, and that it offers a potential for dramatic advance in human well-being.

The primary interest of the second group centered on the issue of the extent to which the United States should be a world peacekeeper. They concluded that we should

do so when our interests are at stake, not otherwise. As with the first group dealing with this topic, these students believed that Internet security is a pressing issue that ought not to be ignored, that issues of privacy are very important, and that privacy is in jeopardy. Finally, the leader offered the thought that the creation of prosperity carried with it an increase in the number of users of resources, and thereby increased consumption. They reached no definite conclusion or recommendation on this final issue, offering only the thought for consideration.

Concerns of the final group deliberating this topic centered on globalization; they noted a fading or increased perforation of borders. The members saw a lessening of the position of the nation-state, and an increase in regionalization. The members concluded that the spread of wealth and the increased uses of international outsourcing would reduce the reasons to go to war. In discussions that followed, however, some of the audience doubted the validity of this final point. Some noted that the actions of a few can have an effect on many in questions of international affairs.

These three panels concluded that there were several issues of substantial importance to consider:

- The threat has changed, and this is no longer a world with the potential for two wars; the conflict is coming home, and Americans must be watchful without resorting to vigilantism.
- There may be no right or wrong way to do things, and each generation has its own perspective. An earlier generation's action may have been entirely correct for the time, but not for the later period.
- Globalization can be a double-edged sword. There is much concern now about too much interdependency and loss of sovereignty. Democracy, however, works, and no two democracies have yet gone to an all-out war. Economics drive political decisions, but so do other, political, interests.
- Religious questions, such as those that plague Serbia and its neighbors, will never be settled. This complicates questions of how to define national interests, not only for the countries involved, but also for the United States.
- The gulf between the haves and the have-nots alarms some in the United States, and people in Europe hold similar opinions. But, is there really such a gulf, and is the situation really getting worse, or are we just focusing on a very short perspective without considering the greater context of world historical affairs.
- Information warfare, the potentials of the Internet, and civil liberties are in conflict, with civil liberties suffering.

B. THE NATIONAL WILL

The issue of the strength of our understanding of National Will was the center of discussion of the next group. They decided to view the matter in terms of consensus of the people, credibility of the national leaders, and confidence of not only the leaders but also of the people in their leaders. The question of casualties arose, the consensus of which was that leaders should be prepared to and will accept casualties if the action is in the national interest. This group saw promise in the way that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been handling the discovery of a spy in its midst; the prompt and open manner in which this matter was presented to the public and to the national leaders was commendable. In addition, this group concluded that we might very well not understand the nature and extent of threats to our country; they believe that for most people one must see the threats clearly and as a present danger before each concludes that we must act assertively. This group posed the question: how do we deal with mega-terrorism? The response will likely depend on the extent of the effects of terrorist acts.

Group two working on this topic worried that the United States might be imposing too much on other countries. In that case, ought we wait for the calamity to support the response? And, in dealing with a calamity, to what extent do duties supersede rights? When rights are superseded, how are they returned to the people? In terms of international security, there is a role that multinational companies play in decision-making. The many and varied interests of these enterprises might serve to restrain violent reactions and break tensions.

The final group offered observations on the role and goals of corporations: that such goals are profit-driven and lead to the questions of when and how governments ought to intervene. Large political contributions make it difficult to act, thus contributing to complexity. The United Nations is large and very diverse, with many interests. As such, the UN cannot act efficiently. Nonetheless, adaptation to crisis is natural for human beings and usually results in some reasonable response to a problem, if not the most effective and timely response. People have a low understanding of the threat we face, their daily lives are more pressing, and they do not devote much, if any, time to worrying about this issue. This group posed the question: how do we deal with an aggressor if we cannot find that group or person? They also posed another question: if awareness is increased, does that serve to stimulate adverse actions?

C. FORCES: LEADERSHIP, DOCTRINE, AND CHARACTER

Defining the threats and their causes and perpetrators was an important starting point of the first group considering this topic. Is the threat terrorism (brought on by perceived desperation)? Is it escalation of small conflicts beyond the point of what is acceptable? What then is the goal of national defense? The conclusion to the second question seemed to be that it is to protect the United States and things of national interest. We must also understand what makes up national defense, and the group decided that it was far more than the military; customs and immigration, intelligence monitoring agencies, investigative and enforcement agencies, and public health organizations, among others, play a very important role. The group posed the question of how does one set up organizations to pursue national security that are free of in-fighting and able to act together, if this is at all possible. In summary, the group concluded that leaders must be able to think of higher goals and be able to decide what is acceptable and what is not in order to keep these powerful agencies in check and on a proper track.

The next group presented its areas of interest, dealing with the vulnerabilities evident in information technology. As with other groups, this one was concerned with the issue of infringement of civil rights by governments and of privacy by a variety of other interests. The reaction times of users of IT are much quicker than in the past, can go surprisingly deep, and can cause great disruptions to domestic society as well as internationally. The members also contrasted the differences between the police mentality (to catch criminals, find evidence, and present all to the courts for adjudication) and military approach (to see and define an enemy, and to destroy that enemy). These differences are substantial, and must not be overlooked by policy planners and leaders. An ideal national leader must be visionary, decisive, reliable, experienced, and quick thinking. Given the above, the group believed it important to define how we currently perceive the military and defense leadership.

Group three asked how do we currently perceive the military and defense leadership? They also believed it important to understand how we can and might protect ourselves from cyber-warfare. This group suggested organizing what is called a tandem organization to allow our talented people to meet the challenges we face in the new century. Toward that end, we must decide how we are to identify, develop, get, and keep the most talented people that we need for the jobs of national security. How do we then decide what are the threats, and what and how to tell the public about them without advocating or developing a secret government agenda?

D. FORCES: COMPOSITION, ORGANIZATION, SIZE, QUALITY

Each of the three groups had a primary challenge – to identify the issues and questions they believed should be addressed as part of the process of deciding how to spend the \$300+ billion allocated to the Department of Defense each year. Each group was to think of the discussion as they would one of their case study problems, and to apply modern business management techniques to their solutions.

The first group concluded that the most pressing issue is to define the threat. This group saw terrorism, especially the use of nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons, as a major threat. The group saw low intensity conflict as more likely than major theater war. The group asked whether it is the armed forces' job to protect the homeland, and their conclusion was perhaps not entirely: that other agencies have a greater and more important role to play. The group thought that one necessary thing is to get rid of the Service stovepipes and move toward a single force, and to develop the willingness to change within the defense specialties.

The next group saw U.S. military objectives as driven by economic considerations. In order to protect ourselves, the United States should create a highly skilled, well trained, and satisfied force. An integral part of this issue is to determine several things: How much money should be spent abroad and how much at home? Once we determine the kinds of conflict for which we must prepare, who is the enemy and what are the weapons we will face? What do we want this force to do, and what will its future roles will be? The group also struggled with the question of creating a less hierarchical, decentralized, but more efficient force. In the past, the classic military focus has been on technology applications to improve operations or solve problems. The group recommended a shift to get the military to focus on what motivates people today. Discussions after the presentations noted that the military is not used only for defense. Today the Services are a social laboratory, economic engine, and research and development base. Many thought that the zero defects mentality was dangerous: that it reduced people to the most conservative, least offensive courses of action that would have fewest adverse effects on careers. Some recommended getting rid of the zero defects view of life by the defense establishment.

This final series of panels produced a series of debate issues that follow:

- Resolved, the Department of Defense should decentralize its operations and should flatten the hierarchy dramatically.

- Resolved, the Department of Defense should consider eliminating or changing the role of the four Military Services.
- Resolved, the Department of Defense should manage its people as if they were volunteers, which they are.
- Resolved, the Department of Defense should create a truly professional, highly competent, and satisfied force. This requires a broad approach beyond simple pay and benefits questions.
- Resolved, the Department of Defense should change its focus from technology to people.
- Resolved, the Department of Defense should identify new ways to fight wars and to achieve U.S. national security goals.

APPENDIX I

**AUGUST 2001 CONFERENCE RESULTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

APPENDIX I

AUGUST 2001 CONFERENCE RESULTS, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

Participants for this conference were members of the professional staff of the Institute for Defense Analyses. Drawn from all of IDA's divisions, this event was used as a way to bring various people, who have greatly divergent training and backgrounds, together for discussions on difficult, cross-cutting topics. The following sections summarize the concluding thoughts and ideas of each of the three working groups. Sections A, B, and C correspond to morning workgroup sessions, and D, E, and F correspond to afternoon workgroup sessions. Sections A and C both dealt with the issue of national will. This occurred because of a miscommunication among seminar staff. No workgroup addressed the issue of strategic and political tensions between the American military's traditional and non-traditional missions. The participants and their affiliations are listed at the end of this appendix.

A. NATIONAL WILL – FIRST WORKGROUP

This workgroup responded to the issue of national will as a strategic factor in U.S. policy planning for the future, specifically addressing whether (and how) national will factors into the development of national security policy for the 21st century. The group quickly agreed that national will is indeed an important factor in future planning, but that it might not be the defining factor policy makers must consider when developing and implementing policy. Several participants noted the difficulty in defining national will in today's rapidly changing security environment. Initial discussion centered on these key questions:

- What exactly is national will?
- How has it been expressed in the past?
- How is it expressed today?
- Should we focus on *national will* or *national interest*?

Participants agreed that the national security frame of reference changed drastically in the last decade, and accompanying that shift was a severe dropoff in the

level of public attention paid to specific issues considered to be in the realm of national security. Interestingly, though, and in sharp contrast to most time periods in American history, the American public continued to voice strong support for high levels of defense spending throughout most of the peaceful 1990s. This support continues today despite the absence of a peer competitor approaching the size of the Soviet threat of the Cold War. What is unique about this support is that it comes without a large number of strings attached. What has emerged is a widespread public trust of elected and appointed officials – particularly the president and top defense leadership – to make sound policy decisions and to execute competently effective national security policy. Since the early 1990s, the American people have chosen to take an essentially hands-off approach. One participant remarked that this reflects the new, increased importance Americans place on leadership in national security matters and noted that the public still cares a great deal about the direction and execution of national security policy. The American people want national security done competently and will voice their displeasure in instances of dramatic failure, such as Somalia, when they sense that leadership has failed to live up to its responsibilities. This participant called this new American outlook the “blank-check” approach. Inherent in this framework, he said, is a pronounced American reluctance to going it alone or carrying what the public perceives as a disproportionate share of the burden in maintaining international stability and security. The group adopted this blank-check perspective and used it to frame the remainder of its discussion of national will.

Agreement on the “blank-check” notion led the group to question the relevance of “national will” as a strategic factor in the formulation of national security policy. Public disinterest in security issues, one participant remarked, effectively minimizes the importance of national will as a factor in policy planning. This results in an enhanced role for “national interests” – and for the importance of competent leadership – as decision makers and implementers are allowed broader autonomy from public scrutiny of their work. National will, this participant noted, is largely static and positive today. Indeed, politics still enter into the equation – as in debates about base closures, force structure reductions, and procurement – but parties to these debates are motivated less by the big picture of U.S. national security and more by narrower issues of local economics and district- and state-level politics. A group consensus emerged on the opinion that national interest has largely eclipsed national will in importance for policymaking in the early 21st century and that, because of this, the importance of effective leadership has increased dramatically.

The group summarized its discussions in several key points that members believed needed to be discussed by a wider audience:

- National will is an important factor to consider in future national security policy planning, but due to the public's "blank-check" attitude toward national security expenditures, the role of leadership is expanded and the hand of leadership strengthened.
- Americans have a general aversion to protracted war that is not limited to an alleged public intolerance for military casualties. This aversion is generally expressed in reverse proportion to what is at stake: where the public perceives that America's interests are great, aversion is low; where American interests are not as great, or where they are not clearly defined, aversion to protracted conflict is high.
- The size and composition of our military – and our national security establishment more broadly – serve as an expression of national will. This expression could change in the future, as could the seemingly static nature of American national will. The group noted that a large domestic terrorist attack would likely shift public opinion dramatically and alter the shape of our national will. Related to this, members agreed, is the touchy issue of American civil liberties and how they would likely change in the aftermath of a domestic terrorist incident.
- America must reassess who is responsible for security.
- The "blank-check" does not mean that Americans no longer care about national security issues. It means that Americans expect their leadership to "do" national security competently and will voice serious concern when they sense that leaders are failing in this task. More broadly, America today needs "galvanizing" leadership – from presidents, congressmen, senators and other such figures, but also from community leaders, teachers, business persons, clergy, and the media to name only a few.

B. EVOLVING GLOBAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT

This workgroup focused almost entirely on non-traditional security threats. It discussed the issues of globalization, post-industrial economics, demographic shifts, nation/state evolution – all those listed in the handout guidelines – but found this list to be an inadequate accounting of relevant topics. Participants looked into additional areas of concern, including environmental security and economic disparity. An in-depth discussion on terrorism emerged, as participants elected to treat it not as a subset of other fields but as a distinct and important element of the 21st century security environment. Participants questioned how the U.S. could build defenses against terrorist threats, as well

as the underlying causes of such threats. Is the U.S. overly involved in the affairs of other sovereign states? Do other states rightly or wrongly perceive this to be the case, and is this the root of the new terrorist threat? Do U.S. interests need to be more clearly defined, for the world to see? Participants agreed that today's military is not capable of countering the most likely threats facing the U.S. in the future. In this light, one participant remarked that real security in the 21st century might require Americans to think differently about civil liberties, and perhaps be willing to enact life changes that reflect this new thinking.

A major discussion question was "what is it that we as Americans most seek to secure in the 21st century?" One participant stated simply that what Americans most want to protect in the future are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We can define success in security by judging how well we protect these three elements. How, though, can these be secured? And what threat(s) most endanger them? The consensus that emerged from group discussion was that terrorism on American soil is the main direct threat to Americans' life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. This consensus included the realization that there is no danger whatsoever of a successful territorial invasion of the United States by a foreign power. Further, there is little likelihood that a foreign war could erode U.S. military resources to the point that our ability to defend the territorial United States from traditional military threat would be in jeopardy.

The most relevant and dangerous threat America must confront in the future is the kind that would be most able to prey on the open nature of American society. This vulnerability is exacerbated by the economic and political effects of globalization, open borders, and the rapid movement of labor. The terrorist threat emerges opportunistically when guards are down and when probability of success – rated in terms of civilian death, property destruction, and social disruption – is highest. Further, the group noted, these kinds of terrorist threats have no return addresses. This makes military retaliation extremely difficult.

Related to this, the group's second main concern was "will (or should) we as a nation consent to restricting or narrowing our rights for the sake of protecting ourselves from future threats?" How much are we as Americans willing to give up in order to protect ourselves? Can the issue of threat be effectively assessed on a national, society-wide scale without a catastrophic incident to bring focus and a sense of purpose to the debate?

Examining the sources of potential 21st century security threats, the group centered on the issue of the haves versus the have-nots. How do we deal with the downtrodden and the disenfranchised? Anger at this economic predicament, tangibly directed at the United States in the form of a violent attack, one participant suggested, would be the logical source of a serious homeland threat. From a foreign policy perspective, how does the rest of the world view the U.S.? As a benevolent hegemonic power? As a cultural imperialist? The issue that mobilizes a potential terrorist threat, the group concluded, is empowerment. The ability to do harm may be the one tool that a group or network can use to threaten American life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. This begs the question: do we as a nation help them by trying to ameliorate the root causes of this unhappiness? Or do we simply defend against resulting threats?

C. NATIONAL WILL – SECOND WORKGROUP

This workgroup approached the issue of national will by first answering two questions:

- What is the objective of the nature of the American nation in today's world (e.g., hegemonic, democratic icon, enforcer), and what do Americans most value?
- What exactly is national will, and how does the United States express it?

Participants in this workgroup addressed the issue first from a broad perspective, seeking to define America's role in the world and to pinpoint its objectives in the international system. Does the United States place a high importance on creating a world in its own image, that of a great democracy? There are certainly indications that this is the case, one participant remarked: one need only look at the types of deployments our forces have been asked to undertake in the decade since the end of the Cold War. On the other hand, does the United States focus its collective energy less on politics and more on its economic aspirations? America has an unmistakable stake in the global economy; it depends on global economic engagement for its very survival. Ours is a post-industrial, services- and technology-based economy that imports a vast amount of the goods on which our citizens depend for daily living. Is U.S. foreign policy based on another overarching objective? Or is reality a balanced mix of considerations? Is the United States as an international actor motivated more by prosperity or by conscience? Are these even distinguishable? The panel agreed that in order to understand American national will – the things that “make the nation tick” – we must first understand the nature of the American nation in today's world.

- The group concluded that the question of just what is national will really boils down to this: how much (in terms of available resources) are we as a nation willing to expend in pursuit of our objectives? Different objectives will undoubtedly command different amounts of resources. But what do we mean by resources? Essentially what we are talking about is money and human lives. One participant noted that in order to discuss national will and resources gainfully in a national security context, we must first understand the issue of threat. Given that we understand our nation's role and objectives in the world, what is the most likely set of challenges that will test American resolve? Do Americans understand the kinds of national security threats the U.S. faces today, or will face in the future? The group noted that terrorism – in all its forms – is the most pressing security threat Americans will have to confront in the early 21st century. This includes traditional notions of terrorism (random acts of violence against innocent people), cyber terrorism that can immobilize the nation's technological infrastructure, and economic terrorism aimed at paralyzing normal market activity.
- The 1990s have been a decade of relative public neglect of military matters, one participant noted; Americans simply do not pay as much attention to national security matters today as they did during the Cold War and before. The economic boom of the mid- to late-1990s insulated Americans and gave them a false sense of security. Politicians charged with maintaining national security have not done an adequate job of breaking through this public numbness. The American public, by and large, is simply not conscious of today's wide array of potential national security threats. If allowed to continue, this could paralyze our functioning in the 21st century security environment. Public awareness must improve, but how? The key is education.
- U.S. policy makers must address the critical issue of changing public attitudes and threat awareness. One of the key roles of elected leaders, said one participant, is not only to listen to the people, but also, where needed, to educate the people. Another added that the American people are probably not willing to make large sacrifices for security at this point because what threats they do see are perceived to be relatively minor. While many policy makers overstate threats (e.g., in the military appropriations process) for political purposes, many also understate threat for political purposes. The bottom line, the panel agreed, is that public awareness of current and future security threats is woefully inadequate and that widespread public education is the answer.

D. THE U.S. ARMED FORCES' MATERIEL AND EQUIPMENT

Following an initial discussion on the relevance of discussion points provided in the seminar handout, participants elected to approach the issue of materiel and equipment

from the position that today's military is unable (and left alone will continue to be unable) to perform the kinds of missions that will be required of it in the new 21st century security environment. There was broad agreement on the panel that U.S. military forces in the 1990s were asked to do too much with too little, and the group acknowledged that our national discussion of military affairs rightly centers on the need for change. The issue, one member of the group said, is whether we pursue evolutionary change, whether we pursue revolutionary change, or whether we will simply continue to tinker around the margins of change. Which path the U.S. ends up taking is dependent on several variables:

- Future threat perception and definition: sound strategy and acquisitions policy depend on sound analysis of the challenges we will ask our military to meet in the future.
- Political realities: every option brought to the table is the product of a unique constituency with particular interests.
- Research and development: significant change in acquisitions will be impossible without a well-defined, cooperative, and lasting R&D framework.

The workgroup turned first to the issue of future threat perception and definition, and there was widespread agreement that America's future force must be properly equipped to deal with non-traditional threats such as chemical and biological attack and cyber warfare. One participant remarked that the acquisitions process would have to undergo difficult, drastic change if it is to transform from its current traditional threat orientation into a non-traditional orientation. Change of the magnitude that would be required for such a reorientation, another added, would rustle more than a few bureaucratic feathers and would be extremely difficult – if not impossible – to realize. In the same vein, another group member suggested that R&D would need to be able to counter a spectrum of non-traditional threats. This could prove especially difficult, this person said, because not only would the system have to contend with the bureaucratic pressures of civilian and military officials of the DoD, but it would also be subject to the (likely faster) schedule of private business. A prime example of this type of military-industrial mismatch is the UAV problem: industry providing unwanted items on its own timeline, which can slow the acquisitions process and cause even more problems.

Another factor complicating the acquisitions process is the political reality that organizations more often than not strongly resist fundamental change. The military is a great example of this, since generals who come up in the system are the most unlikely candidates to seriously alter that which they know best. Institutional inertia of this sort

can cause organizations to be so blind that they simply do not see a compelling reason to change course. One member of the group noted that this might be the result of a lack of any effective mechanism for synthesizing and employing lessons learned. How can substantive change come about, given this bleak assessment? One participant noted that history's successful transformations have been those that erode and replace a dominant (often atrophied) culture. The U.S. Navy was successful in one such transformation in its move from a battleship-based force to a carrier-based force.

How can a favorable climate for change be cultivated? Even if change is welcome in some form, how can its proponents be certain that it will move at an effective pace? And in the military context, what players are likely to initiate and sustain the necessary types of changes in the acquisition process? One person argued that the Services would be most unlikely candidates to advance drastic change and that civilian leadership would be much more likely to advocate real change. The participant cited members of Congress, many of whom are closely aligned with the interests of private business ("an entity that lives by the motto 'time is money'"), when making this point. Another member countered that members of Congress, being "so close to the people," and having such a diversity of interests, would not be the source of such change and that only the executive could succeed in the endeavor of change. Another noted that perhaps the Services could be at least marginally freed from paralyzing inertia if they adopted more of a business-type model for acquisition. This participant cited GE Corp. as an example of an organization that adopted such change, allowing divisions within the company to compete against one another and letting new, good ideas beat out old, static ones. Another countered that perhaps we should think of the Services as a customer and not so much as a company. Do they (the Services) even want new products (processes)? Would they take to such a system? Again the issue becomes: Where does the impetus for change originate?

From an institutional perspective, one participant noted, major change is unlikely to originate from the CINCs. They operate on a short time horizon of 2 to 3 years and "don't have a war plan they don't think they can meet immediately." The Service chiefs might be able to think innovatively, someone else suggested. They know the end goals and perhaps know best how to meet them, given that their time frame is a bit longer and their position in the bureaucracy allows them more freedom of original movement. Two participants then suggested that transformational change is not likely to come from the Services at all – that support for it needs to come directly from civilian leadership.

Complicating transformation, the issue that came to dominate discussion in this session, is the problem of public interest. Does the public really even care if waste, fraud, and abuse permeate acquisitions or other vital processes? What if support for change ran high within the Services, but it was just deemed too expensive by Congress? Would the public even take notice? Again politics enters into the equation. Many agreed that the American people seem to take serious note of military affairs only when it involves something that touches their lives directly, most often a catastrophe involving casualties or a local base closure. Without a head of steam behind it, no proposal for transformational change will ever get off the ground. Tinkering around the edges is the norm today, and will remain so in the absence of a major impetus for change.

E. THE U.S. ARMED FORCES' LEADERSHIP, DOCTRINE, AND CHARACTER (INCLUDING THEIR EVOLVING RELATIONSHIP TO THE LARGER SOCIETY)

The group began by addressing personnel issues. What is at the root of today's personnel problems, and how can we resolve these problems so they do not endanger national security in the early 21st century security environment? Retention dominated the personnel discussion, as participants listed reasons why the military is experiencing such difficulty keeping bright, qualified people in uniform (items are in no particular order):

- Strong economy
- Poor communications in the ranks (senior to junior)
- “Ticket punching” career schedule
- Up or out promotion practices
- Selectivity in recruitment
- Perceived increases in overseas deployments
- High operations tempos
- Demographic factors (e.g., marriage)
- Risk averse decision-making.

The fact that the United States enjoyed remarkable economic growth throughout most of the 1990s did have a significant impact on recruitment and retention of qualified personnel. But this problem is nothing new – similar patterns have emerged over history. And while the Services can do little in the face of a strong economy other than raise salaries and increase benefits and enlistment incentives, participants agreed that the military's personnel problems run far deeper than just competing in a hot job market.

The economy's greatest impact on the military's personnel situation, many agreed, was that it afforded Service members the opportunity to market their skills and consider other employment options. Indeed, the strong American economy lowered many members' toleration threshold with respect to the factors listed above. These problems will not simply go away with the passage of time. The group overwhelmingly agreed that the entire military personnel system, which helps provide military leadership, is broken and needs to evolve to meet 21st century demands.

Participants did not go so far as to suggest radical changes in the military management structure. No one responded favorably to the suggestion that perhaps the military would want to consider a flatter, less rigid rank structure. They largely agreed that the current rank structure is necessary to maintain good order and discipline within the Services. Further, if promotions are done properly, the rank structure can be a valuable motivational tool. The rank structure is not the problem, one participant suggested. Leadership might do better to focus on career development and on getting the most advantage from its diverse talent pool. One participant suggested that there should be two career tracks – a technical track and a management (leadership) track. Perhaps the military education system has not kept up adequately with issues such as cyberterrorism and military operations other than war. A related issue is the relatively short nature of military tours of duty and rapid rotation through vastly different jobs. One person suggested that the military might get a better return on its training investment if it better utilized the talents of its recruits and allowed them to work longer tours in their chosen area of expertise. This is an issue today's military is struggling with, said one participant, but little is likely to change in the short term.

One participant noted that military doctrine is very slow to change. As a result, it tends to be hostile to new ideas and therefore grows reactive rather than proactive. This problem could be remedied, another person suggested, by implementing a better system for formulating and implementing lessons learned.

The group underscored the importance of character to military effectiveness and agreed that it played a relatively more important role in the profession of arms than it might in other professions. The military profession requires individuals who can be trusted, can employ arms competently, and can operate effectively in an environment where mistakes often cost lives in addition to dollars. One person noted that today this sense of military character should be utilized as a selling point in recruitment. Another responded that the Marine Corps long has emphasized this in its recruiting efforts.

F. MILITARY FORCES: COMPOSITION, ORGANIZATION, SIZE, AND QUALITY

This group touched on many of the same personnel and force issues addressed by earlier panels. Members first discussed issues relating to organization and force composition. There was no group consensus on the appropriate size and structure of the U.S. military. Some participants thought the current size and organizational structure are appropriate and that compression and minor organizational adjustments could remedy the force's ills. Others argued that, during the last decade, in which the threats facing our country and the missions demanded of the military have changed dramatically from Cold War norms, civilians and uniformed leadership missed a golden opportunity to build a military capable of meeting the demands of the 21st century security environment. These participants argued that U.S. leadership has not really come to terms with the old quantity equals quality attitude. They argued that the force is simply too massive and weighted by bureaucracy to respond effectively to current and future threats.

The current force was completely ill equipped to deal with the many non-traditional missions with which it was tasked throughout the 1990s. Why do we continue to dedicate so many resources to a force specifically designed to counter threats we no longer face? Couldn't we get a better return on our investment if we brought our resource allocation practices and our military strategy into alignment? Couldn't we actually end up spending less money on defense and getting more security in return? The other contingent responded that less than 10 percent of the force was ever actually deployed on international missions at any one time and that combat readiness never declined as a result of such engagements. Don't we need to be prepared to meet a spectrum of threats – traditional *as well as* (not instead of) non-traditional? The best transformations “come from ground zero,” the other side responded, and we should not kid ourselves by calling it transformation when all we really do is change one thing here, another there, and another there. This debate reflected a larger debate in national security circles, and here, as elsewhere, the participants found no immediate solution.

Both parties to this debate recognized the fact that recruitment and retention present serious challenges for the early 21st century military. The United States can do little to prepare its military to meet new challenges without significant public support. The task will therefore be complicated, given that the public is generally more disinterested in national security affairs today than at any point in recent history. There is a very real gap between the military and civilian society. Increasingly, the military is made up of lower middle-class Americans – and while it is held in high regard by the vast

majority of Americans, fewer and fewer parents want their children to enlist or enroll in officer training. This underscores the need for a new and systematically different approach to recruiting and personnel management in the armed forces.

List of Participants:

Mr. Thomas Allen	Research Staff Member, System Evaluation Division, IDA
Mr. James Bexfield	Research Staff Member, System Evaluation Division, IDA
Dr. Peter Brooks	Research Staff Member, Simulation Center
Dr. Kristen Buehler	Research Staff Member, Operational Evaluation Division, IDA
Ms. Sunjin Choi	Research Staff Member, Strategy, Forces, and Resources Division, IDA
Dr. Theodore Eck	Consultant, Operational Evaluation Division, IDA
Dr. Gerald Epstein	Research Staff Member, IDA
Dr. Michael Hanratty	Research Staff Member, Computer and Software Engineering Division, IDA
Dr. Aileen Huang-Saad	Research Staff Member, Science and Technology Division, IDA
Dr. David Hunter	Research Staff Member, Cost Analysis and Research Division, IDA
Dr. William Hurley	Research Staff Member, Joint Advanced Warfighting Program, IDA
Mr. Paul Jesukiewicz	Research Staff Member, Science and Technology Division, IDA
Dr. George Koleszar	Research Staff Member, Systems Evaluation Division, IDA
Mr. James Kurtz	Research Staff Member, Joint Advanced Warfighting Program, IDA
Col Karl Lowe	Research Staff Member, Joint Advanced Warfighting Program, IDA
Mr. Philip Major	Vice President, Planning and Evaluation, IDA
Ms. Karen Olson	Research Staff Member, Systems Evaluation Division, IDA
Dr. James Ralston	Research Staff Member, Science and Technology Division, IDA

Mr. Joel Resnick	Research Staff Member, Joint Advanced Warfighting Program, IDA
Dr. Bradley Roberts	Research Staff Member, Strategy, Forces, and Resources Division, IDA
Dr. Robert Roberts	Vice President, Research, IDA
Dr. Stephanie Rogers	Research Staff Member, Systems Evaluation Division, IDA
Dr. Robie Samanta Roy	Research Staff Member, Systems Evaluation Division, IDA
Dr. James Silk	Research Staff Member, Science and Technology Division, IDA
Mr. Robert Soule	Director, Operational Evaluation Division, IDA
Dr. Karen Tyson	Research Staff Member, Cost Analysis and Research Division, IDA
Dr. Catherine Warner	Research Staff Member, Operational Evaluation Division, IDA
Mr. James Woolsey, III	Research Staff Member, Cost Analysis and Research Division, IDA
Dr. Caroline Ziemke	Research Staff Member, Strategic, Forces, and Resources Division, IDA

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		<i>Form Approved</i> <i>OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22203-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.			
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE September 2001	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final; Dec. 2000 – Sep. 2001
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE National Security Dialogues on the 21 st Century – Volume II		5. FUNDING NUMBERS CRP C9023, 21 st Century Conflict	
6. AUTHOR(s) Edward F. Smith, Jr., John F. Kreis, Edwin J. Pechous, John C. Tillson, Jr., Warren K. Olson, Rosser Bobbitt, John E. Rothrock, Joel C. Christenson			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Institute for Defense Analyses 1801 N. Beauregard St. Alexandria, VA 22311		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER IDA Document D-2518 Volume II	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Institute for Defense Analyses 1801 N. Beauregard St. Alexandria, VA 22311		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. Directorate for Freedom of Information and Security Review, 13 November 2001.		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) This document, produced under IDA's Central Research Program, collects the comments relative to national security made by a series of conference panels at various locations across the United States. These panels were drawn from a wide cross-section of American citizens. The objective was to hear from people with extensive backgrounds in national security policy making, as well as citizens who had little or no experience in the area, but who could articulate the views of the general public. Comments arose from discussions under six topics: The 21st Century Security Environment; National Will in the 21st Century; Traditional versus Non-Traditional Missions; Force Composition Size and Quality; Materiel and Equipment; and Leadership, Doctrine, and Character. This volume two adds three supplementary appendices covering conference panels that occurred after the completion of the main volume of the document.			
14. SUBJECT TERMS National Security; Post-Industrial Age; Globalization; Post-Cold War; Information Age			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 48
			16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UNLIMITED