

FINAL REPORT



National STRATEGIES AND CAPABILITIES for a Changing World

Report from the
IFPA-Fletcher Conference 2000

Hosted by
The United States Army
Co-Sponsored by
Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, Inc.
The International Security Studies Program of
The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
Office of the Secretary of Defense for Net Assessment

Report Documentation Page		
Report Date 00 00 2000	Report Type N/A	Dates Covered (from... to) -
Title and Subtitle National Strategies Capabilities for a Changing World		Contract Number
		Grant Number
		Program Element Number
Author(s)		Project Number
		Task Number
		Work Unit Number
Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es) Office of the Secretary of Defense' for Net Assessment The Pentagon Washington D C 20301-2000		Performing Organization Report Number
Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es)		Sponsor/Monitor's Acronym(s)
		Sponsor/Monitor's Report Number(s)
Distribution/Availability Statement Approved for public release, distribution unlimited		
Supplementary Notes The original document contains color images.		
Abstract		
Subject Terms		
Report Classification unclassified		Classification of this page unclassified
Classification of Abstract unclassified		Limitation of Abstract UU
Number of Pages 129		

Final Report
IFPA-Fletcher Conference 2000



November 15-16, 2000
Crystal Gateway Marriott
1700 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA

Hosted by
The United States Army

Co-Sponsored by
Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, Inc.
The International Security Studies Program of
The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
Office of the Secretary of Defense for Net Assessment

General Editors
Christopher E. Hornbarger, Captain, U.S. Army
David W. Kearns, Jr., Research Associate,
Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis

The material presented is based upon work supported by the US Army War College under contract no. DABT43-00-P-1111. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the US Army War College.

Photographs by Guy Noffsinger

Design by Christian Hoffman

contents

Introduction	v
Areas of General Consensus	vii
Introductory Remarks	1
<i>The Honorable Louis A. Caldera, Secretary of the Army</i>	
Transforming National Defense	4
Prioritizing the Security Agenda	
<i>Senator Carl Levin (D-MI)</i>	
The National Interest	10
What is Driving our National Security Strategy and What Should?	
<i>Representative Ellen O. Tauscher (D-CA)</i>	
<i>The Honorable Richard L. Armitage</i>	
<i>Dr. Graham T. Allison</i>	
Globalization and National Security	18
<i>Mr. Tom Friedman</i>	
Emerging Threats	23
Implications for Defense Strategy	
<i>Dr. Michael E. O'Hanlon</i>	
<i>Lieutenant General Edward G. Anderson III, USA</i>	
<i>Mr. Michael Vatis</i>	



Coalitions and Alliances	34
The Future of Military Engagement	
<i>General Klaus Naumann (Ret.)</i>	
<i>General Montgomery Meigs, USA</i>	
<i>Lieutenant General Peter Cosgrove, AC, MC</i>	
<i>Dr. Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall</i>	
Service Contributions to	47
National Security Strategy and Capabilities	
<i>General Eric K. Shinseki, USA</i>	
<i>Admiral Vernon E. Clark, USN</i>	
<i>General James L. Jones, USMC</i>	
<i>General Michael E. Ryan, USAF</i>	
The National Military Strategy and Joint Vision 2020	58
<i>General Henry H. Shelton, USA</i>	
Essential Military Capabilities for a Changing World	63
<i>Admiral Hal Gehman, USN (Ret.)</i>	
<i>General Charles T. Robertson, USAF</i>	
<i>General Tommy R. Franks, USA</i>	
<i>General Peter Pace, USMC</i>	
<i>General Charles R. Holland, USAF</i>	
Setting Priorities for a New National Security Strategy	77
<i>Dr. Condoleezza Rice</i>	
Developing Defense Strategy for a Changing World	82
<i>Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft, USAF (Ret.)</i>	
Implementing Needed Change	87
Reforms to Structure and Process	
<i>Dr. John P. White</i>	
<i>Admiral William A. Owens, USN (Ret.)</i>	
<i>General Wesley K. Clark, USA (Ret.)</i>	
Concluding Remarks	97
<i>The Honorable Rudy de Leon</i>	
Biographies	100

introduction

A high-level, two-day conference entitled *National Strategies and Capabilities for a Changing World* was held in Arlington, Virginia, on November 15-16, 2000. The purpose of the conference – hosted by the U.S. Army – was to examine critical security issues facing the new administration. The conference objectives were to understand more fully the challenges of the early twenty-first century; to consider the implications of these challenges for national security strategy; and to address the national and military capabilities needed to execute that strategy.



The conference drew more than 450 participants from academia, industry, the think-tank community, the media, and the U.S. government – including the Departments of Defense and State, the military services, the National Security Council, and Congress. In an effort to stimulate the exchange of diverse views among attendees, an impressive gathering of distinguished speakers addressed the participants on various topics that included:

- The national interest
- Globalization and national security
- Emerging threats and implications for defense strategy
- Coalitions and alliances and the future of military engagement

- Service contributions to national security strategy and capabilities
- Transforming the national defense

The conference was co-sponsored by the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis (IFPA) and the International Security Studies Program of The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, together with the Office of the Secretary of Defense for Net Assessment.

The report that follows provides a summary of key points from conference proceedings and an analysis of panel presentations and discussions. For more complete information, you may wish to refer to the transcript of each speaker's presentation, which is posted on the IFPA web site (www.ifpa.org).

areas of general consensus

Despite a wide range of views articulated by participants during the two-day conference and summarized in this report, a number of common themes or areas of consensus were evident. Following are the key conclusions reached.

vii

- *A national discourse on America's role in the world is necessary.* Much of the difficulty associated with developing a national security strategy stems from the absence of a clear sense of where America sees itself in the world. A decade after the Cold War, we have yet to articulate clearly America's role and obligations in a world of change. Without greater consensus on foreign affairs, it is difficult to determine appropriate uses of military force, levels of defense spending, or military capabilities. Further, coherent national security and military strategies depend on political leadership. Finally, without political support, it will be difficult to implement the needed but sometimes difficult reforms that are crucial to preparing the Department of Defense (DoD) and the uniformed services for the new century.

Although a majority of conference participants identified a need for such a national discourse, some suggested that there is little divergence of views among foreign policy elites of

either party regarding the necessity for U.S. engagement and leadership.

Isolationism is not an option. Fundamental to peace, maintaining prosperity and stability has been and will remain the active role of the United States. While it may be more difficult to make the case to the American people for active overseas U.S. engagement given no Cold War-type threat, there is a direct link between America's strength and the stable global environment America requires to prosper. However, a global U.S. role can only be sustained within the context of a robust overall foreign policy in which the employment of the military is but one of a number of available options.


While no conference speaker advocated U.S. retrenchment, the speakers did not agree on the nature of America's global role, particularly as it pertains to the use of military force. Some asserted the need for a more activist leadership role while others seemed inclined to allow allies to take a greater share of regional burdens. This tension among panelists mirrors that of the public at large and must be addressed.

- 2 *The administration has the opportunity to address tough security issues.* Rather than a comprehensive program review, the next QDR should be a truly strategic review that establishes a vision, sets priorities, and helps resolve the biggest strategy and program issues. The QDR must set forth the requirements and capabilities for all current and anticipated missions, not just preparedness for major theater wars (MTWs). DoD should broaden its planning scenarios beyond two MTWs to include a wider range of potential threats, objectives, conditions, and operational concepts. It is clear that the debate must continue on this crucial issue; its resolution will go a long way toward setting the framework for future personnel, procurement, and funding requirements.
- 3 *Strategists must identify and prepare for emerging threats and potential vulnerabilities.* While the threat of major conventional land war appears to have greatly declined for now, continued U.S. global interests and responsibilities demand a military capable of a broad range of activities from engagement to warf-

ighting. The real challenge is identifying and understanding threats to our interests and developing comprehensive strategies and capabilities for deterring and, if necessary, responding to diverse threats when our interests demand it. Several threats were identified as a basis for these national security priorities:

- 3a) Homeland security must be a national priority. The increased prospect of a conventional or weapons-of-mass-destruction (WMD) attack on the American homeland places an added burden on the national security apparatus. First and foremost, it requires the promulgation of clear directives that establish both the responsibilities and authority essential to any prevention efforts or effective response. It will also require robust contingency planning involving organizations not typically associated with national defense. Entities such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), along with state and local law enforcement, emergency, and health organizations, must be essential parts of any comprehensive approach to homeland security. Finally, while our ultimate goal is deterrence or prevention of attacks, we must earmark and disperse adequate funds for providing effective response capabilities.
- 3b) Missile defense is a reasonable response to a real threat. In addition to the proliferation of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons, the technology to deliver such weapons has greatly improved and increased the possibility of their use. While it is important that the United States make clear to those who might employ these weapons that our response will be decisive, unequivocal, and lethal, beyond a credible deterrence posture, policy makers must prepare for a deterrence failure. This preparation includes increasing resources for intelligence

left to right: General Eric Shinseki, USA; Admiral Vernon Clark, USN; Dr. Robert Pfaltzgraff; General James Jones, USMC; and General Michael Ryan



gathering and interdiction capabilities, and the development of technologies such as missile defense, including missile defense for friends and allies as well as for the United States itself.

In addition to the threat against the U.S. homeland and our friends and allies, the threat or actual use of missiles, particularly those carrying WMD, against forward bases could damage the U.S. ability to project power. Once power is projected, there is an even more critical need to protect those forces with land- and sea-based missile defense systems. As the United States becomes vulnerable to ballistic missile attack from states in regions of importance, the ability, and perhaps the willingness, of the United States to respond to crises may be diminished. These threats demand support for research and development on missile defense technology.

3c The cyber warfare threat requires immediate and close attention. There can be little question that the computers and networks that serve as the backbone of U.S. and global financial markets present lucrative targets. Similarly, as the armed services continue to integrate information systems and capabilities to achieve battlespace dominance, the enabling technologies will become increasingly attractive targets. Public and private sector leaders must work together to safeguard the technologies integral to American prosperity and security. We must develop coordinated responses to potential attacks on existing systems, and work to minimize or eliminate potential vulnerabilities in new technologies.

3d The boldness of adversaries and their willingness to attack U.S. and coalition assets around the world make force protection a pressing concern. However, most commanders need additional resources to provide adequate protection to forward base positions. The bombing attacks against the U.S. facility at the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia and the USS *Cole* in Yemen, together with reports of plots by terrorists against other U.S. assets, make force protection a continuing near-term priority. Protection of forward bases remains crucial to the U.S. ability to move forces quickly to crisis settings.

- 4 *It is critical that the United States maintain strong, flexible, and full-spectrum military capabilities.* Even in the absence of a single global rival, and with increased concern about asymmetric or nontraditional attacks on U.S. interests, the United States continues to face conventional threats around the world. American power must deter, and if deterrence fails, defeat challenges to U.S. security across the full range of military operations. A number of scenarios might require a U.S. military response. Currently, U.S. military power is globally preeminent, but the United States faces important military readiness and transformation needs if it is to maintain adequate military capabilities.
- 5 *There has been a strategy-capability mismatch, which has created a heavy and unsustainable burden on the armed services.* To address this mismatch, there are four logical alternatives: (1) increase defense resources; (2) change our strategy to reduce the demands on the force; (3) adopt a very different way of meeting future challenges by transforming the military; and/or (4) adjust the level of acceptable risk in the near, medium, or long term.

Although the four alternatives are evident, conference participants did not reach a clear consensus about which of these alternatives is best. While a majority seemed predisposed to increase defense funding, a number of others stressed reduced demands, transformation, or a combination of approaches. An approach that merely reduces requirements is unlikely in itself to resolve the strategy-capabilities mismatch.

- 6 *Consequently, defense budgets will need to be increased over the near term.* Even if essential reforms are made within the DoD and throughout the services, defense spending will need to increase in the years ahead. Given the spectrum of emerging threats and the day-to-day readiness requirements facing the services, a significant infusion of funds will be required to address pressing needs. Developing robust means to respond to threats of terrorist or missile attack against the U.S. homeland, cyber warfare, and other changes in the operational environment will require

investment in research and development (R&D) of new capabilities. It is difficult to foresee how this R&D commitment will not place major pressure on existing and future procurement and modernization budgets for traditional service needs. Reconciling funding needs for a wide array of programs will be a daunting challenge for defense policy makers in the future.

Given a tight fiscal environment, additional efforts should be made to eliminate excess capacity and unnecessary redundancies. The secretary of defense should proceed with a new list of recommended base closures, while Congress should move forward with new legislation for a long-term, effective Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) program. Current weapons systems deemed inadequate for the future operational environment and requirements across the full range of military missions should be halted. Congress must approach national security matters in a bipartisan manner to debate and resolve the difficult choices that lie ahead.

7 *The debate over national military strategy is inevitably shaped by resource constraints.* Nevertheless, it is important to consider the requirements for national security as a basis for determining the appropriate allocation of resources. Such an approach can help sensitize leaders to the effect of resource constraints on national military strategy and the risks that such constraints create. While threats should not be overplayed in order to attract resources for specific programs, neither should threats be downplayed because of a perception that adequate resources for addressing them may not materialize. The reality of budget limitations should drive civilian and military leaders to articulate as clearly as possible their needs and to work to build public support for various commitments that flow from an agreed national military strategy.

8 *Alliances and coalitions should play an increasingly important role in responding to crises.* While the United States currently possesses unparalleled military muscle, it should seldom act alone. Except perhaps in defense of fundamental national interests, most U.S. military operations in the future should be conducted as part of a multinational coalition or within an

alliance framework such as NATO. Coalition operations may lend greater legitimacy to a military operation. They have the practical benefit of burden sharing, which is important particularly in cases where critical U.S. interests are not directly at stake. The increasingly transnational nature of threats (such as terrorism, weapons proliferation, or drug trafficking) requires greater cooperation and coordination between countries to develop effective responses. Given potentially divergent interests even among allies, however, as well as limitations in their capabilities, the United States must retain the means to act alone where necessary in support of its most important interests. The United States must have a realistic estimate of the resources allies and coalition partners can provide, as well as their willingness to provide them.

- 9 *The services should continue to develop capabilities and concepts in accordance with Joint Vision 2020.* Individual service transformations should be guided by their respective contributions to a transformed joint force. Moving beyond service traditions and cultures to build a more joint force requires political leadership and initiative within and among the services. While progress has been made, Kosovo revealed continuing deficiencies in the jointness of U.S. forces. For example, critical support elements such as intelligence, communications, and logistics need to become more integrated. Most importantly, Joint Forces Command should be strengthened to become a true joint force integrator engaged in continuous exercises and experiments while mindful of each service's core competencies.
- 10 *A critical component of Joint Vision 2020, U.S. strategic mobility, may be in jeopardy.* The United States needs to retain overseas bases in key regions in order to gain maximum mobility. At the same time, we will require the means to move both U.S.-based and forward-stationed assets quickly. This will require a strong transport fleet. Procurement of transport platforms is often lost in the discussion over new weapons systems. Investment in transport capabilities is crucially important if the United States is to project joint capabilities in support of global interests and responsibilities.

- 11 *One of the greatest challenges facing the military is transforming the force, while remaining ready today to fight and win wars and execute other required missions. There are justifiable concerns about the added risks that transforming the military to address long-term threats may have on short-term readiness. The concern goes beyond just training and addresses risk associated with sustaining current equipment until new technologies pay off, if they eventually do. To the extent that a decision was made in the 1990s to skip over a generation of weapons systems, it is important that the risk in the interim period be adequately addressed and minimized as we search for high-payoff, leap-ahead technologies.*
- 12 *Despite important changes in the strategic and operational environments, the essence of conflict and war has not changed, making land forces an indispensable part of the joint force for the full range of twenty-first century operations. Armed conflict and war are ultimately contests of human will, and in the future, as in the past, will be waged in the competition for power and control over people, land, and natural resources. Adversaries will be adaptive and resolute. Land power, as part of a joint force, offers the greatest opportunity for addressing the human dimension of conflict and bringing lasting resolution to complex problems. Land forces, by their very presence, communicate the strongest signal of strategic intent and are essential to cementing coalitions and enabling interagency actors. Adaptive land forces maximize the effectiveness of the other services, conduct missions under all conditions across the full range of military operations, and offer a response to problems for which there are no technological solutions.*

opening address

The Honorable Louis A. Caldera
Secretary of the Army

SUMMARY

1

Among the instruments of national power, the next president must prioritize those that best contribute to our interests: tools that prevent wars as well as win them.

- Our greatest strength lies not in military might, but in our principles and ideals. Applied in the international context, those principles and ideals include humanitarian, peacekeeping, other stability and support operations, and bilateral military ties.
- Thus, the tools that best enable us to prevent wars, in addition to those that ensure that we can fight and win wars, are essential to national security. This includes not only deterrence, but the proactive, people-to-people interventions that the Army regularly performs.
- In the current era, these people-to-people interventions, coupled with economic and diplomatic efforts and backed by preeminent warfighting capabilities, are the key to our security.

To set effective priorities, the next Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) should be a comprehensive review, not a budget drill.

- The QDR should examine four questions: (1) What short- and long-term threats confront the United States? (2) What pre-

ventive measures or capabilities are needed to deter or respond to those threats? (3) What is the right force structure for those capabilities? (4) What resources are necessary to establish and sustain that force structure?

- The QDR must capture the requirements and capabilities demanded by all of our current and anticipated missions, not just preparedness for major theater wars. Otherwise, it will perpetuate the present mismatch between strategy and resources, and balance the books on the backs of our troops.
- Resolving this strategy-resource mismatch will also require greater joint integration to eliminate inefficiencies and redundant capabilities.

The Army's role is indispensable.

- Army forces are critical to achieving quick, decisive, and lasting victory. The claim that a national aversion to casualties makes ground wars an anachronism is dangerous and false. Americans understand and support the risk of sacrifice if it is in our nation's interest and properly and honestly explained.
- The Army is the most relevant force for shaping the international environment and preventing war through people-to-people interventions. It is the nation's premier engagement force, and its principal operations-other-than-war force.
- The Army is too small to do all that it is currently required to do.
- The Army is just as capital intensive as the Navy and the Air Force, and needs comparable modernization resources (two to three times more than are currently allocated).

■ ANALYSIS ■

Secretary Caldera set the stage for the conference by raising several long-standing challenges to U.S. national security, particularly the perennially difficult problem of setting defense spending priorities among competing claims for resources. With an increasingly complex security environment and a change in administrations,

Secretary Caldera stated that it is both an appropriate and opportune time to address these issues.

Considering the upcoming QDR, the secretary asserted that the Army is not only strategically indispensable, but that it is too small for its current missions, and receives too small a share of the Defense Department's modernization resources. While the Army's leadership has been calling for additional modernization funding for years, only recently have they asserted that the Army's current force structure of 480,000 active duty soldiers is insufficient. Leading into the next QDR, both of these issues will certainly be of central importance.

While it is unsurprising that Secretary Caldera used his remarks to advocate for the service he leads, others in the conference echoed several of his main claims. Most notably, Admiral Owens, former vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, agreed that the Army is the "most relevant service and needs more money." What is unclear going into the next administration is how this assertion will square with Secretary Caldera's call to eliminate inefficiencies and redundancies among the military services. Critics of the Army's transformation initiative, which seeks to convert the heavy, Cold War Army into a more mobile and responsive force, have questioned whether the Marines would be better suited to handle the missions this transformed force is intended to perform.

Transforming National Defense

Prioritizing the Security Agenda

Senator Carl Levin (D-MI)
Ranking Minority Member,
Senate Armed Services Committee

4

SUMMARY

America's interests have not changed, but the threats have.

- Our strategic objectives have remained constant: the survival of a free United States, its values and institutions intact, with a prospering economy and healthy alliance relationships, in a stable world made more secure by the growth of democratic institutions and free market economies linked by a fair and open international trading system.
- The threats to the United States have changed. Those for which we are best prepared are the least likely, including MTWs. Those for which we are least prepared are the most likely, including asymmetric attacks that potentially involve WMD, and terrorism.

The United States should focus more on the most likely threats and less on the least likely, and therefore abandon the two-MTW construct.

- We should focus on preventing terrorist attacks using WMD, which may be more likely than a missile attack against the United States.
- We should expose extremist leaders who use religion as a tool of hate, perhaps convincing leaders of all religious faiths to join

in the condemnation of terrorism. The United States should also make greater use of “red teams,” including foreign-born personnel, to help us better understand the thinking of other cultures.

- We should improve our intelligence-collection capabilities, particularly against terrorists.
- We should abandon the two-MTW construct and instead structure our forces for one MTW plus one or two small-scale contingencies (SSCs).

The United States should improve its ability, in concert with allies, to conduct peace enforcement, peacekeeping, and humanitarian operations.

- We should encourage our allies to take the lead in peace operations.
- We should encourage the European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI) within NATO.
- We should continue efforts such as the African Crisis Response Initiative (ACRI), and encourage African nations to develop a NATO-like regional defense capability.

keynote address

10

Senator Carl Levin (D-MI)



- We should take steps to identify and minimize aspects of peace operations that have an adverse effect on our forces, such as initiatives to train civilian police volunteers.

Reverse the U.S. move away from multilateralism.

- Our allies have placed greater emphasis on multilateral organizations and international treaties. We have tended in the opposite direction by failing to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, refusing to pay UN dues, considering the abrogation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, and unilaterally imposing economic sanctions.
- We should be more sensitive to the perceptions of friends and allies, which will require a great deal of thought and bipartisan support.

Improve Congress's role in national security.

- Congress must approach national security issues on a bipartisan basis, overcoming the urge to score partisan points and to protect interests in members' own states and districts at the expense of more important national security interests. The stalling of the BRAC process and the addition of unneeded items to the defense budget are examples of actions taken in Congress that thwart bipartisanship.
- Presidential leadership is central to achieving this bipartisan approach.
- Congress should replace the unworkable War Powers Act. New legislation should provide, at the request of 20 percent of the members, a guaranteed vote on whether to fund U.S. forces already deployed into hostilities or whose deployment is imminent. If funding were cut off, a reasonable period of time would be allowed for U.S. forces to withdraw.

Most significant was Senator Levin's fundamental assertion that our current security strategy is out of balance – weighted too heavily toward the least likely threats. Based on this assertion, Senator Levin made two proposals. First, abandon our “strategy” of being able to fight two MTWs nearly simultaneously and restructure our military forces for a single MTW and one or two SSCs. Second, improve our abilities to conduct peace enforcement, peacekeeping, and humanitarian operations.

Perhaps most controversial was Senator Levin's call to abandon the two-MTW construct. While other conference participants, such as General Wesley Clark (Ret.) and Michèle Flournoy, rejected this construct as an inadequate basis for national strategy, none actually said that we no longer need the capability to fight two MTWs, deferring that question to the QDR or another comprehensive strategic review. All of the conference's uniformed participants supported a two-MTW capability, either because the threat warrants it, or perhaps as a justification for preserving force structure.

Senator Levin's unambiguous rejection of a two-MTW capability raises several important questions. First, by maintaining the force structure for two wars, we may have deterred those who might use a major U.S. military commitment as their strategic opportunity. Abandoning the capability to fight two wars may arguably increase the likelihood of having to do so, while the costs and consequences of a major war are much more significant than one or two SSCs. Conversely, if we adopt a strategy that commits resources based more on the likelihood of a threat as opposed to its potential severity, we may risk playing into the hands of adversaries who use asymmetric threats principally as a means to dissipate our strength and focus.

It is impossible to know the answers to these questions with certainty, and Senator Levin's appraisal of the proper balance between the likelihood and potential severity of the threats we face may indeed be the most prudent. It is important to note that, unlike many other critics of the two-MTW capability, Senator Levin's stated goal is not to cut costs (a rebalanced strategy may in fact

cost more), but to ensure a more effective and relevant defense. In this regard, Senator Levin expressed strong support for the Army's transformation effort, which he felt would produce a more strategically relevant force, even though it entails a significant resource investment.

According to Senator Levin, a symptom of our strategy's over-emphasis on MTWs is the frequent claim that peace operations erode our warfighting readiness. In his opinion, peace operations are not a distraction from our strategy – they are an integral part of it (or rather, they should be). Though Senator Levin proposed improving our ability to conduct peace operations, his specific recommendations were aimed at reducing their impact on our military forces. His view that the United States should encourage allies and partners to take on a larger share of these missions, including the lead role, echoed the recommendations made by Lieutenant General Peter Cosgrove and Dr. Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall later in the conference. However, Senator Levin stopped short of advocating specialized peacekeeping or constabulary forces, instead praising efforts by the Departments of State and Justice to train civilian police volunteers to perform these functions.

Senator Levin's third significant proposal was to replace the ineffective War Powers Act with legislation that actually achieves what the act intended: to prevent the president from committing U.S. military forces to hostilities without the advice and consent of Congress. Senator Levin proposed a means to increase congressional accountability in the national security process, to make it more difficult for Congress to snipe at deployments without opposing them outright. By requiring a vote on whether to fund military deployments, the new legislation would force senators and representatives to take a clear position. It is important to note that this approach would also apparently strengthen Congress's hand in challenging the president's executive power to commit American military force when he sees fit, a prerogative every modern president has exercised with little legislative constraint. Without an event to serve as a catalyst, the prospects for the success of such a reform are unclear.

On the subject of Congress's role in national security, Senator Levin's call for greater bipartisanship and a less parochial approach

to the defense budget signals at least the possibility that additional rounds of BRAC, widely recognized as necessary, may actually succeed in the 107th Congress.

keynote address

The National Interest

What is Driving Our National Security Strategy & What Should?

10

MODERATOR

■ **General John Galvin, USA (Ret.)**, Former Supreme Allied Commander Europe and Dean Emeritus, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University ■

PANEL MEMBERS

■ **Representative Ellen O. Tauscher (D-CA)**, House Armed Services Committee ■

Ambassador Richard Armitage, President, Armitage Associates L.C.; Former U.S. Envoy and Department of Defense Official

Dr. Graham T. Allison, Douglas Dillon Professor of Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University

PANEL CHARTER

■ It is a widely accepted principle that a well-defined conception of the national interest should serve as the foundation of American foreign policy and national security strategy. Such a foundation establishes priorities, clarifies foreign policy and security choices, and ensures that decisions are made in the context of a coherent, long-term strat- ■

egy. However, there has long been disagreement about how to apply this principle in practice. In the current security environment, in which the United States enjoys an unprecedented level of prosperity and relative national power, the debate on this question has sharpened.

What are the enduring national interests of the United States? Are “vital interests,” defined by some as the survival and well-being of America and her allies, the only appropriate yardstick for the commitment of national power? What other factors should inform decisions to commit such power: the management of national credibility and capability, humanitarian or ethical imperatives, the chances for success, the possibility of casualties or long-term involvement, the degree of popular support, the influence of the media, the roles of allies and partners? Which regions are most important to American national interests? Is it possible, or even useful, to develop a single doctrine that directs the use of diplomatic, military, economic, and other instruments of national power in given situations? How should the answers to these questions be captured in the QDR, and distilled into a national security strategy that provides clear guidance for the day-to-day and year-to-year management of America’s national security?

panel one

11

■ DISCUSSION POINTS ■

- Prioritizing U.S. national interests in a period of complexity and uncertainty – is long-term coherence even possible?
- A future, clarifying concept: from containment to engagement to what?
- Russia, China, India: future partners or strategic competitors?
- The need for bipartisan consensus and popular support in foreign policy.
- The information age: the instant visibility of crises and threats versus their relationship to interests.
- Managing the risks of an assertive foreign policy: anti-U.S. backlash? Great-power rivalry?

- Maintaining U.S. leadership and flexibility: unilateral and multilateral action; burden sharing; the role of the United Nations, NATO, and other international institutions.
- Force, or the credible threat of force, as a signal of national commitment.
- Managing the use of force: missions, objectives, constraints, exit strategies.
- Implications for defense strategy: alternatives to “shape, respond, prepare?” Alternatives to the two-MTW construct?
- The need to maintain a superior military capability.

SUMMARY

Representative Ellen O. Tauscher

The United States must construct a foreign policy that reflects the success of the last century and the environment of the next.

- The United States should pursue “a foreign policy based on doing what is right, in addition to doing what is necessary.”
- Thus, three distinct principles should guide U.S. foreign policy: (1) strong alliances and a commitment to economic security; (2) a credible reputation as a global force of beneficence; and (3) a reliable, state-of-the-art military.

The United States should strengthen and expand its alliances and take action to ensure global economic security.

- Alliances facilitate acceptance of international standards, allow for burden sharing among members, and allow forward-deployment of U.S. military force.



left to right: Dean Emeritus Dr. John Galvin with Dr. Robert Pfaltzgraff, Jr.; Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher; Ambassador Richard Armitage; and Dr. Graham Allison

- The United States should seek to enlarge NATO, strengthen similar alliances in Asia, and work to reform international organizations to bring smaller nations into the fold.
- A deep commitment to global economic security should govern U.S. strategic alliances. U.S. prestige rests on our willingness to help Asian governments overcome the effects of the 1997 Asian economic crisis, and to prevent a similar crisis from occurring in other developing regions.

The United States should maintain a credible reputation based on global beneficence instead of self-preservation.

- The United States loses credibility when it tolerates genocide or allows conflict to go unanswered. This indicates the need for proactive involvement in areas traditionally regarded as outside of our national interests.
- The United States should assist African nations in dealing with the AIDS epidemic by restructuring or erasing their debt, assisting with basic needs, and improving their civil and governmental institutions.
- Bringing nations to a sustainable standard of living will increase their ability to participate in the world community and increase global access to natural resources.

The U.S. military should remain the best in the world, but it must restructure: less emphasis on major theater wars, more on peace operations and new threats.

- The maintenance of a dominant military is critical to continued U.S. leadership.
- The United States must re-calibrate its force to “do it all:” conventional warfighting, greater deployability for lower intensity conflicts, and countering new threats such as entrepreneurial terrorism and cyber warfare.
- The Department of Defense must increase investment in research and development.
- The two-MTW concept is unrealistic. The next QDR should emphasize the capability to fight one MTW and simultaneously respond to a short-term crisis.

Ambassador Richard Armitage

U.S. strategy should rest on a clear statement of purpose: to preserve U.S. preeminence as a force for good – powerful but not arrogant.

- National security strategy should be based on the realist principle that international politics is a struggle for power – for the United States, a struggle to remain the dominant power.
- Four principles should guide our strategy: (1) there is an absolute need for U.S. leadership; (2) there is no dividing line between domestic and foreign policy; (3) the military is not the national instrument of first recourse; (4) the United States must organize to conduct foreign and security policy in the twenty-first century.

There is an absolute need for U.S. leadership in the world.

- Not engaging in the international arena is every bit as irresponsible as indiscriminate intervention. The United States can use its national power wisely and well, or foolishly and badly.
- The United States will be called upon in emergencies, but it has many tools other than military force – economic, political, international financial institutions – with which to respond.

There is no dividing line between foreign and domestic policy.

- The standards we exhibit domestically – in education, culture, and individual initiative and responsibility – send an important message to the world about U.S. values.

The military is not the national instrument of first recourse.

- Too often, military force is used to get out of crises created by weak-kneed diplomacy. Before committing force, we should recognize that half-measures won't work in the absence of peace, and we should decide who will rule once peace is made.
- The prerequisites for committing force are a clear national strategy and a coherent military mission.

The U.S. government must organize to conduct foreign and security policy in the twenty-first century.

- The Departments of State and Defense are monumentally mismanaged. We must move away from “single-issue policy mavens” and towards a simpler way of developing strategy and policy.

Dr. Graham T. Allison

The only foundation for sustainable American foreign policy is a clear sense of American national interests.

- Dr. Allison's remarks were drawn from his recent work as one of two lead authors of the report "America's National Interests: A Report from The Commission on America's National Interests," published in July 2000.
- To make the crucial distinctions necessary to guide policy, interests should be ordered hierarchically: vital, extremely important, important, and secondary.

The United States has only five vital national interests in the decade ahead:

- To prevent, deter, and reduce the threat of nuclear, biological, and chemical (NBC) weapon attacks on the United States or its military forces abroad.
- To ensure U.S. allies' survival and their active cooperation with the United States in shaping an international system in which we can thrive.
- To prevent the emergence of hostile major powers or failed states on U.S. borders.
- Ensure the viability and stability of major global systems: trade, financial markets, supplies energy, and the environment.
- To establish productive relations, consistent with American national interests, with nations that could become strategic adversaries, specifically China and Russia.

How do national interests relate to national security strategy?

- First, interests exist independently of threats to those interests. National security strategy should safeguard our most vital and important interests, looking beyond the immediate threats and allocating resources and assets accordingly. Such an approach aids not only in evaluating threats, but also in seizing opportunities.
- Second, the clear delineation of interests aids in the complex task of evaluating national security in both the short and long term.

- Third, a disciplined conceptual framework of interests informs the analysis of complex policy choices – threats and opportunities, options for action, costs and benefits of these actions, and capacities for implementation.

How do national interests relate to the debate on America's role in the world?

- An interest-based approach to foreign policy does not settle policy debates, but informs and disciplines the discussions.
- The United States is strong enough to use national power, including military force, for purposes that do not affect our vital interests in the short – or even intermediate-term. Whether to do so deserves to be a central part of the debate about American foreign policy going forward.

■ ANALYSIS ■

16

The prepared remarks of the speakers revealed the traditional and healthy tension in American foreign policy between idealism and realism: on one hand, Representative Tauscher espoused a foreign policy of global beneficence; on the other, Ambassador Armitage asserted that the purpose of U.S. security and foreign policy should be to preserve American preeminence. However, while there was certainly a theoretical tension between these two positions, much of their follow-up commentary during the question and answer period actually seemed to articulate similar concerns. When asked by the audience for specifics, the panelists displayed a surprising degree of harmony.

The idealist-realist tension between the first two speakers was more reflective of two different approaches to a shared goal: ensuring continued American international leadership as a force for good. All of the speakers stressed the need for continued and vigorous American engagement in the world. All agreed on the necessity of a strong military and a robust foreign policy apparatus capable of carrying out the day-to-day substance of that engagement. While none supported relegating the U.S. military to the role of global police force, each allowed that under some circumstances it may be appropriate to commit force even when vital or extremely important interests are not directly threatened.

The speakers did appear to differ on what those specific circumstances would be. Admittedly, those distinctions could yield starkly different records on the use of military force. For example, Representative Tauscher expressed her support for U.S. involvement in Sierra Leone, an intervention Ambassador Armitage would presumably not support. At the same time, while declaring Africa a region deserving far greater U.S. emphasis than a realist foreign policy would afford, Representative Tauscher stressed that the best approaches in Africa are those that rely on our allies, international organizations, and economic and diplomatic national tools. As a general proposition, each of the speakers agreed strongly that in most cases, creative and considered use of the other instruments of national power should precede the option of force. Ambassador Armitage was most explicit on this point, echoing much of what has come to be known as the Weinberger Doctrine.

Not covered in the panel was any discussion of how values or principles are translated into interests. Given Representative Tauscher's emphasis on a foreign policy that "does what is right," such an articulation is crucial, providing coherence and strategic purpose to how those values are applied in the international arena. Only Dr. Allison offered a specific explication of what he sees as our vital interests, adopting those of the Commission on America's National Interests.

Interestingly, all of the speakers agreed that the current foreign policy apparatus – the Departments of State and Defense – is in need of an overhaul, and that a revitalized and restructured Department of State (not Defense) should take the lead in "shaping" activities. Each also expressed strong support for appropriately funding an engagement strategy, advocating increased resources for both State and Defense (not at the expense of one or the other). And while Representative Tauscher called for replacing the Defense Department's two-MTW capability with the capacity for one MTW and one short-term crisis, she explicitly stated that defense spending increases were needed to develop and improve capabilities more suited to the emerging security environment.

Globalization and National Security

Mr. Thomas Friedman
Columnist, *New York Times*

18

SUMMARY

Globalization is the international system that replaced the Cold War system.

- Globalization is the integration of markets, finance, technology, and telecommunications, enabling people to reach around the world, and the world to reach people, farther, faster, more deeply, and cheaply than ever before.
- Globalization's features distinguish it from the Cold War system: integration (versus division), speed (versus strength or weight), and a decentralized internal logic in which no one is quite in charge (versus the bipolar Cold War system in which the United States and the USSR were in charge).

Globalization is built around three balances of power: states and states, states and "super-markets," and states and "super-empowered people."

- The Cold War or traditional state-versus-state power structure remains the dominant mode of interaction in the international system.
- However, the interaction between states and "super-markets" (the largest global stocks), and states and "super-empowered people" (Jodie Williams, Osama bin Laden, Ramzi Yousef)

- make globalization fundamentally different from previous systems.
- It is the interaction of these three balances that makes the globalization system so complex, both to manage and to understand.


Globalization was born of three democratizations – the democratization of finance, of technology, and of information.

- In the early 1990s, the democratization of finance, technology, and information transformed the global power structure from a static one of division and barriers to one of dynamic integration and interconnectedness.
- At the same time, the semblance of control that existed in the previous order is absent, allowing for a very different landscape and the emergence of new actors.
- The democratization of information in particular is profoundly important for understanding international relations today.

Globalization has four key components:

- First, the erosion of economic barriers greatly increases the speed of innovation and hence economic competition, with no one entity that is in charge and capable of setting or slowing the pace.
- Second, to compete at this pace, states must adopt the “golden straitjacket,” embodying all the economic rules of the globalization system. Economies grow from greater privatization, deregulation, trade, and investment, but political choices narrow greatly.
- Third, states that want to make their economies grow have to tap the energy of the “electronic herd,” the mass of investors who collectively command massive international capital flows. States’ political options are further narrowed to those that attract the capital of the herd.
- Lastly, the rapid mobility of these international capital flows can have both hugely positive and devastatingly negative effects on states and their peoples. Institutional capacities within states (liberal

Mr. Thomas Friedman



economic rules, courts, regulatory institutions, free press, and democracy) are often the difference between success and disaster in this system.

Globalization has profound strategic and security implications.

- The state matters more, not less, in the globalization system. Those who don't have a state, or have a state without reasonably functioning civil and financial institutions, pay a steep price.
- "Messy states" – those too big to fail or too messy to work (Indonesia, Pakistan, Russia, China) – will very much shape the strategic environment. These states have to develop the institutional capacity to succeed in a greatly reduced timeframe.
- Our national security problem has been completely stood on its head. America's biggest threats will be the weakness (not the strength) of Russia, China, and even Japan as they go through the wrenching adjustment to the globalization system.
- Globalization doesn't end geopolitics, but profoundly affects it. The electronic herd punishes states for going to war, causing leaders to think harder before doing so, and to pay a steeper price if they do.
- America's challenge is to keep this system as stable and sustainable as possible, because America is its biggest beneficiary. Sustainable globalization is an overriding national interest. Cutting back foreign aid and reducing our assistance to international financial institutions run contrary to that interest.
- Globalization is happening in a power structure that is maintained and preserved by the U.S. armed forces – "the hidden fist that keeps the hidden hand operating."

■ ANALYSIS ■

The current strategic environment is very different from that of the Cold War world. Globalization is an attempt to define the structure of that environment, and the forces that led to the fall of the Soviet Union have led to significant changes, both positive and negative, in the international system that we see today. It is important for policy makers to understand the nature of the changes that have taken

place in order to develop capabilities and contingencies to face the threats and exploit the opportunities of the globalization system.

The removal of barriers forces states and leaders to reexamine their relationships with others and their position within the system. The increasing influence of supermarkets on state economic and political structures and the increasing abilities of super-empowered individuals to influence states, for better or worse, demands that policy makers possess a clear understanding of, and robust strategies for working within, the globalization system.

Globalization presents new opportunities and new challenges for policy makers. International relations during the Cold War were defined by the superpower conflict. Interactions between states, to a great degree, were defined by their geopolitical positions within the East-West framework. This has already changed. The increasing integration of financial markets and the effective end to Cold War client-state relationships has led to a reorientation of state goals toward setting the foundations, domestically and through interactions with other states, to benefit from the ascendancy of the super-markets. At the same time, unhindered flows of capital and information within and across borders have improved the capacities of individuals and groups to damage states. Transnational terrorism, crime, and trafficking in arms, drugs, and other contraband have forced leaders to look for multilateral and cooperative approaches to responding to such threats. The ability of states to manage successfully their interactions with the globalization system, to develop the domestic capacities to withstand the stresses and exploit the opportunities presented by the system, make states more rather than less important.

The pressures of the system may often exacerbate problems within states. Intrastate conflict has become an unfortunate hallmark in the first decade of globalization. While the roots of the conflicts clearly predate the systemic shift, the stresses placed upon states by the system and the effects of demographic changes, resource scarcity, and economic turbulence add new fervor and impetus to ancient grievances, setting the stage for deadly conflict. The rapid information flows that characterize globalization disseminate news of atrocities and humanitarian crises around the globe in real time. Leaders are well aware of the "CNN effect," and there

is no reason to expect that, as technology increases the speeds with which people are able to see current events in far off corners of the world, pressures to intervene or take meaningful action to save lives will decline.

We have seen no evidence that state-level conflict will disappear. The challenges presented by “messy states,” those states too large to fail, but inadequately equipped to navigate through the system, are likely to present problems in the future. States that have successfully sealed themselves off from the system, rogue states, can be contained, but are constant concerns. The United States has been the greatest beneficiary of globalization, and therefore it is in the interest of the United States to keep the system moving forward. This requires that the United States remain engaged and actively involved in world affairs, willing to help countries make successful transitions into the system, thus increasing the likelihood of its sustainability. The role of U.S. military power is to provide the underlying power structure, upon which the system rests.

Emerging Threats – *Implications for Defense Strategy*

MODERATOR

23

Dr. Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., President, Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, and Shelby Cullom Davis Professor of International Security Studies, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University

PANEL MEMBERS

Lieutenant General Edward G. Anderson III, USA, Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. Space Command (SPACECOM)

Dr. Michael E. O'Hanlon, Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy Studies, the Brookings Institution

Mr. Michael A. Vatis, Chief, National Infrastructure Protection Center, National Security Division, FBI

PANEL CHARTER

The past decade may well give us a glimpse of the coming decades. The 1990s brought new challenges, complexities, and uncertainty. The future will likely be more challenging, complex, and uncertain. While the United States may not face a global rival for the next

fifteen to twenty years, future challenges will come from an ever-widening array of emerging threats. Some of these threats have been with us for some time but are new in scale, likelihood, or virulence. Some are truly new. Still others loom on the horizon, yet unseen and unnamed.

Terrorism has been a concern for decades, but “grand terrorism” or “catastrophic terrorism” is a current and realistic threat to our citizens at home and abroad, to allies, and to the information, communications, transportation, energy, and financial infrastructures critical to America’s prosperity and well-being. While the Cold War’s end diminished the threat of global nuclear war, the likelihood grows that nuclear weapons or materials will end up in the hands of adversaries who, wary of America’s conventional military might, seek WMD as a means of leveling the playing field. These same adversaries have aggressively pursued ballistic missile technology as a means to challenge America “asymmetrically” – to confront us where we are less prepared and avoid confrontation where we are well prepared. The information technology revolution, while increasing the efficiency and productivity of the American economy and enabling a revolution in military affairs, has created new vulnerabilities that a concerted adversary will undoubtedly seek to exploit. On the horizon, a determined opponent will surely attempt to harness the malicious potential of the incredible and rapid advances in the biotechnology field. A clear lesson from these trends is that our opponents are watching and learning. Where they cannot match our strengths, they will target our weaknesses, real or perceived, with a wide range of constantly modified conventional and unconventional means.



right to left: Mr. Michael Vatis; Lt. General Edward Anderson, USA; Dr. Michael O'Hanlon; and Dr. Robert Pfaltzgraff, Jr.

A common characteristic of many of these emerging threats is that they straddle the institutional divisions in America's national security structure – between defense and law enforcement; between foreign and domestic affairs; and between federal, state, and local levels. Recent adaptations attempt to address this reality, namely a more robust National Security Council (NSC) capability to manage the interagency process, and the formation of new organizations such as the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, Joint Task Force-Civil Support, the National Infrastructure Protection Center, and the National Domestic Preparedness Center. Have these adaptations been enough, or is further structural and procedural innovation required?

On the high end of the threat spectrum, large-scale conventional warfare involving weapons of mass destruction has been discounted by some as a Cold War anachronism, but remains a possibility. While a peer competitor seems unlikely today, history shows that an emerging regional power, or regional alliance, can and will acquire the capability to challenge us. Are we too focused on the visible threats, ignoring those with the long-term potential to engage American vital interests more directly? Will a rising China confront us over the longer term? Will a retreat from democracy in Russia re-polarize European security affairs? Just how well do we see ten, fifteen, twenty years down the road? And will we be ready for the challenges that await us?

■ DISCUSSION POINTS ■

- National missile defense: its benefit versus its cost, its effect on alliance relations and arms control, what to share with whom.
- Are state and local agencies adequately equipped and trained to be effective first responders to a terrorist nuclear, biological, or chemical attack? How do we build the capacity for effective domestic response?
- Ensuring the coherence of interagency programs: responsibility and accountability, resources, research and development, procurement, procedures, training.
- Emerging threats and conventional threats (MTWs): their relative importance, their likelihood versus their severity, bal-

ancing finite resources. Is the two-MTW construct focused on past wars (such as Desert Storm and Korea) that are not likely to happen again?

- The implications of globalization: staying ahead of adversaries who have access to America's technological and industrial base.
- Integrating foreign and domestic intelligence to counter terrorism while protecting civil liberties.
- Additional organizational or structural reforms: are existing interagency solutions adequately responsive and flexible?
- The use of WMD to mitigate conventional power-projection capabilities.
- The implications of emerging threats on military transformation, modernization, force structure, and force mix.

SUMMARY

26

Dr. Michael O' Hanlon

If the United States is going to face anything close to a pure rival in the near future, China is most likely to play that role.

- The most realistic scenario for a conventional conflict would be a Chinese attack on Taiwan. However, the form of this attack is likely to be a naval blockade, and not an invasion of Taiwan by the People's Liberation Army (PLA). This scenario is as probable as any MTW scenario we commonly assess. While it would certainly present the potential for escalation and greater conflict, the United States currently has the capabilities to prevail in such a conflict.

The ability of the PLA to conduct a successful amphibious operation against Taiwan is limited because of a lack of capabilities.

- The PLA presently lacks adequate assets in three key areas: air superiority; the ability to move troops ashore quickly; and the ability to reinforce a beachhead quickly and present forces at least as strong as the opposition's counteroffensive.
- Because of its lack of lift (air, naval, amphibious), the PLA does not have the ability to move the necessary forces across the Taiwan Strait to achieve the second two objectives. Though

China's air force may have numerical superiority, the technical superiority of Taiwan's forces places the battle for air superiority squarely in doubt.

A blockade scenario is more plausible.

- If, during a successful surprise attack, Chinese air strikes were able to eliminate Taiwanese air and naval assets on the ground or in port, it would be possible for China to sustain a "leaky" blockade of the island. Such a blockade would certainly damage the Taiwanese economy.

The United States is in a strong position to respond to a blockade.

- The United States would then have time to develop an effective response. Depending on how the conflict began, whether it was the result of Chinese preemption or a perceived Taiwanese provocation, the conflict and the response could play out over weeks and months.
- The response would likely entail three or four carrier battle groups, more than we currently have in the Pacific, depending on the responses of allies in the Pacific, most importantly Japan. If the United States is able to employ assets from Okinawa, a smaller carrier force may be warranted.

Even without the support of allies in the East Asia/Pacific region, the United States is equipped to respond to the crisis. Not including assets on Okinawa, the operation would proceed along the following lines:

- Dispatch carriers to the east of Taiwan, out of the range of Chinese diesel submarines and land-based PLA assets. From here, employment of air assets to achieve air superiority would effectively end the blockade.
- The United States should forward-deploy attack submarines to eliminate Chinese subs and engage in other anti-submarine warfare operations.
- The United States could escort Taiwanese ships in and out of Taiwan with impunity.
- The entire operation would entail the use of approximately one MTW's worth of air and naval assets. Depending on the situation, the U.S. forces would have the opportunity to move beyond these limited objectives, including striking Chinese

ports and other assets on the mainland. However, it would be important to devise clear rules of engagement and operational safeguards to prevent escalation.

Lieutenant General Edward G. Anderson III, USA

A real challenge for U.S. defense planners is identifying and understanding inchoate or emerging threats and potential U.S. vulnerabilities that must be adequately addressed.

- While the United States may face no immediate conventional or strategic threats, and the probability is low that a global competitor will emerge, cross-border and internal conflicts, proliferation of weapons and technologies, and terrorism highlight existing and emerging threats to U.S. security.

The negative aspect of possessing great power is that adversaries will search for nontraditional, unconventional ways to attack U.S. interests and assets.

- Given U.S. power, it is unlikely that enemies are going to attack the United States with conventional or strategic nuclear weapons. Instead, adversaries will focus on areas of perceived weakness, choosing to attack asymmetrically. Three asymmetric threat areas are emerging: ballistic missiles, cyber warfare, and space control. SPACECOM has been charged with countering threats in these areas.

The increasing threat of a ballistic missile attack on the United States has warranted the development of capabilities to deter or defend against the threat.

- The ballistic missile threat has increased with the global proliferation of missile technology, as well as the secondary systems (guidance, targeting, surveillance, etc.) that make them more effective. SPACECOM is currently responsible for providing warnings for all fifty states and for developing and deploying strategic missile defense capabilities for the nation.
- A national missile defense would be made up of three components: ground-based radars, interceptors, and space-based sensors. SPACECOM is working with other agencies and the services to make sure that an effective system is ready to go when the decision to deploy is made.

The integration of high-speed computers and information technology into critical U.S. infrastructures provides another target for adversaries.

- The threat of cyber warfare has increased markedly as other nations have openly stated their intentions to develop computer network attack techniques and capabilities to target the U.S. military's increasing dependence on computers and information technology.
- SPACECOM is developing and implementing safeguards against any information assurance vulnerability to defend information infrastructures against attack. Synchronized planning is necessary, across government agencies, across the Commanders-in-Chief (CINCs) and the services, and between government and civilian entities to coordinate and implement the necessary responses to this threat.

The space environment has changed and will continue to change, providing a new environment in which the United States must act to protect against potential threats.

- Currently, space operations are employed, and are expected to improve in their effectiveness, as force enhancements: reconnaissance, surveillance, communications, and eventually space-based radar. It is important to examine and address threats to U.S. systems, and also potential adversarial space capabilities.
- Areas of concern include the problems of blending commercial and military space systems; the development of anti-satellite attack capabilities; asymmetric attacks on ground facilities; and ground-based laser systems. SPACECOM must focus not only on force enhancements, but also on maintaining space control and space superiority.

Space control and space superiority encompass four key elements:

- Effective surveillance of the space-operating environment, on the ground and in the air
- The protection of systems from deliberate attack or from environmental hazards
- The prevention of unauthorized access to and exploitation of U.S. systems
- Negation of systems that threaten U.S. or allied capabilities

In order to assure unfettered U.S. access to space, we must deny adversaries the use of it; if we fail to do so, we will degrade our future warfighting capabilities. SPACECOM is working to address these emerging threat areas, but there is much work to be done.

Mr. Michael A. Vatis

Terrorism and the cyber threats against the United States share some common threads that distinguish them from conventional threats:

- Both can involve attacks against or within the homeland.
- State and/or nonstate actors can be involved.
- Attribution of responsibility for a terrorist act or a cyber attack takes time. The identity of perpetrators is not immediately apparent.
- Responses to these types of threats (particularly if they originate or have consequences within the United States) are determined by legal regimes and provide constraints that are unfamiliar to DoD and the services.
- Successful responses to terrorist or cyber threats require the development of close relationships between the services and law enforcement agencies, with clear rules of engagement (ROEs) and clear standard operating procedures.

In a time of open conventional conflict or war, enemies are identifiable. This is not necessarily the case with terrorism.

- Attribution of responsibility is crucial, because the reliability of attribution affects the perceived legitimacy of a given response.
- Because of the FBI's investigative mission, the bureau is clearly an important player in this realm, as are the intelligence services.
- Interagency coordination and cooperation are particularly important in a WMD attack scenario. The magnitude of such an attack and the damage done will overwhelm first responders and civilian agencies, requiring DoD and service involvement.

Clearly understood rules of engagement and standard operating procedures must be developed to craft an effective response and also to reconcile legal and technical issues.

The perpetrators of cyber attacks are even more difficult to identify.

- The universal nature of the Internet, the weakness of civilian communications and technology infrastructures (and lack of early warning systems), and the great number of viruses and hoaxes that are seen every day make the challenge daunting.
- Coordination across government agencies and between the government and civilian sectors is needed to develop the two-way communication necessary to respond to cyber threats.

panel two

■ ANALYSIS ■

In examining emerging threats to U.S. interests, the panel provided a strong vision of the security landscape that confronts policy makers today. The China-Taiwan scenario, presented as one of the more likely examples of major conventional conflict demanding a U.S. response, exemplifies the current state of conventional threats to U.S. interests around the globe. A Chinese attack on Taiwan is a serious and formidable conventional threat. A blockade of the island and serious damage to Taiwan's infrastructure would certainly have negative economic consequences for the region, and to some extent for the United States. However, neither the United States nor its citizens are directly threatened. Further, it seems clear that the United States possesses the capabilities to defeat such an attack in the short term.

The underlying question for policy makers and planners is whether, over the medium and longer terms, the United States will remain capable of successfully responding to such a scenario. Given China's increasing influence in the region, and its attempts to improve its capacities to project power, defense planners must countenance increasing Chinese capabilities with U.S. assets committed to the region. As Chinese forces modernize and evolve, the U.S. military will necessarily have to improve upon its capabilities to maintain its strategic advantage. Potential changes in the force levels and strategic positioning of existing forward deployments of

31

U.S. troops in the region also must be closely examined to determine the procurement and force structure strategies necessary to provide the capabilities needed to safeguard U.S. interests in Asia over the long term.

While U.S. conventional military superiority may be unrivaled in the short term, asymmetric warfare presents frightening new threats to U.S. interests. Terrorism against U.S. citizens or U.S. assets at home or abroad is a real threat that must be addressed. The United States is not out of bounds for terrorists, as the Oklahoma City and World Trade Center bombings have clearly illustrated. The documented proliferation of weapons around the globe provides a sobering example of how relatively easy it is for state or nonstate actors to obtain weapons capable of great damage to persons or property. Clearly, the threat of the use of an NBC device on U.S. soil against a large population of U.S. citizens is one that must be seriously examined and understood as a realistic danger. While resources must continue to be devoted to apprehending potential terrorists and averting such disasters, policy makers must also come to the unfortunate realization that we must be prepared to respond to such a horrific scenario. This means working with local, state, and federal entities to develop comprehensive and clear guidelines for responding to large-scale crises and ensuring that the professionals that make up the various relevant agencies have the training, equipment, and resources they need to respond effectively to such contingencies.

The proliferation of missile technology has also increased the likelihood that actors (state and nonstate) will develop the capability to launch missiles at the United States and its allies. While the detonation of a conventional warhead would certainly be disastrous, the truly frightening scenario would involve a missile carrying an NBC-capable payload, potentially causing catastrophic damage. Regardless of the political debate that has emerged over proposed missile defense programs, it is undeniable that the threat is real and over the near-to medium-term, it will increase dramatically. Policy makers and defense planners must examine developing the capabilities to address this clear vulnerability. Whether the final decision is to deploy a national missile defense (NMD) system, a manner of theater-based system, or some combination of the two, it is important that all

potential solutions be examined and discussed in light of the clear existing threat. At the same time, it is important that the United States work closely with allies to stem the flow of weapons of mass destruction and technologies and improve intelligence and surveillance capabilities to prevent such an attack.

Cyber or information warfare could have serious consequences for the United States. Aside from attempts to minimize U.S. military advantages by attacking the very technologies that provide it with communications, surveillance, and battlefield awareness capabilities, such attacks could hold grave consequences for civilians. Given the large roles that computers and information technologies play in the day-to-day lives of Americans, disruption or destruction of key information infrastructures could paralyze the country. Financial markets, large corporations, government agencies, hospitals, and many other crucial entities rely on technology, and a successful cyber attack could mean catastrophic loss of property and possibly lives as the system fails. It was made clear in the presentations that increased coordination between government and private entities is essential to devising effective safeguards and timely responses to these asymmetric threats.

Coalitions & Alliances

The Future of Military Engagement

34

MODERATOR

■ **Dr. Jacquelyn K. Davis**, President, National Security Planning Associates, and Executive Vice President, Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis ■

PANEL MEMBERS

■ **Lieutenant General Peter Cosgrove, AC MC**, Chief of Army, Australian Defence Force; Commander, International Force East Timor (INTERFET) ■

General Montgomery Meigs, USA, Commanding General, U.S. Army Europe

General Klaus Naumann (Ret.), Former Chairman, NATO Military Committee

Dr. Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall, Senior Advisor, Stanford-Harvard Preventive Defense Project, and Visiting Scholar, Center for International Security and Arms Control, Stanford University

PANEL CHARTER

If there is a clear and unmistakable lesson from twentieth century history, it is that alliances and coalitions are a crucial and perhaps indispensable means for solving the most difficult diplomatic and security problems. While the United States has always reserved the right to act unilaterally, its greatest achievements have been accomplished in concert with others: allies, bilateral security partners, coalition members, even competitors when areas of common interest have served as the foundation for cooperation. Recent history has reinforced this lesson – from the end of the Cold War to the Gulf War, from the Balkans to East Timor.

But the more fluid and uncertain security environment of the last decade has also posed new questions and raised new challenges for the management of these relationships. Witness the strategic transformation of NATO, its test in Kosovo, and its relationship to the uncharted democratic transitions in Eastern Europe; witness conflict and strife in places like the Middle East, Somalia, Rwanda, Indonesia, and Sierra Leone. In Asia, the emergence of nuclear competition on the Indian subcontinent and the pace of change on the Korean peninsula challenge the United States and its partners to stay in front of developments. Moreover, the rise in United Nations peacekeeping operations has spurred calls for greater American involvement. Does American power create a responsibility to act, or should the United States encourage the willingness and capability of others, including the UN, to do so?

Add to these complex questions the less-discussed but perhaps equally important issues of alliance and coalition management. Even as NATO has succeeded in expanding both its strategic purpose and its membership, the technology and capability gap between the American and European militaries – a challenge in Kosovo – continues to widen, jeopardizing interoperability even with our closest allies. As our military services aggressively seek to transform for the future, do we risk leaving our allies and potential partners behind? Will the requirement for more strategically responsive forces, deployable in hours and days instead of weeks and months, reduce the window for conferring with allies, creating pressure for unilateral action? How do we ensure that we can operate effectively not only with other militaries, but with nongovernmental organizations,

even other departments and agencies of our own government? How do we balance “shaping” activities such as military-to-military programs with the need to maintain warfighting readiness, especially given operational tempo and readiness challenges? For the unified commanders in chief, responsible for much of the day-to-day substance of engagement, these are crucial questions.

DISCUSSION POINTS

-
- The future of NATO: conditions for the next round of enlargement; its effect on Russia and China.
- European Security and Defense Identity and the Atlantic alliance: convergence or divergence?
- The Pacific: the future of U.S. alliances with Australia, Japan, Korea, and the Philippines; the role of U.S. forces in the region.
- Future alliances and relationships? Where is cultivation warranted? Feasible?
- The U.S. role in multinational operations: Lead? Support? Enable?
- Improving U.N. capability and effectiveness while maintaining U.S. freedom of action.
- The technological gap: encouraging allied investment; critical capabilities essential for interoperability; implications for Service transformation efforts.
- Managing commitment: setting priorities; ensuring readiness; maintaining popular support.
-



left to right: General Klaus Naumann (Bundeswehr, Ret.); General Montgomery Meigs, USA; Lt. General Peter Cosgrove (Australia); and Dr. Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall

- Intelligence sharing: achieving coalition unity of purpose and operations while maintaining the integrity of the U.S. intelligence apparatus.

SUMMARY

General Klaus Naumann (Ret.)

Interventions in the future will not be conducted by individual nations, but rather by alliances and coalitions.

- The United States is reluctant to act unilaterally and put soldiers at risk. There must be a clear and present danger to national interests at stake. This unwillingness to act on the part of the U.S weakens deterrence.
- Regional and global intervention will be viewed as illegal unless legitimized by the UN or in an act of self-defense or where it is in response to a humanitarian tragedy as in Kosovo. Such interventions will be conducted by coalitions or allies.
- A coalition is a sub-element of an alliance. An alliance is based on common goals and beliefs focused toward a common gain. Coalitions will be used in an ad hoc manner to achieve a one-time goal or objective.

The spectrum of military operations that we see today has intervention at the high end and engagement at the lower end.

- Intervention takes place without the consent of one or more of the warring parties. Engagement requires the consent of all parties.

Intervention is the most likely scenario in the current environment, for a number of reasons.

- The occurrence of conflict is increasing because there is no functioning world order within which to arbitrate disputes or adequately address grievances.
- The world today is made up of a small number of rich and powerful nations and a large number of poor and weak nations. The struggle for finite or scarce resources in developing regions will increase the likelihood of intrastate and, to a lesser degree, interstate conflicts. The struggles of nationalities and

ethnic groups to obtain independence and sovereignty will also increase in frequency and intensity and are exacerbated in situations of resource scarcities.

The increasingly transnational nature of threats will require greater coalition cohesion and coordination to develop successful responses.

- The growing risk of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction will increase the dangers. Nonstate actors acting independently or on behalf of states can themselves cause crises. State actors employing asymmetric means of attack will attempt to thwart coalition or alliance intervention. It may no longer be possible to ensure peace through deterrence because it will be more difficult to identify where threats originate.

The UN is not equipped to preserve stability. Therefore, the United States and Europe will increasingly need to act together.

- Such interventions will act to enforce peace and then set the stage for a transition to peace building. This model allows peacekeepers to exit in a certain timeframe as intervention shifts to engagement. NATO is more suitable for these lengthy operations than ad hoc coalitions.

In situations where coalitions or alliances act, the political leaders in the respective member nations must play an important role to hold the alliance or coalition together.

- Political aims must be clearly defined and the military forces must be adequate for the mission required.
- The process must be seen through to the end.

Operationally, for alliance or coalition military operations to be successful a unified chain of command must be in place and national contingents must be capable of working together.

- The United States must be prepared to share technology with Europe to ensure interoperability, especially in regard to command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, satellite and reconnaissance (C⁴ISR).
- Not only must the United States reconsider to what extent it will share technology but the Europeans must be willing to share the burden of developing new technologies.

Alliances have the necessary structures and underlying political commitment to achieve these goals and to participate in long-term operations.

- Since coalitions usually are ad hoc arrangements by nature, formed (typically) to achieve a single goal, future interventions will depend more heavily on alliances.

General Montgomery Meigs, USA

The only way to conduct military operations in the future will be through a multinational coalition.

The characteristics of successful coalitions include the existence of alliance cohesion, agreement on a single strategic purpose, and the commitment to withstand the pressures generated as a campaign progresses.

Cohesion is dependent on three crucial factors:

- The competence of the multinational commander. The commander must approach policy development and decision making with a coalition view, not his own national view. He must work to achieve strong relationships with all members of the multinational command to develop a functional unity, and to instill a feeling of unity and commitment in the multinational troops.
- Support of the political leadership. The commander often operates in gray areas and must know he has the support of his political masters. To a great degree, effectiveness depends on the support of the command by the coalition's political leadership. Strong political support empowers the commander to assume risks that he is not otherwise able to accept.
- Singleness of strategic purpose. Aim and end-state are critical to the quality of the operational plan in terms of its intent, concept, validity, and clarity.

Coalitions must have the right commanders, who must be allowed operational initiative and be provided with political support when things get tough, and a clear end-state must be defined. Interoperability will fall into place if human factors are solved.

- NATO worked through many problems in logistics, administration, and intelligence. The chain of command is a sound way of crossing barriers. The important sinews of coalitions

are human factors. Though there may be no real identifiable threat at the current time, it is impossible to know where the next crisis will arise. NATO contributes greatly to security with a ready means, including infrastructure, command structure, and training experience, to face these crises.

Lieutenant General Peter Cosgrove, AC MC

The model for coalitions based on the Australian experience in regional deployments includes the East Timor deployment.

- Several years ago, Australia began to prepare for unilateral non-combatant evacuation operations (NEO) of Westerners and East Timorese. Options included, on the lower end of the spectrum, an air bridge, and on the upper end, deployment of ground forces to secure areas to be used for the evacuation and possibly a short-term stability operation.
- The actual operation lay somewhere in the middle. Australian forces evacuated over two thousand UN personnel and East Timorese. As the situation deteriorated further, it became apparent that Indonesia would agree to a multinational peace-keeping force. This force would come from an unknown coalition and structure.
- As the base force on the ground, the Australian Defence Force had the task of carrying out the initial phases of the coalition operation. They adapted the high-end intervention operation plan that they had previously developed for a unilateral operation to a strategy for the proposed multilateral coalition. As other nations signed on to the mission, Australia expanded operations on shore until the coalition forces could be phased in.
- The coalition operated under predetermined UN mandates that Indonesia and the East Timorese had agreed to. The existence of a UN mandate provided a legal basis and therefore legitimacy to the intervention.

Several factors determine the effectiveness of coalition forces:

- Differing levels of readiness, deployment timelines, and capabilities exist. Many nations may be willing to take part in coalition operations, but most are not capable of rapid deploy-

- ment. For early-entry coalition forces, time is of the essence because of humanitarian and media pressure to act fast.
- Early-entry coalition forces must have an appropriate balance of operating systems and capabilities to stabilize rather than escalate the crisis.
- There must be a common end state and common objectives, and early-entry forces should exist when those are achieved.
- Governments (previously willing but incapable) should then be prepared to send follow-on forces for operations of longer duration. Build-up of follow-on forces is complex and highly specialized.
- The UN transition force can then be deployed when the threat environment is reduced.

Challenges remain for global and regional powers with rapid response force capabilities.

- They need to develop an international framework for early-entry operations.
- They need to increase planning at the political/strategic level for such operations.
- Military planners should take the first steps to devise strategies at the operational level for such operations.

Dr. Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall

The United States has unparalleled military muscle, but it cannot act alone.

- U.S. civilian and military leaders must know that future operations will include multinational forces, nonmilitary actors and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). The military must keep this in mind when planning for all operations across the spectrum. The management of the Pentagon's international relations is about ensuring that the military can get the job done given the conditions it must operate in.

The international environment has changed, making the status quo posture of the DoD obsolete and requiring civilian and military leaders to be innovative in the management of the Pentagon's international relations.

- The Cold War is over, but the U.S. military is in greater demand to do more than ever.
- Multinational operations are politically preferable, but often militarily inefficient.
- The pace of technological change is creating an expanding gap between U.S. military capabilities and those of other nations.
- Peacekeeping and humanitarian operations will consume too many military resources unless the United States works to build up the capacities of other nations to organize and carry out those missions.
- DoD does not have existing mechanisms to interact with international and non-governmental organizations.
- Though officially mandated, the shaping function is neither institutionalized nor adequately funded.

The United States must work to ensure interoperability with alliance and coalition forces.

- A technology gap with NATO allies became apparent during the Kosovo campaign, specifically in the areas of secure communications, intelligence cycle time, and compatible equipment.
- Fighting in coalitions should be a net benefit to the U.S. military, not a drag on our system. The largest challenge is to close the growing technology gap.

U.S. defense leaders must take steps to improve interoperability and close the technology gap.

- A combined joint task force within NATO that develops a model for an enhanced alliance C⁴ISR capability should be established.
- DoD should require that the U.S. systems architecture now being built is capable of accommodating allied plug-ins.
- The United States should encourage the ESDI to enhance military capabilities, especially C⁴ISR compatibility among European nations.

- The United States should encourage transnational defense industrial linkages with NATO countries and other major military allies to enhance interoperability.
- The United States should build basic command, control, and communications compatibility with coalition partners, not just permanent allies, with whom we may need to deploy in the future.
- Information security standards needed to enhance coalition warfighting capabilities should be set in advance.

Recent multilateral deployments have highlighted the need for greater cooperation and coordination.

- The UN deployed twelve thousand multinational troops to Sierra Leone. They had no common training or experience; therefore their failures were no surprise. The United States and the United Kingdom had to train and equip the UN West African troops afterwards, at great expense.
- We learned that we need to strengthen others whom we may potentially depend on in future coalitions, so as to reduce the burdens that the United States faces when a crisis erupts.

The United States needs to organize more effectively to facilitate cooperation with potential coalition members.

- The United States should devote more political and financial capital to enhance the UN and regional security organizations.
- The United States should promote the establishment of an effective UN policing force to fill the gap between the completion of military intervention and the development of civilian institutions ready and able to keep the peace.
- The United States should prepare for interaction with international and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).

One tool that has been underutilized is military-to-military cooperation.

- Such programs contribute to the fulfillment of the shaping mission. Military-to-military cooperation with potential partners should be used to prepare for future warfighting, peacekeeping, and humanitarian operations. These programs

should be fully funded and fully institutionalized in the planning, programming, and budgeting systems.

■ ANALYSIS ■

In the current global environment, the United States, as the only superpower, is uniquely capable of conducting unilateral operations on a strategic level. Regional powers may act along their borders, but not in prolonged operations. However, there is a growing perception that the United States is not willing to take on the risks and possible damage to its credibility for operations that do not present a clear and present danger to vital or major interests in a particular region.

Whether the perception reflects reality or not, it is clear that the United States cannot be everywhere at once, and that overseas commitments are already straining readiness and strategic flexibility. Therefore, it is increasingly likely that future U.S. military operations will be almost exclusively carried out as part of an established alliance or within the framework of an ad hoc coalition. There are a number of reasons that this makes sense. Multinational operations typically provide a sense of legality to interventions, especially when the United Nations passes resolutions mandating a given action. Coalition operations also allow smaller nations to participate when their national interests are at stake, thus alleviating the burden typically faced by the United States, though it is clear that the United States can do more to make allies more able to assume greater shares of the burden.

Leadership is clearly a crucial commodity in the development and ultimate success of a multilateral operation. In all coalitions it serves commanders and political leaders well to have a clear appreciation of the fundamental national interests driving each coalition partner. Even in a strong alliance, such as NATO, political disagreements can limit the ability to act. From political leaders down through staff officers to individual component forces, it is important that the people who make up multilateral forces have the answers to certain questions. Why are they there? What are they prepared to do, to the full extent of the UN resolution or restrictions? Once these issues are understood, it is easier to start tasking each compo-

ment of the coalition. Leaders can then devise operational decisions and tasks that are consistent with the national interests of various member countries.

Interoperability is obviously a problem. The technology gap between the United States and several of its allies or potential allies is significant. The United States is more capable of managing critical intelligence and information in battlefield management. This is clearly an issue that must be addressed as we move forward. It is certainly a difficult question because of the influence of industrial and national political interests that are involved in the policy process, and existing opposition to sharing technologies and critical information. Through strong U.S. political leadership and cohesion of command it may be possible to overcome the interoperability problems, but at some point, if the technology gap persists and expands, the ability of commanders to lead multinational forces to decisive victory will erode. Further, the burden that is supposed to be shared by acting multilaterally will increase for the United States if allied capabilities are not improved. The United States should work with its partners to develop baseline standards and procedures for interoperability so that allied forces can be fully planned as part of any alliance strategy and can be counted on to contribute on the battlefield. Many of the differences in C⁴ISR may be solved by agreement on software and communication links between equipment. NATO must agree on how to move information around first, and then advance to procuring the same equipment in such a fashion that industry in as many NATO countries as possible can participate.

It is not necessarily only differing levels of technologies that affect interoperability. On the operational side, obstacles to units working together include differences in capabilities, differing interpretations of ROEs, and conflicting national instructions. The commander is the key to interoperability in this operational sense because he must understand these variables in order to tailor the missions of coalition member military components.

To this end, military-to-military relationships and working with partner nations can pay large dividends and should be encouraged. The engagement arena provides the opportunity to develop leaders capable of working within multilateral frameworks. The United States should look closely at what is expected from senior leaders

and develop training for junior leaders to attain those requirements. Increasing deployments to Bosnia and other coalition or alliance based assignments will assist junior officers when they advance to higher levels.

The incidence of intrastate conflict has increased over the past decade. It is clear that the UN is incapable of stopping such violence, and many conflicts do not occur in areas of important U.S. national interest. There is certainly political opposition to the use of U.S. forces all over the globe, or on missions that fall under the mantle of “nation building.” At the same time, allies and other nations, humanitarian organizations, and media coverage have increased the pressure to intervene to save lives. Given the United States’ finite capabilities, concerted efforts to help build international peacekeeping or (in some cases) peace enforcement capacities for willing nations or regional organizations can dampen emotional calls for U.S. intervention, while making a meaningful difference in trouble spots around the world.

Service Contributions to National Security Strategy & Capabilities

MODERATOR

47

Dr. Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., President, Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, and Shelby Cullom Davis Professor of International Security Studies, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University

PANEL MEMBERS

General Eric K. Shinseki, USA, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army
Admiral Vernon E. Clark, USN, Chief of Naval Operations
General James L. Jones, USMC, Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps
General Michael E. Ryan, USAF, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force

PANEL CHARTER

The shape of America's military services – the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines – has not changed nearly as dramatically as the international landscape. For the most part, this maintenance of the status quo has been deliberate and thoughtful – complex institutions can absorb only so much change without eroding the day-to-day readiness that our nation expects and our strategy demands. Nonetheless,

America's military is in many ways simply a smaller version, by more than a third, of the force that won the Cold War. Today's force – still the best trained, best equipped in the world – has essentially the same capabilities and shortcomings as it did during Desert Storm, nearly a decade ago.

There has been progress. Joint Vision 2010 and Joint Vision 2020 have established a clear picture of the capabilities required by the future joint force. Each service has pursued its own strategy for achieving those capabilities and for applying the lessons learned from Desert Storm and other recent operations. And each service has set its priorities judiciously, making difficult choices to ensure that it can provide, now and in the future, the most critical capabilities.

As each of the service chiefs has testified, this has been and continues to be enormously difficult. The simultaneous challenges of downsizing the Cold War force, adapting to a rapidly changing security environment, and preparing for an uncertain future – all while maintaining the readiness demanded of an engagement strategy predicated on global interests and responsibilities – has not been easy. In order to maintain current readiness and support a greatly increased operational tempo, the services went through an extended period of successive declines in modernization accounts, deferring the investments in science and technology and the R&D necessary to build tomorrow's capabilities. Even as the modernization investment remained at historically low levels, the increased maintenance costs of aging equipment and the burden of excess infrastructure stretched readiness resources even further. Meanwhile, the services have faced difficulty in attracting and retaining enough quality personnel to fill their ranks and develop tomorrow's leaders.

These bills have compounded, adding to the challenge the services now face: building forces capable of ensuring America's national security over future generations, just as they have over



right to left: General Michael Ryan, USAF; General James Jones, USMC; Admiral Vernon Clark, USN; General Eric Shinseki, USA; and Dr. Robert Pfaltzgraff, Jr.

previous generations. There has been healthy debate, even heated controversy, over how best to achieve this. Should the services continue to spend money updating a “legacy force,” or should they take advantage of the strategic window of opportunity to skip the next generation of weapons systems? Should the services accept greater risk with current readiness in order to invest more heavily in the future? Are current and envisioned levels of investment enough? Should the services adjust existing structures, or adopt revolutionary new structures? Should future roles and missions change? What is the right pace of change? There are strong imperatives for finding the right answers to these questions.

DISCUSSION POINTS

- Change is more than technology: developing leaders and service members for tomorrow.
- Current readiness and operational tempo: A resource challenge? A strategy challenge? A force structure challenge?
- The need for “legacy forces?” Will current or future technologies allow skipping a generation of weapons systems?
- Ensuring adequate science, technology, and research and development investment to achieve next-generation capabilities.
- Innovative force structure proposals: are the services too reluctant to change existing structures? Too aggressive?

SUMMARY

General Eric K. Shinseki, USA

The role of the Army in the post-Cold War era.

- The primary reason for an army is to fight and decisively win the nation’s wars. The purpose of fielding a large peacetime standing army is to be able to fight and win the wars that cannot be anticipated.
- Depending on its flexibility and versatility, such a force can do many other things besides fight wars, but it cannot fail to deliver on its warfighting responsibility, and its responsibility as part of a joint team, when called.

Developing a coherent and effective national military strategy.

- A debate over national military strategy should begin without regard for resource constraints. The senior leadership must be aware of the requirements of U.S. national strategy. In this way, the leadership can fully appreciate the implications that resource constraints would have for that strategy and the risk such constraints create.

The Army has begun a transformation that reflects the needs and requirements for future missions.

- The Army today, as it was ten years ago, is a Cold War legacy force designed to fight and win in Central Europe. Desert Storm showed that U.S. forces lacked strategic responsiveness and were not suited for full-spectrum operations. Today, the Army does not meet the requirements for Joint Vision 2020.
- The Army has embarked on an ambitious transformation campaign that could take up to thirty years to complete.

The challenge is to transform the force, while remaining ready to fight and win wars.

- This will necessitate the selective recapitalization of the existing legacy force. At the same time, it is important to develop an interim force that bridges the gap between existing heavy and light forces.
- In the long term, through the aggressive use of new science and technology solutions, the goal is to build a force that is more agile, more lethal, more survivable, and more sustainable than the current force. In doing so, the force will provide dominant maneuver land capabilities and therefore contribute to the joint team full-spectrum dominance. Such a force will serve as a strong deterrent and provide policy makers with a wide range of strategic options.

Policy makers must also address important personnel issues.

- The Army is only as good as the soldiers who serve. Training and education are essential in developing the understanding and skill sets necessary to implement transformation fully and to overcome the challenges of tomorrow.

The U.S. Army will remain a vital component of the national military strategy.

- Given the changing nature of the world, the National Command Authority (NCA) must possess the broadest range of options possible to deal with future threats. If the United States is to maintain its leadership, it must remain strong and possess the capabilities necessary to safeguard its interests.

Admiral Vernon E. Clark, USN

The fluid nature of the current security environment makes planning for specific contingencies difficult.

- Before moving to discuss specific military issues, there is a real need to determine what kind of military America needs in the future and what it will be used for. Given the uncertainty in the world, the quote “The best strategy is to be strong,” seems appropriate.

The services have suffered in recent years without a clear direction, defined roles, or the resources necessary for the missions presented.

- During the past decade, the services’ capabilities have diminished significantly. There is a need for a national commitment to address how to do all that the services are expected to do.

The U.S. Navy plays a number of important roles within the national military strategy and will continue to do so in the future.

- The services will be expected to take on important responsibilities in the decades ahead. Specifically, the Navy is expected to control and command the seas. With the other services, the Navy will work to provide the kind of stability that allows globalization to continue. The economic health of the United States is tied to the ability of the military to maintain stability and access.
- In the future, the Navy will continue to provide forward deployment and carry the influence and prestige of the United States to the four corners of the earth, and in doing so, to shape events. The capabilities of the services determine their ability to affect events around the world.
- As a component of a future joint force the Navy will sometimes serve as an enabler, sometimes in a lead role, sometimes in a

supporting role, but will always be capable of bringing a piece of the national capability to bear when and where the national command authority needs it.

The future role of the Navy within the joint forces concept.

- For the Navy, transformation will not be about physical changes; two-thirds of the personnel who will make up the 2020 force are active today. Rather, it is about building jointness by developing the tools, principles, and applications necessary to allow the Navy to integrate seamlessly into a joint strategy. To this end, the Navy will need to be forward, expeditionary, capable of applying speed and agility to the task, and where necessary, to provide access.

General James J. Jones, USMC

There is a pressing need to have a national discourse on what portion of the U.S. GDP should be committed to national security.

- It is important that people see national security in a greater context and not in a vacuum. The uniformed services and the entire national security apparatus provide the security and stability that allow our country to prosper. Failure to invest appropriately in national security will affect the long-term health of the U.S. economy, the successful exportation of American values, and ultimately U.S. technological leadership. In this context, it is appropriate to discuss whether the United States should be spending more on national security than 2.9 percent of GDP.

The United States must come to terms with its place in the world and, in doing so, define the roles and missions that the services will be expected to undertake.

- There is an inherent question of whether the United States will continue to accept the leadership role in the world that is its legacy. While the Marines spend a great deal of time focused on winning America's battles, a great deal of time and effort is also spent on other contingencies. There is no doubt that a substantial portion of the investment that the United States receives for investing in national security goes toward engaging and shaping and setting the conditions under which it is

not necessary to fight. In doing so, the conditions are created within which nations of the world can come together and work to make the world, as a whole, a better place.

Transformation of the Marines is well underway.

- The transformation and modernization of the Marine Corps are evolutionary in nature. The goal is to provide to the national command authority a force that possesses strategic agility, operational reach, and tactical flexibility. Having committed itself to innovation and experimentation, the Corps seeks to be scalable, interoperable, and capable of combined arms utilization to contribute to joint, allied, or interagency operations. This will allow the Corps, as a strong joint component, to help shape the international environment as the Corps responds to an ill-defined spectrum of crises and conflicts.
- If the Marine Corps is able to obtain the exciting new programs and platforms that are currently on the books (such as the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) and the V-22 Osprey), then it will continue to be a strong force for tomorrow's officers and leaders.

General Michael E. Ryan, USAF

The Air Force has undergone dramatic change. Moving forward, personnel issues will rival modernization as the primary concern for senior leaders.

- During the past decade, the Air Force has undergone a huge change in size and shape. The ability to recruit and retain high-quality personnel is essential for the Air Force, and the other services. Even with the best technology and machinery in the world, without the most competent and talented individuals to operate the equipment and solve the problems that will face the nation in the future, it will be difficult for America to enjoy the success that it has grown accustomed to. The lack of adequate compensation, combined with the burdens that enlisted men and women endure on today's missions and deployments, makes it difficult for the services to compete with the booming private sector. Disparity in pay and benefits must be addressed in order to sustain an all-volunteer force.

The United States must decide, as a nation, about how it wants to engage the world in the future.

- The debate will most likely land the United States somewhere between isolation and a role as the world's policeman. This will present a variety of operational challenges to the services across the spectrum of conflict. The United States should be prepared to address crises early on, with an engagement strategy, or later, when the crisis evolves or matures into a conflict that the United States must win.

Air Force transformation has been underway for ten years, and has taken the Air Force from a Cold War stature to one of an expeditionary aerospace force.

- The bomber force has been turned into a conventional rather than nuclear force. The intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance force has shifted from an information collection force to one that contributes to the targeting process. Overall, the Air Force can move from the strategic to the operational to the tactical very rapidly, and the strike force has evolved from an aluminum force to a stealthy, standoff force that operates with precision.

Like the Navy, the Air Force will not change rapidly.

- Recapitalization will be a huge issue in the upcoming QDR. While the average age of today's force is twenty-two years, the current rate of purchase of new aircraft today is one-third of the rate necessary to arrest the continuing aging process.

■ ANALYSIS ■

There seems to be consensus that the United States has not completely come to terms with its leadership position in the world. Given the removal of a monolithic threat and with it the likelihood of nuclear war, a majority of Americans have, to varying degrees, turned inward and become increasingly unconcerned about foreign affairs. This has serious implications for civilian and military defense planners. Clearly, the United States has benefited greatly from the past decade of relative peace. As Thomas Friedman pointed out in his presentation, the U.S. military has been crucial in providing stability and structure to a world very much in flux over that period. That

sentiment was echoed during this panel discussion when the service chiefs discussed engagement activities around the world. However, without a clearly defined adversary or a clear understanding of the threats that America faces today and in the future, it seems that many Americans are unsure about the importance of the military to the overall standing of the United States in the world.

A populace that is generally disengaged from the discussion of world affairs and unclear on America's role in the world is less likely to support the necessary commitment of resources that our military requires. However, without these resources, it may be difficult to field the capabilities for missions needed to safeguard U.S. interests and therefore, to maintain the relative peace, prosperity, and security that most in the United States have come to expect. Therefore, it seems crucial that political leaders and policy makers do everything possible to work toward a national dialogue that will ultimately bring the nation to a consensus on the U.S. role in the world. From that, it will then be possible to develop a national security and national military strategy that reflects the will of the nation.

In the meantime, it seems clear that the services are thinly stretched in terms of personnel. Overseas forward deployments have pushed the readiness envelope. All four of the service chiefs mentioned in their remarks that manpower, recruitment, and retention are major issues of concern. If the matter is not adequately addressed, there could be grave consequences for U.S. national security in the future. Increases in funding for increased pay and benefits for service men and women have been widely discussed and with congressional support can be acted on relatively quickly. The more difficult problem faced by the service chiefs and civilian and military policy makers is that of attrition in the junior officer corps. Increasingly, the bright talented young officers who will lead tomorrow's military are opting to resign their commissions for opportunities in the private sector or elsewhere. Developing programs to retain junior officers will be critical to ensuring the high level of human capital that is essential in a professional military.

Increasingly, Reserve and National Guard elements are critical to the overall force plans of the respective services and are considered active partners on a day-to-day basis. Given the stresses on manpower, these units are even more important in the current

environment, and the specialties possessed by some units make them essential to certain operations. These units have been active in Bosnia for most of the last five years. Given the nature of participation in the National Guard and Reserves, continued use at current levels may discourage enlistment due to the heavy burdens on members, their families, and their employers. Monitoring the operations tempo of Guard and Reserve units to alleviate some of this burden will be important to sustaining the overall viability of those organizations.

The service chiefs strongly believe that the two-MTW concept is important for the purpose of force structuring, but not for developing strategies. A shift away from the two-MTW framework would not be helpful now, even if the actual probability of two simultaneous conflicts may be low in the current and near-term environments. A shift to a one-MTW or similar framework would not improve readiness, given the strain on manpower that exists now. Instead, such a move would likely leave the National Command Authority without the level of forces capable of addressing the potential spectrum of conflict that the United States could face in the future. Clearly, this position is at odds with some of the conference participants who favor a shift to a one-MTW, SSC, or two-SSC plan. However, given the acknowledgment by the chiefs that the two-MTW standard is a tool for force structure planning, and not a strategy, it seems that further discussion is warranted and a comprehensive, overall review of strategies and capabilities within the context of the upcoming QDR is of great importance.

There is strong support for the increased jointness among the services. Specifically, the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) process, Joint Forces Command (JFCOM), and the CINCs are viewed collectively as positive developments that will improve the ability of the services to achieve joint transformation and in doing so, improve the ability of the respective forces to carry out their missions. Of course, at the same time, the service chiefs advocate continued support and necessary funding to modernize and recapitalize their respective services. Moving forward, as the Joint Vision is implemented it will be important to see how acquisition of new platforms and the definition of individual service roles and missions within a joint strategy progresses. The ability of the services

to carry on a joint fight has been characterized as still very much a work in progress. Aside from issues of technological integration and interoperability, the integration of four distinct cultures into a joint fighting force is a daunting task that military and civilian leaders will have to manage if truly joint forces are the ultimate goal.

The National Military Strategy & Joint Vision 2020

General Henry H. Shelton, USA
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

58

SUMMARY

The current international security environment will be challenging because of its complexity and the variety of potential threats that may emerge.

- The services may not continue to act with the freedom that we are accustomed to because the operational challenges of this new environment may well exceed our capabilities. To address this challenge, experimentation to develop a new operational concept and associated service transformations is vital.

There is currently a strategy-force mismatch, which creates an unsustainable burden on the armed services.

- The global security environment dictates the needs of the services. Events give us a window through which to see the trends.

U.S. global interests demand a broad range of military activities ranging from engagement to warfighting.

- In the future, the use of the military will not be restricted to vital interests. Rather, it is highly likely that forces will be deployed to achieve limited objectives. The two-MTW capabil-

ity serves us well, because it enables us to go in two directions at one time.

- The two-MTW model deters opportunistic aggression if U.S. forces are engaged elsewhere, it strengthens relations with allies and coalition partners, and it provides a safeguard against surprises.

High technology brought about dramatic changes in the global environment, affecting decision making and creating new vulnerabilities.

- It is understood that cable television, the Internet, and other information flows have greatly reduced the time available to the national leadership to respond to crises. Together with the increased complexity of current events, the tasks that the military is asked to accomplish will only become more difficult.
- Given our increased reliance on space-based capabilities and information operations, it is highly likely that information warfare will become a serious concern.

Given the recognition of U.S. power and the existence of anti-American sentiment around the world, adversaries will likely turn toward asymmetric approaches to attack our nation and its allies to thwart or sap our collective will.

- Opponents will make use of anti-access strategies, and extend the battlespace to U.S. territory. Although America has no peer competitor today, the fluid environment holds the potential for a singular rival or some combination of rivals to emerge to oppose U.S. power and thus present competition to U.S. interests.

Even in the absence of a single peer rival, it is critical that the United States maintain strong, flexible, and versatile military capabilities.

- American power should deter, and if deterrence fails, decisively and overwhelmingly defeat challenges to U.S. security. U.S. global interests, responsibilities, and obligations are not going to disappear. It is likely that the range of types of conflict that will face the U.S. military will expand.
- Therefore, it will be necessary to possess the capabilities to dominate across the full spectrum of military operations, and to do so simultaneously. This requires rapid, decisive operations and a seamless joint force.

The Joint Forces Command will oversee and focus on experimentation and transformation.

- JFCOM is working to develop interoperability to provide a common operational picture of the battlefield where combat fusion is the ultimate goal and the key to success.
- The Rapid Decisive Operations (RDO) concept is the primary vehicle for joint transformation. It provides the context for joint services and CINC warfighting experiments and necessary milestones for assessment, and serves to implement Joint Vision 2020.

At the same time, it is essential that the services continue their respective transformation programs to move toward the joint force concept.

- Individual service transformation efforts have three fronts: investment in people through education and training, the development of new doctrine and organization to achieve joint goals, and experimentation and exercises.

Three important issues will further the development of joint capabilities:

- Transformation, innovation, and joint experimentation will be included in the upcoming QDR.
- Interoperability will be the primary, non-negotiable parameter for all new systems acquisition.
- Joint organizations have been developed to address specific threats. In the field of counterterrorism, a joint civil task force will support lead federal agencies. SPACECOM has been charged with developing approaches to information warfare.

The joint force concept must pervade all aspects and decisions of the services and drive thinking as we move forward.

- Integration of service capabilities into a joint force must also include areas such as intelligence, doctrine, organizations, and equipment. Joint force C⁴I must get down to lower levels.
- Joint force commanders must understand exactly what their own service brings to the fight and key areas where integration with other services and even coalition partners is opportune. These capabilities are needed to protect U.S. interests, deter, aggression, or fight across the spectrum of conflict and assure victory.


ANALYSIS

While the dramatic changes of the past decade have seemingly left America as the only superpower, the world continues to be a dangerous place. Various actors will strive to challenge U.S. capabilities and leadership. While the evolution of asymmetric threats demands the development of appropriate preventive and responsive capacities, the United States must also remain vigilant to more traditional threats. It may seem that hegemonic rivalry is unlikely at this point, but given the complex environment, the potential exists for a nation or group of nations to challenge U.S. preeminence. Involvement in operations other than war can only be expected to continue, as well. In this environment, the U.S. military must be capable of operating and achieving decisive victory across a wide spectrum of challenges.

Truly joint forces provide U.S. leaders with the best capabilities for addressing this new environment. By building upon existing strengths, developing combined strategies and doctrine that allow for synergies across the services, and integrating individual service activities such as intelligence, logistics, and procurement into a joint framework, the U.S. military will transform to meet future threats. Aside from the difficulty in managing the cultural differences between the services in moving toward a joint force, the integration of these support activities may be the most difficult to achieve. General Shelton's insistence that the Joint Vision must extend to all corners of the individual services illustrates his clear understanding of the difficulty of developing a truly joint force.

Budgetary constraints and demographic challenges also play a role in the need for change, as it becomes more difficult to count on funding for individual service programs and increasingly hard to recruit and retain soldiers. Interoperable, joint programs should lower costs and unlock the potential savings as unneeded redun-

General Henry Shelton, USA,
Chairman,
Joint Chiefs of Staff



dancies are eliminated, and remove the pressures on salaries and benefits for our fighting men and women. This should improve the readiness, flexibility, and lethality of our current forces. However, the joint force concept, for all of its positive aspects, cannot be a cure-all for military and civilian leaders in terms of budget authority and funding. A joint force is not going to be a single, hollow, four-component version of what were four strong services. America's presence in the world will require a significant commitment of funds regardless of the exact nature, makeup, and structure of the military.

In all likelihood, it will be necessary to increase defense budgets in the near future in order to recapitalize existing programs while modernizing the services with an eye on increased jointness. However, new programs that prove to exhibit high levels of interoperability and utility across services will improve our capabilities while also creating savings over individual, stand-alone programs. Joint acquisition will be a key component of the overall Joint Vision and should play a large role in the success of the effort toward joint transformation.

Essential Military Capabilities for a Changing World

MODERATOR

■ **Dr. Jacquelyn K. Davis**, President, National Security Planning Associates, and Executive Vice President, Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis ■

63

PANEL MEMBERS

■ **Admiral Hal Gehman, USN (Ret.)** former Commander in Chief, U.S. Joint Forces Command ■

General Charles T. Robertson, USAF, Commander in Chief, U.S. Transportation Command

General Tommy R. Franks, USA, Commander in Chief, U.S. Central Command

General Peter Pace, USMC, Commander in Chief, U.S. Southern Command

General Charles R. Holland, USAF, Commander in Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command

PANEL CHARTER

Earlier panels identified the imperatives that should shape America's military capabilities. What do our national interests demand of our security strategy and the military's role as a crucial element of that strategy? How should we accommodate changing geopolitical realities, such as globalization and the increased uncertainty of the current and future security environment? What capabilities are required to meet the threats we face now and in the future? What capabilities will allow us to act effectively in concert with allies and partners? What capabilities, on what timeline, can and should the services provide?

The customers who must help shape the answers to these questions are the warfighting and functional unified commanders in chief. The CINCs are the senior commanders responsible for projecting and employing American military power – for carrying out the will of the president and the secretary of defense (SECDEF), for executing theater engagement strategies, and for integrating Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine forces into effective joint teams. The services provide capabilities; the CINCs employ them. As the Department of Defense embarks on its second QDR, the CINCs' perspectives are crucial.

Are existing capabilities sufficient for implementing a strategy of engagement? Are they sufficient for executing the full spectrum of missions – from humanitarian operations to major theater wars? What gaps or shortcomings must be addressed? Are Service transformation and modernization efforts on track to provide the solutions? Which are most important and why? Has adequate jointness among the services been achieved? If not, what more should be done? Do the CINCs have the tools needed to ensure that military force is effectively integrated with interagency and multinational capabilities?

Perhaps just as important as defining the need for new or improved capabilities is the need to develop or refine the processes for achieving those capabilities. Given the challenges the services face in modernizing and transforming while maintaining current readiness, do current processes ensure that service modernization efforts complement instead of compete with one another? Are these processes aimed at providing the joint capabilities needed by the CINCs, making the best use of finite resources? What is the best way to integrate

individual service experiments – in equipment, leader development, doctrine, training, and force structure – into joint experiments that ensure the future synergy of American military power?

DISCUSSION POINTS

-
- What military capabilities do the CINCs require for their areas of operation today? Are existing capabilities sufficient: theater missile defense, strategic mobility, specialized capabilities, force structure?
- What capabilities will be most needed in the future? Are service transformation and modernization plans on track to provide them?
- Are changes warranted in the national military strategy? Is the two-MTW paradigm necessary given the emerging strategic environment? Is it sufficient? What should the military strategy require?
- The CINCs' perspective: can we accept more risk in current readiness in order to invest in future capabilities?
- Ready for what? Are existing readiness standards a useful management tool for today's strategy, or should they be changed? How?
- Is recent success in achieving jointness enough? What should be improved? How?
- The future of joint experimentation: the role of Joint Forces Command? Of the other unified commands?
- Establishing joint requirements: ensuring coherence in Service modernization investments.
- Integrating military and nonmilitary capabilities: interagency, multinational, nongovernmental.

panel five

65

left to right: Admiral Harold Gehman, USN (Ret.); General Charles Robertson, USAF; Dr. Jacquelyn Davis; General Tommy Franks, USA; General Peter Pace, USMC; and General Charles Holland, USAF



SUMMARY

Admiral Hal Gehman, USN (Ret.)

The Unified Command Plan (UCP) serves the military well.

- The UCP, which is reviewed every two years, allows for a process by which evolutionary changes can be made, rather than disruptive large-scale reorganizations.
- The QDR and the UCP review will both take place in 2001, providing a special opportunity to examine military strategy and force structure.
- The existing structure of nine CINCs is sufficient, and additional missions can be distributed accordingly without creating any additional CINCs. The CINCs' role is significant in the requirements-determination process. However, the process may need to be reinforced.
- Military personnel, skills, and technical capabilities have to evolve with changes in the world. However, there is no need to develop a new set of military occupation specialties to accomplish the mission. Good soldiers make good peacekeepers, but not vice versa.

Recent discussion to leapfrog a generation of equipment in response to budgetary constraints should not be viewed as an either/or decision. It is more complicated than that.

- While there may be tradeoffs, we can modernize, transform, and adopt leap-ahead technology without necessarily sacrificing readiness. We cannot replace each item of equipment all at once with expensive new generations of equipment, but there are ways to bridge the gap. One method would be to improve situational awareness and solve the combat ID (fratricide) problem. This currently limits weapons systems to operate at only one-third of their effective range. We can also use interoperability and joint force core competency to fix immediate problems, mitigate the risk to our forces, and modernize at the same time.

It is a challenge for military leaders, including the CINCs, to realize that this is a period of transition, and that new threats, new challengers, new

methods, and new technologies are going to present new challenges that cannot be anticipated.

- It is important that the review process strike the proper balance in ensuring that CINC priorities are understood and supported in the resourcing process. The current process only partially recognizes CINC requirements.

Missile defense is a legitimate concern and responses to that threat are being examined.

- The current policy places priority on lower-tier missile defense, then upper tier, then national missile defense. This correctly corresponds to the threat. The weapons exist and it would be folly to ignore the danger they present.

Homeland defense has become an increasingly important issue for civilian and military defense planners.

- In responding to a WMD attack against the homeland, the DoD is in a supporting role. The first responders will be civil agencies such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Military training in core competencies such as engineering, security, and transportation will be required to prepare for an attack so serious as to overwhelm state and local officials.
- DoD cannot and should not replicate the core competencies of the national health system or civil police forces. There is plenty that the military can do in terms of training that is applicable to such a situation.

Terrorism is a real threat and an unfortunate reality for the United States because of its position in the world.

- It is important to understand that recent terrorist attacks are not aberrations. As long as the United States remains an open society, it presents targets to those who seek to do harm. There is an understanding that the United States needs to be engaged in different parts of the world where that presence is resented. There are vulnerabilities, and terrorist attacks should be expected.
- The task of the military and other government agencies is to minimize the risk and mitigate the damage of such attacks, using the lessons learned from past acts of terrorism.

The U.S. military is making progress in its abilities to participate in joint and combined operations with allies, but there are still key areas that need improvement.

- Kosovo is illustrative of alliance operations. The alliance is basically interoperable. However, the top priority should be improvements in secure communications capabilities.

General Charles T. Robertson, USAF

The UCP provides a long-term strategic perspective on the roles of the CINCs in missions as opposed to a narrower tactical perspective.

- As the world evolves, and ways of approaching missions evolve because of changes in technology or modernization, so should planning. The biennial transformations of the UCP take into account a strategic, long-range view, so that it evolves as the environment evolves, without being influenced by short-term expediency.

The nation must decide what its national interests are and then develop a strategy to protect those interests or achieve national objectives.

- It is particularly important to have adequate funding of the DoD and the services to implement that strategy. As a force provider, it is clear that Transportation Command possesses the resources for one MTW in the nearly simultaneous two-MTW scenario.
- It is important in the upcoming QDR that planners do not make unrealistic assumptions about what the force provider can provide and when, given existing missions and finite resources.

TRANSCOM faces three specific challenges:

- The health of the force is a concern. Recruitment and retention must be a top priority. Changes must be made to attract quality people and retain talent.
- The health of the transport fleet is a growing concern. As the services become increasingly expeditionary in nature, there will be greater emphasis on getting troops to where they need to be quickly. Aging fleets and the necessary increased levels of maintenance to keep older platforms operating drain resources.

- The boldness of adversaries and their willingness to attack U.S. and coalition assets around the world makes force protection a huge concern. However, most commanders do not have the resources to provide adequate force protection.

There is a pressing need to develop anti-missile technology as fast as possible.

- There is great concern about the implications of missile threat for primary aerial ports of debarkation (APODs) and SPODs. A missile attack or WMD attack could be devastating for TRANSCOM, seriously reducing capabilities to move and deploy troops. Aside from theater and intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), it is also concerned about anti-ship and anti-air missiles. This threat will not go away.

The decline in forward basing increases the difficulty of TRANSCOM's tasks.

- In the two-MTW scenario, the ability to move cargo and personnel rapidly is the key objective. The United States is down to six bases in Europe and six bases in the Pacific since the height of the Cold War, making TRANSCOM's job more difficult, placing greater strain on its fleets.
- Within the areas of responsibility (AORs), healthy infrastructure is critical as it improves the effectiveness of TRANSCOM to perform its tasks. It is also important to realize that the access and support provided by allies is crucial and that relationships that the United States establishes in peacetime can pay huge dividends during a conflict.

General Tommy R. Franks, USA

The UCP has remained dynamic so that it embraces the reality of the world.

- The UCP, the National Security Strategy, and the National Military Strategy should be reviewed and, where necessary, changes should be made to reflect changes in the environment. As nations move along a continuum from conflict to coexistence to coalition and back, U.S. policy should change.
- The most important relationships are the interagency ties among the services, DoD, the State Department, and the NSC,

among others. These entities must work together and stay abreast of developments in the world.

A change in the two-MTW framework should not simply be made because of budget constraints, but due to changes in assessments of threats and possible missions.

- The two-MTW strategy was not developed capriciously and it did not have a great deal to do with capabilities. It was based on an assessment of the world at the time. If it is in the national interest to be able to conduct two major theater wars simultaneously, then the framework should remain unchanged.
- If the two-MTW strategy no longer applies, then an alternative strategy would be appropriate. There is a flaw in addressing capabilities in accordance with what is affordable rather than what is necessary.

Engagement and the building of strong relationships is a crucial part of the U.S. military's mission overseas.

- In a region where there is no NATO, it is important to engage in activities with friends and their militaries that build the best cooperating and collaborating capabilities possible. There will certainly be different levels of complexity and different levels of capability in dealing with each given nation. Tomorrow's fight will certainly be a joint (combined) fight, likely within a coalition. It is important to work to build coalitions.

CENTCOM has a large, daunting, and complex mission given its AOR.

- CENTCOM is made up of an area that includes twenty-five countries on the nexus of three continents with 65 percent of the proven petroleum reserves on the planet. It is in the national interest for CENTCOM to be there. Threats include well-financed terrorism and the proliferation of WMD. There are states in the region with conflicting interests, and states that oppose the U.S. presence. There are also great challenges and opportunities in the region.

Missile defense should be pursued as long as missiles continue to pose a threat.

- WMD and missiles present a threat to the United States and its allies and coalition partners for which missile defense is needed. Theater Missile Defense (TMD) is de facto National Missile Defense to the states in the theater of deployment. CENTCOM is working with Gulf nations on a cooperative defensive initiative involving missile defense, building on the “plug and play” capabilities that exist to provide TMD in the coalition context.

Strategic responsiveness and the ability to deploy forces rapidly are crucial to CENTCOM’s mission.

- CENTCOM has relatively few forces permanently stationed overseas. There are planning requirements for how long it would take to move assets into the field to defend a given position, or how many people and assets must be forward deployed to facilitate a buildup.

We must consider many complex issues when developing a new strategy.

- Going forward, it is important to remember that a strategy is defined in terms of ends, ways, and means. With an understanding of national interests, it will be most important to adapt to new realities. The military must adjust to the realities of asymmetries as an approach by enemies and potential enemies to achieve their goals. It is necessary to adjust structures, specialties, and processes to be as relevant tomorrow as yesterday.

General Peter Pace, USMC

The UCP serves the military well.

- The design of the UCP allows for evolutionary change, and encourages the CINCs to focus on strategy. Similarly, the inter-agency process provides the CINCs with an opportunity to prepare and properly influence planning.

Force modernization is difficult and cannot be carried out at the expense of the safety of those currently in the services.

- If the proposal to leapfrog a generation of technology to focus on acquisition of future platforms causes leaders to accept more risk today, then such a plan should absolutely not be implemented. Troops must be properly prepared and equipped, today and tomorrow.
- The question becomes whether we need an incremental advance in capabilities or a greater advance for the next generation of technology. If it is correct that the United States does not have a peer competitor, then today's equipment, properly maintained, should serve its purpose, and there can be greater risk taken to develop and utilize the leap-ahead technology.

Future operations will certainly be joint and, most likely, combined.

- There must be interoperability within U.S. forces, and with our partners. U.S. partners do not necessarily have to possess the exact same equipment, as long as there are some technologies that are capable of bridging the gap. The United States should take advantage of increasing regional cooperation and attempts by nations to better partner with the United States.

The number one challenge the United States faces today is homeland defense.

- Within the Southern Command AOR, the greatest challenge is making the leadership of the United States understand the importance of the region to U.S. interests. Strong friendships and trade relations with nations of the region should not be taken for granted. The challenge is to encourage an allocation of resources to the region that reflects its importance.
- NMD as a component of homeland defense is vitally important. The leadership owes it to the citizens of the country to be prepared for such an asymmetric threat.

General Charles R. Holland, USAF

The UCP and interagency review processes are important, because it is clear that there is no such thing as a status quo.

- The world is changing. Special Operations Command trains to certainty but educates for uncertainty. SOCOM takes its leads

from the regional CINCs and attempts to provide them with the necessary assets.

- Most operations now are joint, combined, and interagency. It is important that each participating entity contribute the capabilities that can provide the most robust overall solution.

Training and professional development are crucial in a changing environment.

- It is important that service personnel today have the skills and requisite training to fully exploit available technology. The military should seek to update skills continually, and provide the requisite training necessary to meet new mission needs.

Force modernization decisions must be made with consideration of all potential risks.

- There must be a bridge between today's capabilities and tomorrow's technology that accounts for the relevant threat that the United States is likely to face over that time period. If the decision is made to skip over a generation of technology, it is important that the risk be adequately addressed.

SOCOM faces a number of challenges moving forward and views terrorism as the prevailing threat.

- Challenges exist in three major areas: readiness, people, and modernization. The readiness piece and the ability to support the regional CINCs is coming up short in certain areas. The low-density, high-demand areas, such as civil affairs, are in need of greater resources and have been forced to turn to reserve components to help resolve the shortage.
- Terrorism, and the damage that committed individuals can do to U.S. assets, is a serious threat. Improvements in information operations and the continued development of coalitions are needed to maintain the edge that the United States has enjoyed. The threat of WMD and the importance of homeland defense are critical today.

Proactive use of SOCOM assets could protect U.S. interests from possible WMD attack.

- WMD pose the greatest threat to the national fabric, and SOCOM will do everything possible to prevent a WMD attack.

There are a number of preemptive options available for Special Forces to counter the threat of WMD. It may be possible to stop the development of WMD at different points, by limiting the ability of adversaries to obtain technology or components. Coordination and increased resources will be critical to success. Most importantly, without the will to be preemptive, there is no next step.

Adapting to confront the next threat and remaining relevant threats is crucial.

- Moving forward, it is important to adapt to change and to assess and understand new threats and realities. It is important to work with allies and coalitions to remain engaged. The United States must maintain its relevancy in the world of the twenty-first century.

■ ANALYSIS ■

74

The panel members agreed that the UCP serves the operational needs of the CINCs well. The two-year review process allows for responsiveness to changes in priorities and requirements. As new threats and mission needs emerge, the regional CINCs are able to relay the changing needs for different equipment, specific skills, technical specialties, or other assets to force providers who can then develop and field the necessary capabilities for each specific command. There was also general support for the progress made toward joint forces and JFCOM's role in joint experimentation and the development of joint requirements. Panelists opposed the creation of any more unified commands or CINCs and believed that new tasks could be effectively divided among existing commands.

The regional CINCs have varying force needs and mission requirements, and while none complained about a lack of resources, General Robertson clearly illustrated a major problem facing military and civilian policy makers. His description of aging fleets, crucial to the ability to project power and move troops into theater rapidly, provides a vivid picture of the difficulties of procurement and developing military budgets. Transport platforms are often not discussed in policy debates and are lost in the arguments over the costs and benefits of high-tech weapons systems. However, their

importance to military operations is undeniable, particularly in the context of building more flexible mobile forces and providing greater strategic reach to military leaders. TRANSCOM's fleets must be maintained and improved to achieve the strategic flexibility and responsiveness desired by many policy makers. This will require a significant commitment of resources to a fairly unglamorous purchase. This typifies much of the debate over spending priorities, and illustrates how difficult it will be to make serious cuts in defense budgets without sacrificing needed capabilities.

The panel members also discussed the issue of human capital in the context of the need to constantly improve the skill sets and technical abilities of our fighting men and women as the world changes. SOCOM's ability to provide special skills to commanders in the field is dependent upon recruiting, developing, and retaining highly-professional, highly-trained, highly-motivated individuals. Attrition degrades SOCOM's ability to perform its mission, reflecting the service-wide problems of retaining talented people. The issue of pay raises and increased benefits for service personnel has been raised and discussed, and this reinforces the idea that more funds will have to be made available.

The hesitation of the CINCs to endorse the notion of skipping a generation of technology is not surprising. It would be unusual for any officer to be willing to sacrifice capabilities and risk sending troops into combat without the best equipment, support, or protection available. It is difficult to envision this issue becoming a point of serious contention between civilian political leaders and the military. As Admiral Gehman intimated, there may be ways to take advantage of better technology to improve existing platforms without deploying the legacy system for each. There must be clear discussions about the ramifications and alternatives between civilian and military leaders to develop a comprehensive, effective, and viable approach to addressing this potentially divisive issue.

Like the service chiefs, the CINCs were supportive of the two-MTW standard because of the flexibility it provides with regard to force sizing. Again, this is not surprising, given that commanders in the field would never want to be faced with the prospect of inadequate manpower when entering a conflict.

The development of missile defense at the theater and national levels to address the growing threat of missile attacks is another area that received support from the CINCs during the discussion. However, this issue, together with others discussed in the session, seems to point to a looming battle over funding priorities that will be extremely difficult but nevertheless necessary to reconcile, given the many needs and emerging threats faced by defense policy makers.

Setting Priorities for a New National Security Setting

Dr. Condoleezza Rice
Professor, Stanford University

SUMMARY

77

The end of the Cold War has left the United States in a position of singular power and influence.

- This is not simply reflective of U.S. military or economic power. The triumph of U.S. values – democracy, individual liberty, and market economics – over communism has created the situation where states now endeavor to join the international economic order of which the United States is the leading member.

The overarching goal of this period is to extend peace, prosperity, and democracy around the globe.

- It is and will continue to be important to help states attempting to make the transition into the new system. At the same time, the United States must beware of overextending itself as the inevitable result of a lack of focus and purpose in its foreign policy. At the same time, the United States must take advantage of opportunities to help other states make the adjustment.

In order to achieve the overarching goal of developing a sustainable peace, there are three major security objectives that the United States must address:

- The United States must address the challenges of major, potentially hegemonic competitors who could threaten global stability: Russia and China.
- The United States must address the challenge of regional powers that, while not directly threatening the survival of the United States, pose serious threats to the stability of important regions and U.S. allies.
- The United States must work to limit (if not eliminate) the potential for asymmetric attacks on its homeland or on U.S. assets and allies around the world. This includes terrorism of all types, the proliferation of missiles and missile technology, and the spread of WMD.

The gravity of these challenges necessitates a continued commitment to a strong national defense policy.

- A powerful military, capable of deterring aggression and safeguarding U.S. interests is fundamental to such a policy. The need to take steps to prevent and defend against asymmetrical attacks is also apparent, and a national missile defense should be the centerpiece of U.S. capacities to address such emerging, non-traditional threats.

In addition to strict security concerns, the United States must also address the problems of intrastate conflict and humanitarian disasters around the world.

- From a moral standpoint, extreme violence arising from ethnic and civil conflicts, crimes against humanity, and massive violations of human rights are in direct conflict with American values and ideas.
- From a pragmatic standpoint, such violence can spread and have seriously destabilizing effects on surrounding nations in a given region.

Use of military assets is not always the solution to such problems. A real, meaningful commitment to prevent and resolve intrastate conflicts should include various nonmilitary tools.

- Provide structural and technical support to help nations build capacities to survive and improve within the international economic system. Supporting integration of less developed countries into free trade arrangements is one such method.
- Aid states in the development of civil institutions and civil society, by improving interactions between relevant U.S. government assets and private sector and NGOs on the ground.
- Support the development of civilian policing capabilities to maintain order and support peace-building initiatives.

In a complex global environment, U.S. foreign policy must be comprehensive and coherent.

- Foreign policy should integrate security, economic, and diplomatic interests to develop a comprehensive approach to U.S. interactions with other nations. Cohesive vision and greater coordination between and among U.S. government (and in some case non-government) actors is the most obvious approach for crafting robust foreign policy.

■ ANALYSIS ■

The active involvement of the United States around the world was the principal factor in the resolution of the Cold War. The removal of the principal adversary to U.S. global interests dramatically changes the international landscape, but the fluidity and rapid change of the current system may demand even greater focus and closer attention from policy makers. It is a time of great opportunity to shape and influence the system and states within the system to solidify Ameri-

left to right: Dr. Jacquelyn Davis,
Dr. Robert Pfaltzgraff, Jr.; Dr.
Condoleezza Rice; and General
Eric Shinseki, USA



can leadership and overall sustainability of global free trade and liberal economic principles. At the same time, the system presents threats to U.S. interests, particularly over the long term, if disengagement or disinterest precludes policy makers from taking important steps today that may have far-reaching effects. The progress of China and the transformation of Russia present the most obvious examples of relationships that demand ongoing U.S. engagement and attentiveness given the potential benefits of long-term cooperation and the potential costs of long-term rivalry.

Comprehensive U.S. approaches to addressing such issues, taking into account security, economic, and diplomatic interests at play, are critical. Further, the strengthening of relationships with existing allies and the development of new strategic relations and coalitions are crucial to ensuring that the United States does not find itself alone in responding to contingencies in the future. It is important for policy makers to define areas where U.S. interests overlap with other nations and build upon areas of agreement. Similarly, it is useful to understand clearly where U.S. interests diverge from those of other states, and examine approaches to reconcile those differences, or if necessary, develop means to safeguard those interests. Clearly, coordination within and among relevant U.S. government agencies and with partners and allies is fundamentally important to developing robust policies that serve U.S. interests.

There may also be situations where, though national interests may not be threatened, the United States may be compelled to act because of a fundamental challenge to American values. Genocide, humanitarian disasters, and intrastate conflict are unfortunate realities. The United States may well have a strong moral inclination to alleviate suffering, stop violence, or help a state rebuild after conflict. These are legitimate goals, though the U.S. military may not always be the correct instrument to best address the issues at hand. It is important that the U.S. government work with partners to develop capacities and structures that can effectively achieve the objectives of helping states in crisis without necessarily creating unmanageable burdens for the United States in general, or the U.S. military specifically.

The United States must maintain a strong military that can not only win wars and meet necessary requirements to protect U.S.

global interests, but also deter potential enemies. It is important to have the “right” forces to meet tomorrow’s challenges and, given the dynamic international landscape, this would place a premium on flexibility and adaptability. In addition, the development of solutions to asymmetrical threats – a national missile defense to deter or protect from ballistic missile attack, infrastructure and technological innovations to protect against cyber attacks, and improvements in domestic preparedness in the event of terrorism within the homeland – is central to a prudent national security strategy.

Developing Defense Strategy for a Changing World

Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft, USAF (Ret.)
Former National Security Advisor

82

SUMMARY

The United States has not developed a coherent foreign policy for the post-Cold War era.

- We have yet to internalize the world we live in, one dramatically different from the Cold War world where we addressed clearly-defined threats with clearly-specified capabilities. Developing a defense strategy was straightforward. The current environment is ambiguous, and developing defense strategy is more difficult because of the diverse nature of the threats.

There seem to be two forces at work in the world today:

- Globalization makes the world opaque by opening up national borders in order to trade and fosters economic interdependence. This is a world in which capitalism can prosper, and since the United States is the sole superpower, globalization and American power have become synonymous.
- Particularization is dialectically opposite and inimical to globalization as a unifying force within the global community. This is manifested in the ethnic and religious conflicts that have taken place around the globe.

American leadership is essential.

- The United States is the only nation that can galvanize the world to deal effectively with the myriad problems plaguing the global community. That makes us both a unifying force and a potential target of those who see us as arrogant, the “new Rome” trying to force American values and virtues on an increasingly diverse world.

The United States must develop a viable strategy for dealing with the post-Cold War world.

- The United States cannot prosper in a world of turmoil. A strategy for dealing with the post-Cold War world should be based both upon protecting our vital national interests and on doing what is right and virtuous. This is not easy. It may be relatively easy to rank our national interests into a specified order of importance, but it is much more difficult to measure humanitarian interests.
- The debate between values and interests is important because if we fail to have the debate we run the risk of strategic overextension. We have more crises than we have resources, and more crises than we have vital interests. America has not had this debate and consequently, no clearly defined policy exists on when and how we conduct humanitarian interventions.

There are some practical ground rules for the use of force within a national security strategy.

- The United States should operate multilaterally rather than unilaterally whenever possible, incorporating allies and coalition partners and empowering the UN as a robust instrument of international peacekeeping.
- The United States should maintain substantial deployments in Europe and in Asia. In that regard, ground forces are a much more enduring symbol of American commitment than air or sea forces because they are visible and more relevant to day-to-day human activity.
- The United States should not embrace policies that are needlessly antagonistic toward China, a nation that could as easily become a partner as an antagonist. Additionally, future administrations ought to think about ways to thwart radicalization


in the Islamic world with more balanced policies and careful diplomacy.

Military modernization should move forward in the context of the emerging security environment.

- U.S. military capabilities should look ahead to the world of asymmetric threats and not backwards to the Cold War world. Army transformation is on the right track, but aversion to change exists in all the services.
- The United States needs hard-hitting forces that are flexible, mobile, and able to strike quickly and precisely anywhere on the globe. We need both to enhance current capabilities and to foster new and different ones.

Specifically, policy makers involved in modernization and transformation of the services should consider certain issues.

- The United States should leverage its technological advantages to develop asymmetric threats of its own. A long-range stealth bomber that attacks without warning with near-perfect precision is an asymmetric capability to most countries in the world.
- In defending the homeland we must be more proactive than reactive. Developing intelligence and surveillance capabilities that can identify threats such as ICBMs, together with the technology to deter such threats, is an example of a proactive policy.
- There is a need for a dedicated peacekeeping force. Soldiers should be adept at warfighting. What is required in peacekeep-



Lt. General Brent Scowcroft,
USAF (Ret.)

ing is a range of talents and capabilities not accessible to the military. The United States should encourage the UN to play a larger role in increasing capacities for peacekeeping.

■ ANALYSIS ■

The United States has the ability to shape the world to its benefit without dominating through military power and economic coercion. Reflecting the ideas of other speakers, General Scowcroft strongly articulated the need for U.S. leadership and the importance of developing clear policies to enhance and protect that leadership. However, there are ways in which the United States can sustain its power without creating enmity and jealousy or driving other nations to challenge American leadership.

Most importantly, increased cooperation with allies within the structures of multilateral organizations, and with respect for other cultures and other agendas, is the key to furthering U.S. interests without creating conflict or sowing jealousy and distaste. By working to build alliances and coalitions, and using resources to build UN capacities to deal effectively with some of the problems we have seen over the past decade, the United States can increase the international stability that is so crucial to continued prosperity.

Empowerment of the UN has been a divisive political issue in recent years, with some political leaders advocating withholding U.S. funding for the organization and limiting any perceived UN encroachments on state sovereignty. General Scowcroft presents a strong case for supporting organizations like the UN for both altruistic and strategic reasons. Through multilateral organizations, it is possible to raise resources and develop capacities to aid nations in need, particularly in the developing world. At the same time, organizations like the UN lend legitimacy to sanctions, interventions, or other instruments of power to maintain a semblance of order in the world. The development of policing capabilities for peacekeeping operations and transitional administrations in states struggling to escape from civil conflict or humanitarian crises is a major benefit that organizations like the UN can provide to the United States and the global community. It may take greater U.S. involvement to improve and empower UN capacities to undertake such missions,

but such an investment can pay real dividends, given the continuing incidence of intrastate conflict around the world.

It is clearly important that the United States continue to work closely with traditional allies like the NATO countries and Japan to take advantage of forward basing of troops and assets, which allows the United States to respond quickly and forcefully to safeguard its interests. Given the rise of China and the continuing internal problems of Russia, it is important to maintain a forward presence in strategic regions to deter and, if necessary, defend against hostilities in a worst-case scenario.

U.S. military capabilities should be matched to our strategy in such a way that traditional missions, like deterrence and warfighting, would be enhanced. Peacekeeping and activities that fall under the rubric of nation building would be shifted to dedicated forces and shared by other agencies or nations or multilateral organizations such as the UN.

While political leaders should do everything possible to maintain a forward military presence in regions like Europe and Asia, General Scowcroft advocated increasing capabilities to strike anywhere in the world at any time. Given the discussions over procurement of certain platforms, such as the JSF and the F-22, the idea of reopening the B-2 production line to provide military planners with long-range strike capabilities (alleviating dependence on forward basing) is certainly worthy of serious discussion. Resources should also be devoted to proactively averting threats to the homeland and other U.S. interests.



Dr. Andrew Marshall and
Dr. Robert Pfaltzgraff, Jr.

Implementing Needed Change

Reforms to Structure and Process

MODERATOR

■ **Ms. Michèle Flournoy**, Distinguished Research Professor, Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University ■

87

PANEL MEMBERS

■ **The Honorable John P. White**, Former Deputy Secretary of Defense; currently Lecturer in Public Policy, the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University ■

Admiral William A. Owens, USN (Ret.), Former Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

General Wesley K. Clark, USA (Ret.), Former Supreme Allied Commander Europe

PANEL CHARTER

■ The purpose of this conference has been to look forward, engage a variety of perspectives, and identify what is required to ensure the security of our nation into the foreseeable future. Many ideas have been proposed and many solutions have been recommended. Acting on these proposals requires setting priorities. Only so much ■

can be done, only so fast. Of the major issues discussed, which are paramount? Conversely, where can the nation afford to accept some risk in order to address the most pressing concerns? Facing a future security environment that is uncertain and ever changing, how do we ensure the coherence of our efforts over time? We have great experience and success marshalling energy and resources to tackle the known threat; how do we do so when the threat is diverse, changing, or around the corner?

Some changes can be implemented immediately; most will require years, if not decades, of effort. Some changes require adjustment; many require a bold departure from the lessons of past experience and challenge the cultures of institutions with long and proud histories. On many fronts, there is bipartisan consensus on what should be done; in other cases, significant differences of opinion must be bridged to move forward. Even where there is agreement on what must be done, there is a broad diversity of opinion on how to get it done. As formidable as these challenges are, we must work through them. History shows we have repeatedly failed to do so in the past, waiting for the first battle of the next war to create the impetus for action.

The next administration's national security team, in partnership with Congress, will undoubtedly work hard to prioritize the agenda. What priorities should they set, and why? What should they tackle first; what second? What changes can be directed by executive action? What requires the often painstaking task of brokering compromise, winning consensus, and establishing momentum? What leadership and management strategies are needed to overcome the institutional and cultural inertia that stands in the path of meaningful and needed reform? In short, how do we translate discussion into action to ensure a future of peace, opportunity, and prosperity?



left to right: Admiral William Owens, USN (Ret.); Dr. John White; General Wesley Clark, USA (Ret.); and Ms. Michèle Flournoy

DISCUSSION POINTS

-
- Focusing effort: balancing priorities (what must be changed now) against realities (what can be changed given the constraints of resources, the political landscape, and time).
- Who can do what? What requires presidential leadership? Congressional action? What can the secretary of defense and the senior civilian and military leadership accomplish?
- Overcoming public indifference to security affairs: Why are these issues important? Are they worthy of time and resources? What level of investment are we willing to bear?
- Adjusting national security structures: advantages and disadvantages of changing a system that has served us well? Are existing structures sufficiently flexible? Alternatives to the status quo?
- Improving the interagency process.
- Managing change: staying the course, synchronizing the effort, building momentum.
-

SUMMARY

Ms. Michèle Flournoy

The incoming administration must address the “iron triangle” of the next QDR.

- The next administration must resolve a \$30 billion to \$50 billion annual mismatch between what our defense program demands and the projected available resources.
- It must do so by taking action in one or more of three areas: (1) increase defense resources; (2) reduce costs while maintaining acceptable risk; (3) change our strategy to reduce the demands on the force. This is the iron triangle of the next Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR): spend more, reduce costs, or do less.

The next National Security Strategy and QDR must set explicit priorities.

- The next administration’s strategy must be more explicit in setting priorities. Greater prioritization requires a different approach to both the NSS and the QDR.

- National Security Strategy development should be a rigorous interagency exercise that involves the principals and deputies of the relevant agencies, sets prioritized objectives, and provides clear guidance for planning, resource allocation, and resource management within and among the various agencies.
- Rather than a comprehensive program review, the next QDR should be a truly strategic review that establishes a vision, sets priorities, and decides the biggest strategy and program issues.
- To ensure priorities drive resource allocation, the DoD's incoming leadership must (1) take ownership of their strategy early; (2) issue the strategy as binding guidance; (3) be clear about the scenarios that should drive planning; (4) ensure that the strategy and priorities are consistently and rigorously enforced; and (5) create an environment in which there is an open and fair competition of ideas and approaches.
- DoD should broaden its planning scenario set beyond two MTWs to include a wider range of potential threats, objectives, conditions, and concepts of operation.

Dr. John P. White

The next administration has an opportunity and an obligation to address a broad set of defense management problems.

- Dr. White's remarks were drawn from *Keeping the Edge: Managing Defense for the Future*, the book he recently co-edited with Dr. Ashton Carter.
- While the United States has the finest military in the world, the support system behind the military – encompassing a broad range of management structures and processes – is antiquated and dysfunctional.
- If left unfixed, these back-office deficiencies will erode the capabilities of our fighting forces.

We must develop an edge in new, or “homeless” missions.

- The new administration should charge the NSC, in concert with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), to develop an interagency program with strong central management

- of multi-agency missions: information warfare, biological warfare, peacekeeping, and so on.
- The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be required to develop an annual force development roadmap outlining joint requirements and architectures for functions such as information operations, intelligence, and precision strike.
- The CINC JFCOM should join the JROC and the Defense Resources Board and should have previously served as a CINC, service chief, or vice chief.
- JFCOM should be strengthened to become a true joint force integrator engaged in continuous exercises and experiments to upgrade our capabilities in command and control.

We must maintain our edge in continuing missions.

- To harness the forces of globalization and commercialization, DoD must adapt to remain the fastest integrator of commercial technology. This necessitates drastic changes to existing export controls.
- DoD must encourage a strong core defense industry by rewarding business for sound performance, including shared savings and higher profits for better value.
- DoD should encourage consolidation in the defense industry's second and third tiers.
- DoD should work toward more robust transatlantic linkages.
- DoD should adopt specific policies that adjust the all-volunteer force to evolving demographic, economic, and cultural realities.

We must solve chronic problems.

- The SECDEF should be given control over DoD's civil service and implement a new system that allows flexible pay and hiring rules, encourages career movement between the public and private sectors, compensates performance, ranks the person, and increases professional education.
- The SECDEF should establish as policy that the private sector is the preferred supplier.
- The SECDEF should obtain relief from OMB A76 constraints and congressional limitations and conduct a broadly based set

of functional competitions in areas such as communications, financial management, depot maintenance, and common skills training.

- The SECDEF should proceed with a list of recommended base closures, while Congress should proceed with new legislation for a long-term, effective BRAC system.

Admiral William Owens, USN (Ret.)

DoD must embrace profound change.

- If left on its present course, DoD will not be able to perform even one Desert Storm. We must look at all kinds of possible changes, even at the possible expense of the things we have loved most about our defense institution.
- These changes are matters of process and culture, not reorganization.

DoD needs a true joint requirements process.

- DoD must adopt a joint requirements process that, while involving the services, focuses on producing the best defense, as opposed to service, capabilities.
- This could be an enhanced JROC, or a joint requirements management board consisting of high-level civilians, civilian defense leadership, four-star service representatives, and the chairman or vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs.
- DoD must invest resources in an academically-based, science-based analysis of joint requirements. Both Admiral Owens and Dr. White proposed doubling current levels of investment as a starting point.
- This improved joint requirements process should subsume a truly joint acquisition process, allowing elimination of layers of DoD and service acquisition structure.

DoD must greatly improve its ability to leverage commercial technology.

- The future strength of DoD will lie in its ability to exploit opportunities created by commercial technology, using information technologies to improve battlefield sensors, integrate legacy weapons systems, and revitalize the efficiency of infrastructure.

- This will generate \$50 billion in savings that can capitalize needed requirements, such as a joint information umbrella that will allow us to see everything of relevance in future combat theaters. We don't have it now; we need it.
- Commercial technology is the key to solving the interoperability challenges inherent in joint and combined operations.

DoD should be willing to question traditional service roles and structures in order to spur needed innovation.

- It is arguable whether, if conducting a zero-based review, the military would be organized into the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.
- A functionally-based analysis today would recommend a different structure – a battlefield awareness force, a precision strike force, a cooperative defense force, a mobile ground maneuver force, and a smart logistics force – essentially organized around the pillars of Joint Vision 2010.
- The Army is the most relevant service today. It should receive greater funding even at the expense of other services.

panel six

93

General Wesley Clark, USA (Ret.)

DoD must place more weight on the just-cause model of warfighting, and less on the Desert Storm model.

- Before we can pursue reform, we must understand the nature of the battlefield to which U.S. forces will be committed in the future.
- We have focused on the Desert Storm model (heavy forces, forty-four-day air campaign, precision strike) at the expense of the just-cause model (risk taking, bold maneuver, insertion of ground troops). We must reemphasize the latter.
- Kosovo is an example. The United States expended one MTW worth of reconnaissance, and commanders couldn't see what was on the ground. Service reconnaissance capabilities were not interoperable, and as a result were ineffective.
- The battlefield comprises more than targets. It includes people in buildings, in villages, and underground; therefore we must have the ability to go in on the ground, accepting higher risk.

The just-cause model requires investment in certain neglected joint capabilities.

- Precision strike, while crucial, is overemphasized. We have underestimated the need for jointly synchronized reconnaissance to support just-cause operations more effectively.
- Organizations need to be more “tailorable” and more joint. Despite Goldwater-Nichols, we must place far greater emphasis on jointness, in both combat and support areas, in service doctrine, and among military leaders at all levels.
- More must be done with joint experimentation, and the CINC JFCOM must have more authority to pull together early-in-war activities like joint reconnaissance and information flow.

The United States needs a true military strategy and should create the planning structure to develop it.

- The two-MTW strategy was never a strategy for employment. It was only intended to retain the force structure we had.
- To have a national military strategy, we must have a national security strategy. To have a national security strategy, the National Security Council needs the structure to focus beyond the current crisis: a planning section, a planned operations section, and an operations section.

The armed forces must eliminate the zero-defect culture.

- The armed forces must let go of the quest for control, simplicity, and perfection. Negatives happen, but junior leaders do not believe that senior leaders will underwrite their mistakes.
- We have gone too far in over-planning, over-prescribing, and over-controlling. We must focus on the objective and define how we want to fight.

■ ANALYSIS ■

The message from this panel discussion was the need for significant, even radical, defense reform, and the obligation of the next administration to pursue it. The panel members not only called for reexamination of our strategic ends, characterizing the two-MTW construct as inadequate and wrongly applied, but importantly focused their remarks on the need to update, overhaul, or

create the crucial processes and systems that support those ends. Dr. White and Admiral Owens offered strikingly similar recommendations, perhaps not surprising given their former service as the senior civilian and uniformed systems managers of DoD. Truly notable, however, was the degree to which General Clark's Kosovo observations complemented these recommendations.

First and foremost, all stressed the need for the DoD to move beyond the Goldwater-Nichols reforms to achieve far greater jointness, including a truly joint requirements process, greater harmony in joint warfighting doctrine, and a more effective joint experimentation program under a strengthened CINC JFCOM. While General Clark stressed the importance of understanding the strategic landscape before pursuing reform, there was a shared tone of urgency on the issue of jointness – a clear call for immediate action.

Perhaps equally important, all of the panel members stressed the need for cultural change as a necessary precursor or accompaniment to reform. Admiral Owens put it most starkly, questioning the services' long-standing roles and missions, but Dr. White and General Clark echoed the theme in different ways – White by proposing specific personnel management reforms, Clark by criticizing service dogmas and the zero-defect mentality. The lesson to the next defense management team seems clear: to transform the institution, you must change the culture as well.

You must also have an effective vehicle for initiating and managing change, and all of the speakers hit upon this point as well. Ms. Flournoy used this issue to build the foundation for the panel, asserting that the next administration's defense leadership must first apply a disciplined and rigorous approach to both the National Security Strategy and the QDR, only then implementing managerial initiatives within the priorities established by those reviews. There was general agreement that the QDR is suitable and the best available process for pursuing needed reforms in a coherent fashion. General Clark's recommendation for a new NSC office focused on strategic planning, and Dr. White's proposal that the NSC, in concert with OMB, integrate multi-agency plans and programs both built on Ms. Flournoy's assertion that national strategy formulation needs to become both more rigorous and interagency in character.

Lastly, each of the speakers either stated or implied that national security requires greater resources over current levels, even while acknowledging that dramatic increases are unrealistic. This reality demands greater prioritization with an eye toward greater jointness, and a willingness to pursue some long-standing management problems. In spite of nearly a decade of DoD effort, the well of efficiency has not dried up. The change of administrations provides an opportunity to address some chronic inefficiencies, most notably excess infrastructure and non-core management functions, while putting in place management solutions that are not only more efficient, but more effective in generating improved defense capability.

closing address

The Honorable Rudy de Leon

Deputy Secretary of Defense

97

There has been a revolution in military affairs and the revolution is continuing.

- The Clinton administration has indeed supported the military to the tune of \$180 billion already with another \$50 billion to \$100 billion on the way. This infusion of funds should begin to address many of the issues discussed during the conference.

Four revolutions with significant implications for defense policy have taken place in the last decade:

- The collapse of the Soviet Union and the revolution in international relations with an accompanying reorientation of American defense thinking
- The economic revolution which is still in motion
- The information revolution whose dimensions we still do not fully comprehend
- A demographic revolution as the baby boomer generation passes but is trailed by its progeny

It will be a challenge for the president to govern in an evenly balanced political situation. Bipartisan activity will be fundamental to governing for the next four years at least.

The Goldwater-Nichols legislation fundamentally changed how DoD operates in establishing an acquisition czar, but more so in three other areas:

- The expanded role of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS)
- The development of the acquisition chain of command
- The creation of a Joint Requirements examination process – the JROC

An unanticipated consequence of the changes from Goldwater-Nichols is the emergence of the regional CINCs as dominant forces in the development of foreign policy.

In some cases, the CINCs have become the most significant U.S. policy representatives to entire regions.

The upcoming QDR is critically important to determine the direction of the U.S. military and U.S. defense capabilities. A number of issues must be examined:

- The existing needs of the regional and functional CINCs are likely to dominate the discussions and will most likely clash with the views of the JCS, who are focused on platforms for modernization and future operations.
- Investments in people are critical – recruiting, training, and retaining, including keeping a close watch on Reserve Component operations tempo.
- We need the money and the will to refurbish essential infrastructure and divest ourselves of the excess (we must do another BRAC and do it thoroughly as we cannot afford the drain of excess infrastructure).
- Business reform within DoD must continue. Currently DoD has no capacity to stay current with the information revolution: it takes DoD two years to replace computer systems and programs that change significantly every six months.

■ ANALYSIS ■

The deputy secretary's closing remarks reaffirmed an important theme that emerged from the conference. Political and institutional leadership within DoD is necessary to address the numerous problems confronting the department and the services today.

Bipartisan support for tough decisions such as passage of BRAC legislation will play a large role in improving the efficiency of resource allocation and obtaining new sources of revenue for needed programs. However, the closing of bases often becomes a highly charged political battle, as constituents in districts that house bases fear the loss of jobs and the disappearance of perhaps the largest single engine of economic power in the region. Representatives of districts slated to lose a base will face enormous pressure to fight the closing and thus it will take presidential leadership and a clear articulation of the pressing need to reduce unnecessary infrastructure burdens.

Further institutional reforms allowing for better business practices and greater integration of new technology within DoD will also streamline operations and increase efficiency, resulting in lower costs. However, even with the implementation of an aggressive BRAC campaign and a successful reform initiative at DoD, it is questionable whether the savings will be enough to cover the various spending needs that were made clear throughout the conference. It is difficult to envision a scenario where spending was curtailed in the absence of the implementation of serious, comprehensive reform efforts. However, it is difficult to see that such reforms would provide enough savings to address the needs that exist.

This reinforces the importance of the upcoming QDR together with other ongoing efforts, including this conference, to examine emerging security threats and required strategies and force structures.

biographies

100

Dr. Graham T. Allison, Jr.

Dr. Graham Allison is director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government. From 1977-89, Dr. Allison served as dean of the School. Under his leadership, a small, undefined program grew twenty-fold to become a major professional school of public policy and government. In the first term of the Clinton administration, Dr. Allison served as assistant secretary of defense for policy and plans where he coordinated DoD strategy and policy towards Russia, Ukraine, and the other states of the former Soviet Union. Dr. Allison has authored or co-authored more than a dozen books and one hundred articles, including, most recently, *Realizing Human Rights: From Inspiration to Impact*; *Avoiding Nuclear Anarchy: Containing the Threat of Loose Russian Nuclear Weapons and Fissile Material*; *Cooperative Denuclearization: from Pledges to Deeds*; and *Beyond Cold War to Trilateral Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific Region*. Dr. Allison has been a member of the secretary of defense's Defense Policy Board for Secretaries Weinberger, Carlucci, Cheney, Aspin, Perry, and Cohen. He was a founding member of the Trilateral Commission, a director of the Council on Foreign Relations, and a member of many public committees and commissions. He has served on the boards of the Getty Oil Company, New England Securities, the Taubman Companies, and Belco Oil and Gas, as well as on the advisory boards of Chase Bank, Hydro-Quebec, and the International Energy Corporation.

Lieutenant General Edward G. Anderson III, USA

Lieutenant General Anderson is deputy commander in chief and chief of staff, United States Space Command, and vice commander, U.S. Element, North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD). At United States Space Command, Lieutenant General Anderson helps lead the unified command responsible for directing space control and support operations including missile defense, as well as Computer Network Defense and Computer Network Attack. Lieutenant General Anderson has also served as the director for strategic plans and policy, the Joint Staff. Lieutenant General Anderson's awards and decorations include the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, the Army Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with Two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Bronze Star Medal with V Device. Lieutenant General Anderson is a graduate of the United States Military Academy. He holds a master of science degree in aeronautical engineering from the Georgia Institute of Technology and a master of arts degree in national security and strategic studies from the Naval War College. He is also a graduate of the British Higher Command and Staff Course.

Ambassador Richard Lee Armitage

Mr. Richard L. Armitage, the president of Armitage Associates L.C., is engaged in a range of worldwide business and public policy endeavors as well as frequent public speaking and writing. From March 1992 to May 1993, with the personal rank of ambassador, Mr. Armitage directed U.S. assistance to the new independent states of the former Soviet Union. In January 1992, Mr. Armitage was appointed coordinator for emergency humanitarian assistance. During his tenure in these positions, he completed extensive international coordination projects with the European Union, Japan, and other donor countries. From 1989 through 1992, Mr. Armitage filled key diplomatic positions as presidential special negotiator for the Philippines Military Bases Agreement and special mediator for water in the Middle East. President Bush sent him as a special emissary to Jordan's King Hussein during the 1991 Gulf War. In the Pentagon from June 1983 to May 1989, he served as assistant secretary of defense for international security affairs. From 1981 until June 1983, Mr. Armitage was deputy assistant secretary of defense for East Asia and Pacific Affairs in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. In 1967, Mr. Armitage graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy. He has been awarded the Department of Defense Medal for Distinguished Public Service four times, the Presidential Citizens Medal, and the Department of State Distinguished Honor Award.

The Honorable Louis Caldera

The Honorable Louis Caldera became the seventeenth secretary of the Army on July 2, 1998. As secretary of the Army, Secretary Caldera has statutory responsibility for all matters relating to Army man-power, personnel, reserve affairs, installations, environmental issues, weapons systems and equipment acquisition, communications, and financial management. Secretary Caldera has overall responsibility for the Department of the Army's annual budget of nearly \$70 billion. He previously served as managing director and chief operating officer for the Corporation for National Service. Before coming to Washington, D.C., he served for five years in the California state legislature, where he represented the nearly 400,000 residents of the 46th Assembly District. He served as chair of the Assembly's Banking and Finance Committee, Revenue and Taxation Committee, and Budget Committee. He also served as a member of the Intergovernmental Policy Advisory Committee to the U.S. trade representative. Secretary Caldera served as a commissioned officer in the U.S. Army from 1978 to 1983 and was awarded the Meritorious Service Medal. On active duty, he served as a military police platoon leader, battalion intelligence officer, and battalion executive officer. He later served in the U.S. Army Reserve. Secretary Caldera graduated from West Point and earned a law degree from Harvard Law School and an M.B.A. from Harvard Business School in 1987.

Admiral Vernon E. Clark, USN

Admiral Clark became the twenty-seventh chief of naval operations on July 21, 2000. Admiral Clark directed the Joint Staff's Crisis Action Team for Desert Shield and Desert Storm. While commanding the Carl Vinson Battle Group, he deployed to the Arabian Gulf and later served as the deputy commander, Joint Task Force Southwest Asia. Admiral Clark has also served as the deputy and chief of staff, United States Atlantic Fleet; the director of operations (J3) and subsequently director, the Joint Staff. He has received the Defense Distinguished Service Medal (three awards), the Distinguished Service Medal (two awards), the Legion of Merit (three awards), the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal (four awards), and the Navy Commendation Medal.

General Wesley K. Clark, USA (Ret.)

General Clark was the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) from July 1997 through May 2000. He was also the commander in chief of the United States European Command. As Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, General Clark was in overall command of NATO's military forces in Europe. In his position as SACEUR, General Clark was also the overall commander of approximately 75,000 troops from thirty-seven nations participating in

ongoing operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo. In 1999, General Clark commanded Operation Allied Force, the Alliance's successful military action in response to the Kosovo crisis. Simultaneously, as commander in chief of U.S. European Command, General Clark commanded United States military activities in eighty-nine countries and territories covering more than thirteen million square miles of Europe, Africa, and the Middle East. General Clark's previous assignments include commander in chief of the United States Southern Command, Panama, from June 1996 to July 1997, and director, strategic plans and policy, J5, the Joint Staff (April 1994-June 1996). He also led the military negotiations for the Bosnian peace accords at Dayton. General Clark is a 1966 graduate of the United States Military Academy of West Point, New York, where he graduated first in his class. He holds a master's degree in philosophy, politics and economics from Oxford University where he studied as a Rhodes Scholar.

Lieutenant General P.J. Cosgrove, AC, MC

Lieutenant General Peter Cosgrove graduated from the Royal Military College of Australia in 1968 and was commissioned into the Royal Australian Infantry Corps. Shortly after graduation he was posted to the 9th Battalion, Royal Australian Regiment, in South Vietnam where he commanded a rifle platoon. He was subsequently awarded the Military Cross for his service in Vietnam. His command appointments include the 1st Battalion, Royal Australian Regiment in 1983-84, the 6th Brigade in 1992-93, and the Royal Military College in 1997. He is a graduate of the United States Marine Corps Command and Staff College, the Joint Services Staff College, and the Indian National Defence College. He was appointed as commander 1st Division and Deployable Joint Force Headquarters in March 1998, and commanded International Force East Timor (INTERFET) from September 1999 until February 2000. Lieutenant General Cosgrove assumed his current appointment as chief of army on July 16, 2000.

Dr. Jacquelyn K. Davis

Dr. Jacquelyn Davis is executive vice president of the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis and president of National Security Planning Associates. Dr. Davis is an authority on force planning and military technology trends; U.S.-allied security relations in NATO-Europe, the Persian Gulf, and the Asian-Pacific region; counterproliferation and deterrence issues; and regional security dynamics, especially as they affect U.S. policies regarding forward presence. Her other areas of expertise include defense problems related to the former Soviet Union and the CIS republics and the security policies and programs of key European countries, particularly the United Kingdom, France, and Germany. As a member of the chief of naval opera-

tions' Executive Committee, she has written and lectured extensively on issues of naval strategy and maritime power. Dr. Davis has written and collaborated on numerous books, articles and IFPA special reports. Her recent publications include: *Strategic Paradigms 2025: U.S. Security Planning for a New Era* (co-author) and *CVX: A Smart Carrier for the New Era*. Dr. Davis served a four-year tenure (1992-96) on the Board of Advisors at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California. In addition, she was a member of the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS), serving as national chairperson from 1986-88. Dr. Davis is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the CNO Executive Panel, the Hart-Rudman Study Group, and the International Institute for Strategic Studies. Dr. Davis received her M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania.

Ms. Michèle A. Flournoy

Ms. Michèle A. Flournoy is a distinguished research professor and director of the Quadrennial Defense Review 2001 Working Group at the National Defense University's Institute for National Strategic Studies. Previously, she served as principal deputy assistant secretary of defense for strategy and threat reduction and as deputy assistant secretary of defense for strategy. She was the principal author of the "Shape, Prepare, Respond" strategy and of Presidential Decision Directive 56. Before joining Department of Defense, she was a research fellow at Harvard's Center for Science and International Affairs. Ms. Flournoy has published two books and more than fifty articles on international security issues. She received a B.A. in social studies from Harvard University and an M.Litt. in international relations from Balliol College, Oxford University. She is a member of the Defense Policy Board, the Council on Foreign Relations, the International Institute of Strategic Studies, and the Executive Board of Women in International Security.

General Tommy R. Franks, USA

General Tommy R. Franks is the commander in chief, United States Central Command. He has commanded the Third (U.S.) Army/Army Forces Central Command and the Second Infantry (Warrior) Division, Korea and was assistant division commander (maneuver), First Cavalry Division during Operations Desert Shield/Desert Storm. General Franks attended the Army War College where he completed graduate studies and received a master of science degree in public administration at Shippensburg University. General Franks' awards include the Defense Distinguished Service Medal; Distinguished Service Medal (two awards); Legion of Merit (four awards); Bronze Star Medal with V (three awards); Purple Heart (three awards); Air Medal with V; Army Commendation Medal with V; and a number of U.S. and

foreign service awards. He wears the Army General Staff Identification Badge and the Aircraft Crewmember's Badge.

Mr. Thomas Friedman

Mr. Thomas Friedman joined the New York Times in 1981 as a financial reporter specializing in OPEC and oil-related news and later served as the chief diplomatic, chief White House, and international economics correspondent. A two-time Pulitzer Prize winner for his coverage of the Middle East, Friedman is also the author of *From Beirut to Jerusalem*, which won both the National Book and the Overseas Press Club Awards in 1989 and was on the New York Times "Bestseller List" for nearly twelve months. Friedman also wrote *The Lexus and the Olive Tree* and the text accompanying Micha Bar-Am's book, *Israel: A Photobiography*. Friedman graduated summa cum laude from Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass., with a degree in Mediterranean studies. He received a master's degree in modern Middle East studies from Oxford. He has served as a visiting professor at Harvard University. He lives in Bethesda, Maryland, with his wife Ann and their two daughters.

General John R. Galvin, USA (Ret.)

General John Galvin was the sixth dean of The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, and is currently dean emeritus. He served as NATO Supreme Allied Commander Europe and commander in chief of U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Forces in Europe during the five years that ended the Cold War. More recently, he was an envoy of the U. S. State Department with the rank of ambassador to assist with negotiations in Bosnia. Dean Galvin played a central role in many of recent history's defining moments, including the Gulf War, the redesigning of NATO strategy, humanitarian support in Central and Eastern European nations, the rescue of 450,000 Kurdish refugees in northern Iraq, East-West negotiations on arms control, and U.S. military operations in Zaire, Liberia, and other African nations. He has published several books and articles on U.S. military strategy, transatlantic relations, and the future role of NATO. A graduate of West Point, Dean Galvin holds a master's degree in English from Columbia University and continued his military education at the Army Command and General Staff College and the Army War College. He also did postgraduate study at the University of Pennsylvania and attended The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy on a fellowship in 1972-73.

Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr., USN (Ret.)

Admiral Gehman served as commander in chief, U.S. Joint Forces Command, from September 1997 until his retirement September 5, 2000. He served briefly as deputy commander in chief, U.S. Atlantic Command,

from 1994 until 1996. In 1996, he reported for duty as the twenty-ninth vice chief of naval operations. He served as executive assistant to commander in chief, U.S. Atlantic Command/Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic, from 1990 until 1991. Admiral Gehman served as the director for operations, U.S. Atlantic Command, from 1991 until 1993. Admiral Gehman served as assistant for surface warfare captain assignments at Naval Military Personnel Command; head, officer plans and management branch on the staff of the chief of naval operations and executive assistant to the vice chief of naval operations from 1989 until 1990. He attended the NROTC program at Pennsylvania State University and graduated with a bachelor of science degree in industrial engineering.

General Charles R. Holland, USAF

General Holland assumed command on Oct. 27, 2000, as commander in chief, U. S. Special Operations Command. Before his current position, General Holland was vice commander, Headquarters, U.S. Air Forces in Europe (USAFE), Ramstein Air Base, Germany. He acted for and in the absence of the USAFE commander. In support of the U.S. European Command, the general conducted and coordinated offensive and defensive aerospace operations. The general entered the Air Force in 1968 after graduating from the U.S. Air Force Academy. He has commanded a squadron, two Air Force wings, and the Special Operations Command Pacific, and served as deputy commanding general of the Joint Special Operations Command. Before his current assignment, he was commander of the Air Force Special Operations Command at Hurlburt Field, Florida. He is a command pilot with more than forty-six hundred flying hours, including seventy-nine combat missions in an AC-130 Gunship in Southeast Asia.

General James L. Jones, USMC

General James Jones assumed his current post as thirty-second commandant of the Marine Corps in July 1999. Immediately before this assignment, he served as the military assistant to the secretary of defense. Previously, General Jones served as deputy chief of staff for plans, policies, and operations at Headquarters Marine Corps; director, Expeditionary Warfare Division (N85) in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations; and commanding general, 2d Marine Division, Marine Forces Atlantic. General Jones also served as deputy director (J-3), U.S. European Command, before being reassigned as chief of staff, Joint Task Force Provide Promise, for operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Macedonia. Earlier, General Jones served as commanding officer, 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit, and participated in Operation Provide Comfort. Earlier in his career, General Jones served as senior aide and then military secretary to the commandant of the Marine

Corps and as commander of the 3d Battalion, 9th Marines, 1st Marine Division. General Jones' decorations include the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, Silver Star Medal, Legion of Merit with three gold stars, Bronze Star Medal with Combat V, and the Combat Action Ribbon. General Jones holds a B.S. degree from the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service and has attended the National War College.

Senator Carl Levin (D-MI)

Mr. Carl Levin was first elected to the United States Senate in 1978, after serving as president of the Detroit City Council, and is now serving his fourth term. He is the senior Democrat on the Senate Armed Services Committee, where he has earned a reputation as a strong advocate for the men and women of our armed forces and as an effective waste fighter. Levin is a member of the Small Business Committee. He also serves as the ranking member of the Government Affairs Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, as well as of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. He graduated with honors from Swarthmore College, and from Harvard University Law School.

General Montgomery C. Meigs, USA

In October 1999, General Montgomery C. Meigs returned to the Headquarters of United States Army Europe and 7th Army in Heidelberg, Germany. He had been serving as the commander of the multinational Stabilization Force in Bosnia-Herzegovina since October 1998. He assumed the duties of commanding general, U.S. Army, Europe, and 7th Army on November 1998. He graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1967. After study at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and a year at the Army's Command and General Staff College, he taught in the History Department at West Point and spent the 1981-82 academic year at Massachusetts Institute of Technology as an international affairs fellow of the Council on Foreign Relations. He received his Ph.D. in history from Wisconsin in 1982 before reporting to 2d Armored Cavalry Regiment as its executive officer. He has worked as a strategic planner on the Joint Staff in Washington, D.C., and assumed command of the 2nd Brigade, 1st Armored Division, on September 26, 1990, and soldiered with it through Desert Storm. He subsequently commanded the 7th Army Training Command in Grafenwoehr and served as chief of staff of V Corps and deputy chief of staff for operations of the U.S. Army, Europe, and 7th Army. General Meigs commanded the 3rd Infantry Division from July 1995 until February of 1996. In October 1996, he deployed with the 1st Infantry Division to Bosnia, serving nine months as COMEAGLE in command of NATO's Multi-National Division (North) in Joint Endeavor and Joint Guard. His awards

include the Distinguished Service Medal, the Bronze Star Medal with V Device, and the Purple Heart.

General Klaus Naumann (Ret.)

General Klaus Naumann was chairman of the NATO Military Committee from 1996 to 1999. Immediately before taking this position, he served as chief of staff, Federal Armed Forces of Germany, from 1991 to 1996. Previously, he served as commanding general of I Corps in Münster. Earlier assignments included deputy chief of staff (politico-military affairs and operations) and deputy chief of staff (planning) on the Armed Forces Staff at the German Ministry of Defense (MOD) in Bonn. In addition, he had two assistant branch chief tours in Bonn and an assignment as executive officer to the vice chief of staff, Federal Armed Forces at MOD. He also served on the staff of the German military representative to the NATO Military Committee in Brussels, where he was chief of the military policy, nuclear strategy, and arms control section. General Naumann has published widely, including the book *Die Bundeswehr in einer Welt im Umbruch* [The Bundeswehr in a World of Transition]. His military awards and decorations General Naumann include the Commander's Cross of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Gold Cross of Honour of the Federal Armed Forces. General Naumann's military education includes the 13th Army General Staff Officer Training Course at the Federal Armed Forces Command and Staff College in Hamburg, Germany, and courses at the Royal College of Defence Studies, London.

Dr. Michael O'Hanlon

Dr. Michael O'Hanlon is a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, specializing in U.S. defense strategy and budgets, military technology, Northeast Asian security, and humanitarian intervention. He has been a senior scholar at Brookings since 1994 and an adjunct professor at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs since 1996. From 1989-94 he worked in the national security division of the Congressional Budget Office. His most recently published book at Brookings is entitled *How to Be a Cheap Hawk: The 1999 and 2000 Defense Budgets*. His latest effort, *Technological Change and the Future of Warfare*, is forthcoming. He and Ivo Daalder are now collaborating on a book on the war over Kosovo. Dr. O'Hanlon received a bachelor's degree in physics and a Ph.D. in public policy from Princeton University.

Admiral William A. Owens, USN (Ret.)

Admiral Owens is co-chief executive officer and vice chairman of Teledesic LLC, which is building a global, broadband Internet-in-the-sky. Previ-

ously, he was president, chief operating officer, and vice chairman of Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), the nation's largest employee-owned high technology company. Before joining SAIC, Owens was vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the nation's second-ranking military officer. He had responsibility for the reorganization and restructuring of the armed forces in the post-Cold War era. Owens was the architect of the revolution in military affairs (RMA), an advanced systems technology approach to military operations that is the most significant change in the system of requirements, budgets, and technology for the four armed forces since World War II. Owens has written more than fifty articles on national security and authored the book *High Seas*. He is a 1962 graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy with a bachelor's degree in mathematics. He has bachelor's and master's degrees in politics, philosophy, and economics from Oxford University and a master's degree in management from George Washington University.

General Peter Pace

General Peter Pace was promoted to general and assumed duties as the commander in chief, United States Southern Command, in September 2000. General Pace previously served as commander, U.S. Marine Corps Forces, Atlantic/Europe/South. General Pace has served as president, Marine Corps University/Commanding General, Marine Corps Schools, Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia. While serving in this capacity, he also served as deputy commander, Marine Forces, Somalia and as deputy commander, Joint Task Force. General Pace was advanced to major general in June 1994 and was assigned as the deputy commander/chief of staff, U. S. Forces, Japan. He was promoted to lieutenant general and assigned as the director for operations (J-3), Joint Staff, Washington, D.C. General Pace is a graduate of the United States Naval Academy. He also holds a master's degree in business administration from George Washington University (1972).

Dr. Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr.

Dr. Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., is the president of the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis and Shelby Cullom Davis Professor of International Security Studies at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University. He has held a visiting appointment as George C. Marshall Professor at the College of Europe, Bruges, Belgium, and as professor at the National Defense College, Tokyo, Japan. He has advised key administration officials on military strategy, modernization, the future of the Atlantic Alliance, nuclear proliferation, and arms control policy. Dr. Pfaltzgraff has published extensively and lectured widely at government and industry forums in the

United States and overseas, including the National Defense University and the NATO Defense College. Dr. Pfaltzgraff leads the Institute's research projects on future security environments, technology diffusion, and curricular development on issues associated with weapons of mass destruction. His work encompasses alliance relations, crisis management, missile defense, the development and conduct of gaming exercises, arms control issues, and strategic planning in the emerging security environment. He holds an M.A. in international relations, a Ph.D. in political science, and an M.B.A. in international business from the University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Condoleezza Rice

Dr. Condoleezza Rice is the Thomas and Barbara Stephenson Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution. She previously served as a Hoover senior fellow from 1991 until 1993, when she was appointed provost of Stanford University. She is a tenured professor in the university's political science department and was a Hoover Institution national fellow from 1985 until 1986. Following her initial Hoover Institution affiliation, Rice went to Washington, D.C., to work on nuclear strategic planning at the Joint Chiefs of Staff as part of a Council on Foreign Relations fellowship. She came back to Stanford when the fellowship ended. Rice returned to Washington in 1989 as director of Soviet and East European affairs with the National Security Council. She also was appointed special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Soviet affairs at the National Security Council under President George Bush. She has written numerous articles and several books on international relations and foreign affairs, including *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed: A Study in Statecraft*, with Philip Zelikow (Harvard University Press, 1995). Rice enrolled at the University of Denver at the age of fifteen, graduating at nineteen with a bachelor's degree in political science (cum laude). She earned a master's degree at the University of Notre Dame and a doctorate from the University of Denver's Graduate School of International Studies.

General Charles T. "Tony" Robertson, Jr., USAF

General Charles T. "Tony" Robertson, Jr., is commander in chief, United States Transportation Command, and commander, Air Mobility Command, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois. As a unified command commander in chief, he is responsible to the secretary of defense for the nation's defense transportation requirements. He exercises command over service transportation components from the Army, Navy, and Air Force. As commander of Air Mobility Command, he provides operationally trained, equipped, and mission-ready air mobility forces to support U.S. requirements. The general entered the Air Force in 1968 as a graduate of the U.S. Air Force Academy.

His thirty-year career has included a wide variety of operational and staff positions, among them command at the squadron, wing, and numbered air force levels. His most recent assignments include duty as director, personnel plans, Headquarters U.S. Air Force; vice director, the Joint Staff, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Washington, D.C.; vice commander, Air Mobility Command; and commander, 15th Air Force, Travis Air Force Base, Calif. A command pilot, he has logged more than 4,000 hours in airlift, tanker, and bomber aircraft, including 150 combat missions as a gunship pilot in Vietnam.

General Michael E. Ryan, USAF

General Ryan is chief of staff of the U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C. As chief, he serves as the senior uniformed Air Force officer responsible for the organization, training, and equipment of 750,000 active-duty, Guard, Reserve, and civilian forces serving in the United States and overseas. As a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he and the other service chiefs function as military advisers to the secretary of defense, National Security Council, and the president. The general entered the Air Force after graduating from the U.S. Air Force Academy in 1965. He has commanded at the squadron, wing, numbered air force, and major command levels. He flew combat in Southeast Asia, including one hundred missions over North Vietnam. He also served in staff assignments at the major command level, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force, and the Joint Staff. As commander of 16th Air Force and Allied Air Forces Southern Europe in Italy, he directed the NATO air combat operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina that directly contributed to the Dayton Peace Accords. Before assuming his current position, the general was commander of U.S. Air Forces in Europe and commander, Allied Air Forces Central Europe, with headquarters at Ramstein Air Base, Germany.

Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft, USAF (Ret.)

Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft is founder and president of the Forum for International Policy, a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization that provides independent perspectives and opinions on major foreign policy issues. He also is president of the Scowcroft Group, Inc., an international business consulting firm. General Scowcroft served as assistant to the president for national security affairs to Presidents Ford and Bush, and he worked as military assistant to President Nixon and as deputy assistant to the president for national security affairs to Presidents Nixon and Ford. He has held positions in the organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the headquarters of the U.S. Air Force, and the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. He has also chaired or served on a number of policy advisory councils, including the President's General Advisory Committee on Arms Control, the President's Commission on Strategic Forces,

and the President's Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense Management. General Scowcroft received his undergraduate degree and commission into the Army Air Forces from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He has an M.A. and Ph.D. from Columbia University.

General Henry H. Shelton, USA

Commissioned a second lieutenant in the infantry in 1963 through the Reserve Officer Training Corps, General Shelton spent the next twenty-four years in a variety of command and staff positions in the continental United States, Hawaii, and Vietnam. He completed two tours in Vietnam, the first with the 5th Special Forces Group and the second with the 173d Airborne Brigade. Following his selection for brigadier general in 1987, General Shelton served two years in the Operations Directorate of the Joint Staff. In 1989, he began a two-year assignment as assistant division commander for operations of the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), a tour that included the division's seven-month deployment to Saudi Arabia for Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. Upon returning from the Gulf War, General Shelton was promoted to major general and assigned to Fort Bragg, North Carolina, where he assumed command of the 82d Airborne Division. In 1993, he was promoted to lieutenant general and assumed command of the XVIIIth Airborne Corps. In 1994, while serving as corps commander, General Shelton commanded the Joint Task Force that conducted Operation Uphold Democracy in Haiti. In March 1996, he was promoted to general and became commander in chief of the U.S. Special Operations Command. General Shelton became the fourteenth chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on October 1, 1997. In this capacity, he serves as the principal military advisor to the president, the secretary of defense, and the National Security Council.

Dr. Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall

Dr. Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall is a senior research scholar at Stanford University's Center for International Security and Cooperation and a senior advisor to the Stanford-Harvard Preventive Defense Project. She is a co-author of the project's most recent publication, *Keeping the Edge: Managing Defense for the Future*, in which she writes about managing the Pentagon's international relations. She served from 1994-96 as deputy assistant secretary of defense for Russia, Ukraine, and Eurasia, with responsibility for national security policy toward the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union. In this capacity, she was honored with the Department of Defense Distinguished Service Medal. She is a consultant to the Office of the Secretary of Defense and a member of the Pentagon's Regional Centers' Board of Visitors. She also advises Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

on its nonproliferation and arms control initiatives in the former Soviet Union. Dr. Sherwood-Randall served previously as associate director of the Harvard Strengthening Democratic Institutions Project, as chief foreign affairs and defense policy advisor to Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr., and as a guest scholar in foreign policy studies at the Brookings Institution. She holds a bachelor's degree from Harvard-Radcliffe Colleges and a doctorate in international relations from Oxford University, where she was a Rhodes Scholar.

General Eric K. Shinseki, USA

General Shinseki graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1965. Since his commissioning, he has served in a variety of command and staff assignments, both in the continental United States and overseas. These assignments included two combat tours in Vietnam with the 9th and 25th Infantry Divisions, as an artillery forward observer and as commander of Troop A, 3rd Squadron, 5th Cavalry. He has served in Hawaii at Schofield Barracks with Headquarters, United States Army Hawaii, and Fort Shafter with Headquarters, United States Army Pacific, and taught in the United States Military Academy's Department of English. General Shinseki's ten-plus years of service in Europe included command and senior staff assignments in Schweinfurt, Kitzingen, Würzburg, and Stuttgart. He served as the deputy chief of staff for support, Allied Land Forces Southern Europe, in Verona, Italy. General Shinseki commanded the 1st Cavalry Division at Fort Hood, Texas. In July 1996, he was promoted to lieutenant general and became the deputy chief of staff for operations and plans, United States Army. In June 1997, he was appointed to the rank of general before assuming duties as commanding general, United States Army Europe; commander, Allied Land Forces Central Europe; and commander, NATO Stabilization Force in Bosnia-Herzegovina. He assumed duties as the twenty-eighth vice chief of staff, United States Army, on November 24, 1998. General Shinseki assumed duties as the thirty-fourth chief of staff, United States Army, on June 22, 1999.

Representative Ellen O. Tauscher (D-CA)

Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher is currently one of only two women to hold a leadership post among House Democrats. She is a member of the House Armed Services Committee and is active on nuclear nonproliferation, particularly in Russia and the former Soviet Republics. Rep. Tauscher sits on the Procurement and Military Personnel subcommittees. Rep. Tauscher was the youngest woman to hold a seat on the New York Stock Exchange for Bache Securities.

Mr. Michael A. Vatis

Mr. Michael Vatis is the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Infrastructure Protection Center. Previously, Mr. Vatis served as associate deputy attorney general and deputy director of the Executive Office for National Security in the Department of Justice. In this capacity, he advised the attorney general and the deputy attorney general on national security matters and coordinated the Department of Justice's national security activities. Mr. Vatis has also served as a special counsel in the Department of Defense and as a law clerk to the late Justice Thurgood Marshall of the U.S. Supreme Court and then-Judge Ruth Bader Ginsburg of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. circuit. Mr. Vatis has also worked as a lawyer in private practice in Washington, D.C. Michael Vatis is a magna cum laude graduate of Princeton University and Harvard Law School.

Dr. John P. White

Dr. John P. White is a lecturer in public policy at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. From 1995-97, he served as deputy secretary of defense. From 1993-95, he was director of the Center for Business and Government and a lecturer at the Kennedy School, following his active involvement in both the Perot and Clinton presidential campaigns in 1992. He chaired a Presidential Commission on Defense and has participated in previous IFPA-sponsored meetings. Dr. White also served in the federal government as the deputy director of the Office of Management and Budget (1978-81), assistant secretary of defense, manpower, reserve affairs, and logistics (1977-78), and an officer in the U.S. Marine Corps, on active duty from 1959-61. He has held corporate management positions in the private sector at the RAND Corporation, Interactive Systems Corporation, and Eastman Kodak Company. Dr. White holds a B.S. in industrial and labor relations from Cornell University and an M.A. and Ph.D. in economics from Syracuse University. Dr. White's recent work includes *Keeping the Edge: Managing Defense for the Future*, a publication of the Stanford-Harvard Preventive Defense Project. Dr. White co-edited the volume with Dr. Ashton Carter, and authored chapters on the revolution in business affairs and ensuring quality people in defense.