AMERICA'S SECURITY STRATEGY

End of the Cold War - great for me, but not necessarily for everyone

- A lot of conferences, studies, books on need for new strategy, new vision

- Some focus on resurgent Russia, expanding China, nutty North Korea, the troubled Middle East, and Homeland terror threat.

- Some look at capabilities, core competencies, new technology - Deep Strike, non-lethal, info war

- Some seek the grand strategy - What was our strategy in the Cold War? European Allies? After the Cold War? Now?


Grand Strategy without an enemy
Multiple but secondary goals
Pluralism with vengeance

And what have our old enemies done \(\rightarrow\) cut, cut, cut.

Russia - used to be 3.5 million, now going on 850K, spend what?
China 4-5 million - now it doesn’t have much of the Air Force or the Navy
Iraq - how much is left for the coming fight?
North Korea - 1/2 the population = 1/20th the economy of South

And what have our Allies done \(\rightarrow\) cut, cut, cut.

Germany cut from 500K to under 240K
UK cut from 400K to 200K
France cut from 600K to under 300K
under 2% of GDP

We have stayed Big

Navy 10X next, USMC nearly the same as UK, USCG rivals Canada, USAF, USA. We are in the process of raising defense budget to over $400B (Fr, UK ??). R&D is 5 times that of Europe
What about our new enemy?

Terrorism is more a police/ para-military problem
Underlining causes?
What comes next after Iraq?

Will it last much longer? Should it last longer? What are the underlying forces?


Several themes

1. LABOR SCARCITY - no casualties
   Nothing too good for our boys
   Firepower, Big Tail
   Is it just scarcity? What about Democracy?

2. SUSPICIONS OF A STANDING ARMY
   Article I of Constitution - fund Army only 2yrs
   (Glorious Revolution)
   2nd Amendment - well regulated Militia

3. FREE SECURITY/ UNPREPAREDNESS
   No invasion since 1812
   Soft Neighbors
   Two big oceans
   No threat for survival since the Civil War?

4. CIVILIAN CONTROL OF MILITARY
   Domestic politics has a role

5. MILITARY RESISTANCE TO CHANGE
   True?

Did WWII, Cold War change all of this?
Can we rely on reserves?
What about our global interests?

But is a global patrol in our interest? In keeping with our values? Preemption?
Grand Strategies

1. Primacy
2. Humanitarian/ collective security
3. Selective Engagement
4. Restraint

Freidberg, "Why Didn't Untied States Become A Garrison State?" IS Spring 1992

- No UMT
- No dispersal of industry
- Fear of burdening Economy
- Budget Limit

Internal constraints even in big wars; economics helped drive the strategy – not driven by it.
Contract State – Not a Garrison State

Airpower, nuclear weapons win over ground troops

Just before the end of the Cold War people argued we were overextended
Soon we would be short of manpower
Oil dependency
Burden Sharing

Now?

Sapolsky and Shapiro, "Casualties, Technology, and America's Future Wars,"
Parameters Summer 1996

- No US
- No Friendly
• No Collateral
• No Environmental
• No enemy innocent
• No cultural
• No legacy

Is it the politicians or the Wars?

Mines, Depleted Uranium - what is next?

Will we have to pay for wars twice, three times - Agent Orange?

Can we carpet bomb? Did we?

Have wars changed? Nuclear weapons - what happens if Iraq uses one? Nuke Baghdad?