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Introduction

The Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis (IFPA), and the International Security Studies Program of The Fletcher School, Tufts University, with the co-sponsorship of the United States Navy and the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, convened a major conference on December 2-3, 2003, in Washington, D.C. The focus of the 34th IFPA-Fletcher Conference on National Security Strategy and Policy was “Security Planning and Military Transformation after Iraqi Freedom.”

More than 350 people, including senior officials from the executive branch, the military services, the Joint Staff, the intelligence community, the combatant commands, Congress, as well as participants from industry, the media, academia, and from overseas were in attendance. Prominent speakers addressed such issues as lessons learned as a result of 9/11 as well as Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom for future security planning. There was extensive discussion of such major topics as priorities for transformation from the perspective of each of the armed services as well as the U.S. military as a whole; post-9/11 deterrence; developing and fielding capabilities to counter weapons of mass destruction; changes in U.S. military capabilities to meet twenty-first-century threats and challenges and their impact on alliance relations; and key areas for coalition planning in light of recent experience and emerging challenges.

Designed to give broader dissemination to the proceedings, this Conference Report provides a summary, synthesis, and analysis of the panel presentations and discussions. Additional information about the conference, including transcripts of its sessions, can be obtained by visiting the Institute’s website, www.ifpafletcherconference.com

*Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr.*
President
The Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, Inc.
Executive Summary

Following Operation Iraqi Freedom, together with the ongoing war on terrorism, the conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the publication of the National Security Strategy of the United States, there are numerous lessons to be learned and other critical issues that need to be considered as the United States reorganizes its security structures to address the threats of the early twenty-first century. These are discussed in detail in the Conference Report.

In order to examine these diverse issues and challenges and to better understand their political and military implications, the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis (IFPA) and the International Security Studies Program of The Fletcher School, Tufts University, with the sponsorship of the United States Navy and the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, convened the 34th IFPA-Fletcher Conference on National Security Strategy and Policy focusing on security planning and military transformation after Operation Iraqi Freedom. Topics addressed included the changing context of security planning; assuring, dissuading, and deterring twenty-first-century threats; perspectives on organizing and implementing national defense strategies; service views on transformation; and coalition operations and alliance transformation.

TheChangingContextof
SecurityPlanning

The opening session examined the changing context of security planning. Panelists provided insights on critical security planning and challenges including: the use of force in regional contingencies; military transformation and alliance futures; asymmetric threats and non-state actor terrorist challenges; new operational concepts and technologies for defense and deterrence; implica-
tions for strategy and operational planning; and the war for the “hearts and minds” and security cooperation in the new era.

Panel members agreed that, despite the progress made, the United States still has to organize its forces and other capabilities more effectively to deter asymmetric threats such as those posed by international terrorism. Panelists also agreed that a new mindset and cultural change are needed to implement successful military transformation throughout the U.S. military establishment and the armed services.

Key points that emerged during presentations and discussion include:

- The United States must develop a global posture that reflects as fully as possible the challenges of the early twenty-first century. A new posture must incorporate more rapid deployment, jointness, flexibility, and cutting-edge technology.

- The United States is fighting a worldwide counterinsurgency which requires discarding vertical layers of micro-management and allows U.S. troops greater flexibility in order to respond and adapt to enemy tactics more rapidly.

- Today's security framework could be termed the second nuclear age, characterized by the widespread proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) to other nations and nonstate actors. A key feature of the second nuclear age is an increase in complexity due to the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the emergence of actors for whom Cold War standards of deterrence and escalation control are inadequate or irrelevant.

- Three major types of global terrorist activities exist today, nuisance, symbolic, and structural, each of which seeks to undermine or destroy U.S./Western values and institutions. Without a fundamental understanding of the mindset and worldview of Islamist terrorist organizations, the United States cannot develop effective strategies to combat them.

executive summary
To combat terrorism, the United States must utilize its substantial technology base and capabilities to focus specifically on the global terrorist threat; create joint command and control structures in the front-line fields; and bolster the language capabilities in U.S. intelligence services and Special Forces.

The United States should consider the establishment of a separate stabilization and reconstruction force, encompassing one active and one reserve Army-equivalent division, to deal with the requirements for post-conflict contingencies.

**U.S. Nonproliferation Policy**

The objective of U.S. nonproliferation policy is not only to prevent the spread of WMD, but also to eliminate such weapons in the hands of rogue states and terrorist groups. While the Bush Administration favors peaceful solutions, it rules out no options, including the use of preemptive military force to stop proliferation when required.

As recently acknowledged, Iran has had a nuclear weapons program underway for at least eighteen years in clear violation of its Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty commitments. Therefore, the United States has used international pressure to end Iran’s nuclear weapons program and to secure international consensus against Iran’s pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability. In the case of North Korea, the United States seeks the complete, permanent, and verifiable dismantlement of North Korea’s nuclear programs.

The United States, together with other international partners, has developed the Proliferation Security Initiative which is designed to prevent WMD, missiles, and related technologies flowing to and from would-be proliferators by disrupting WMD trafficking at sea, in the air, and on land. It is anticipated that additional countries will join this Initiative.
Assuring, Dissuading, and Deterring 21st Century Threats: Operationalizing the New Strategic Triad

This session examined the issue of dissuading and deterring twenty-first-century threats. Panelists provided insights on topics including: the post-9/11 deterrence paradigm; the future of extended deterrence; fielding and organizing capabilities for counter-WMD missions; identifying options for preemption in the context of the Nuclear Posture Review and the National Security Strategy; and integrating global strike, missile defense, and information operations in support of regional contingency planning.

There was broad agreement among panel members that the strategic security challenges confronting the United States require several important initiatives. The United States is developing a new deterrence concept for the twenty-first century as reflected in the latest Nuclear Posture Review. Panelists also agreed that the nuclear deterrent posture designed for the Cold War is no longer relevant or adequate. While future threats can be deterred, new capabilities are needed to ensure that deterrence will endure well into the future.

Other ideas and issues that came forward in this session encompass:

- It is vital that the United States shape its strategic defenses to address the threats of the early twenty-first century. Moreover, in cooperation with its allies and friends, America must develop a new global strategy designed to deter aggression, and if necessary, to defeat it. The United States must also produce new deterrent concepts for a dramatically changed strategic environment.

- Deterrence can no longer be assumed to operate predictably or reliably because of the changes in today’s strategic environment. The United States must develop approaches to deterrence and new threat options that are better suited to the emerging security environment. In addition, the United States must understand the motivations, goals, and values of current and anticipated U.S. adversaries in order
to determine how to deter specific actions. One size will not fit all situations.

- Deterrence should not depend exclusively on nuclear weapons but rather on a mix of conventional and nuclear assets and offensive and defensive capabilities. For example, the U.S. strategic inventory must encompass conventional global strike capabilities; missile defense; information systems, including robust space-based assets; and an adequate, up-to-date nuclear stockpile in order to perform future deterrent missions.

- Because of the less than predictable nature of future threats, the U.S. strategic arsenal can no longer be considered a separate force, dedicated solely to the deterrence mission. It must be integrated with overall national security requirements as well as with non-strategic systems for improved and coordinated operations.

**Combatant Command Views on Organizing and Implementing National Defense Strategies**

The next panel session facilitated a broad discussion of combatant command perspectives on organizing and implementing national defense strategies. Presentations and questions focused on various topics including: command priorities and essential mission areas; working through cross-regional issues; prosecuting the global war on terrorism and what it means for combatant commanders; re-balancing forward posture and support infrastructures; and synchronizing continental U.S.-based capabilities for regional contingencies.

Panel members described their individual combatant command views and responsibilities for organizing and implementing national defense strategy involving military transformation. Each combatant command must increasingly work as closely as possible with the others on cross regional issues, particularly the prosecution of the global war against terrorism. In addition, since 9/11, it was strongly suggested, the importance of intelligence,
especially integrated intelligence assessments, has increased dramatically. To be successful in the global war on terrorism, intelligence must be collected, analyzed, and disseminated much more effectively and rapidly within and among federal, state, and local authorities.

Other points that surfaced during presentations and discussion include:

- The role of the U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) in the global war on terrorism includes a major effort in Colombia against the narcoterrorists who threaten both Colombia and the entire region. SOUTHCOM works closely with other combatant commands, particularly conducting coordinated planning with U.S. Pacific Command and the new U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM), two commands that border SOUTHCOM’s area of responsibility.

- U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) serves as the lead agent for planning the global war on terrorism. SOCOM’s transformation focus is in the areas of intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, and related pre-strike functions.

- NORTHCOM’s mission is to defend the United States and to provide military support to civil authorities. Its priorities range from critical infrastructure protection to missile defense.

**Congressional Views on Transformation**

Congress plays an important role throughout the military transformation process in preparing for future threats to national security. Even though America’s military is indisputably the most capable in the world, its force structure must continue to change if the United States is to meet the security needs of the early twenty-first century.

Transformation efforts need to include Congress as an integral part of the process because without Congressional support such efforts simply will not succeed. Since it controls the defense
authorization and appropriation budget bills, Congress will have a key role in determining which approaches, i.e., organizational change and/or weapon system choices, are appropriate for the future. Therefore, the Department of Defense (DOD) must keep Congress involved to ensure that the armed forces possess the requisite tools to meet diverse mission requirements.

**Security Planning and Transformation**

Several key elements of military transformation confront DOD. Transformation is a continuous process that involves both creating and anticipating the future. Moreover, transformation encompasses more than just the development of new military technology: it also requires changes in DOD’s core concepts, processes, and organizations. By its very nature, transformation has no end state; instead, it is a continuing process.

In the information age new sources of power and competitive areas and competencies associated with the transformed international security environment have emerged that include shorter cycle times and adaptive planning, greater market opportunities, and new customer bases. Meeting these challenges will require fundamental shifts in the underlying principles that govern how America promotes global security. Above all, DOD must adopt new values, attitudes, and beliefs, particularly a willingness to embrace change and new patterns of behavior.

**Transformation for the New Era: Service Perspectives**

The issue of military transformation within the armed services and the U.S. Coast Guard was examined by leaders from each of these organizations during this panel session. Presentations covered a wide range of issues, including the nature of military transformation, recent and ongoing successes and challenges, lessons learned from Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom, the ongoing global war on terrorism, and the transformation plans of the military services.

Panel members concurred on several broad themes, including the challenge associated with simultaneously conducting current
military operations and designing the future force. They depicted the process as an iterative one in which insights gained from current operations would contribute to crafting a better force for future conflicts, and the development of new military technologies and concepts of operations would also provide additional capabilities. Furthermore, panelists stressed the importance of jointness, readiness, and flexibility as essential components of transformation. Additional issues that arose during this session include:

- Despite the changes in the international security environment, the essence of war has not changed: it is still characterized by uncertainty, danger, and deception. These challenges can be managed successfully if the military services operate as a joint force and continue the process of transformation in order to provide the capabilities needed for the twenty-first century.

- The Marine Corps, in conjunction with the Navy, is developing the concept of sea-basing to overcome the access problem and to allow the use of the oceans and seas as maneuver space.

- Two essential core competencies of today’s Army are training and equipping soldiers and developing leaders; and providing relevant and ready land power to the combatant commanders and the other members of the joint team. Military transformation includes more than simply equipment, it encompasses changes in doctrine, organization, training, leadership development, people, and facilities.

- The Coast Guard has benefited from its incorporation into the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) because it is now better aligned with the other DHS agencies involved in the homeland security mission. The Coast Guard is focusing on four principal transformation areas: transforming authorities (i.e., working with the military and civilian authorities at both the domestic and international levels to help reconcile overlapping maritime jurisdictions and to establish/strengthen agreements related to mari-
time security); enhancing capabilities; improving capacity; and transforming partnerships with other federal agencies, state and local officials, and foreign governments.

- From an Air Force perspective the most significant lessons gleaned from military operations in Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq are: truly joint operations can produce tremendous transformational effects; the need for an expeditionary mindset (e.g., new Air Expeditionary Forces); the importance of compressing the “kill chain”; and the essential contribution of transformation in helping the services meet escalating demands on their assets. Military transformation involves both doing novel things and using newer and older capabilities in new ways.

- Transformation impacts the Navy in five fundamental areas: people, i.e., the human resources structure; force structure; organizations; the way we do things; and the joint operational concepts that will be required for the force needed in the twenty-first century. The Navy is able to deploy to the far corners of the earth unconstrained by issues of national sovereignty which provides national decision makers a broad range of options.

**Military Transformation: A Joint Staff Outlook**

There are many diverse but interrelated elements in transforming the U.S. military. Transformation is far more than simply changes in technology. Successful innovations typically entail changes in doctrine, organization, training, leadership, personnel, and facilities as well as material. Changes in culture or concepts are oftentimes the most important – and most difficult – elements of transformation to achieve.

One of the biggest challenges facing the U.S. military is the requirement to conduct current operations and transform simultaneously. Another key aspect of military transformation is the need to educate and train future U.S. military officers to command forces and capabilities in a new era. Military leaders must foster a climate in which innovation can flourish.
The final session examined coalition operations as a key component of U.S. military planning. It is an important topic because the technological and capability gap between the American and allied/coalition militaries continues to widen, jeopardizing interoperability even with our closest allies. As the U.S. armed services aggressively seek to transform for the future, we risk leaving our allies and potential partners behind. This session addressed several key areas of concern with regard to coalition planning including the lessons learned from coalition operations in Operation Iraqi Freedom, U.S. global posture changes and their impact on alliance relations, and priority mission areas for U.S.-Allied coalition planning.

Panelists shared the view that military transformation is a comprehensive process involving changes in military culture, concepts, and capabilities. They stressed that transformation has to occur in other militaries apart from the U.S. armed forces in order to minimize interoperability gaps. Transformation activities also have to encompass civilian agencies which have an essential role in post-conflict reconstruction. Although they recognized the challenges facing military coalitions and alliances, the panelists expressed confidence that such coalitions could continue to work together to promote international security even in an age of global terrorism. Closer cooperation among allies and coalition partners in this ongoing struggle will be essential to success in the global war against terror.

Further issues that emerged encompassed:

- U.S. Joint Forces Command plays a leading role in the military’s transformation efforts through developing joint concepts and experimentation, identifying joint requirements, advancing interoperability, conducting joint training, and providing ready forces and capabilities to the combatant commanders. For transformation to succeed, the armed forces have to move beyond the deconfliction and coordination of service efforts to true service integration.
Major lessons gleaned from Operation Iraqi Freedom include: the value of the close political understanding that existed between the United States and the United Kingdom; the need for combat agility and for early-on planning of the transition from the war to the postwar situation; the importance of media relations; the need to minimize both friendly and enemy casualties; and the requirement to design militaries with international cooperation in mind from the beginning.

A key transformation priority of Romania, as one of NATO’s newest members, is making its forces better able to participate in NATO-led operations and therefore capable of promoting international peace and security.

The Japanese self-defense forces are also transforming in significant ways, increasingly contributing to the maintenance of international security through participation in UN-led peacekeeping operations, and in partnership with the United States, to countering terrorism and WMD proliferation.

U.S. Central Command is developing a multinational headquarters to help plan the next phases of the global war on terrorism. Sustaining coalitions of the willing – as in the current global war on terrorism – requires flexible management and adaptability, dialogue, consultations, and mutual support among allies.
Dr. Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., President, the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, and Shelby Cullom Davis Professor of International Security Studies, The Fletcher School, Tufts University

Since the tragic events of September 11, 2001, the United States has fought two major combat operations, in Afghanistan and Iraq, as part of a larger and more protracted war against terrorism – the end of which is not yet in sight. This war will decisively shape our national security strategy for years to come.

- The United States faces major challenges as well as opportunities, as its plans for future security and military forces are transformed to meet the needs of the twenty-first century. We now have a better understanding and appreciation of the close relationship that exists between the need to eliminate terrorism by destroying terrorist bases and the consequences of terrorism.

It was with such considerations in mind that the topic and major issues that form the agenda for this conference were selected.

- We seek not only to address the important security issues of the day, but also to anticipate key trends that will shape the emerging security setting.
- Each of our conferences has been convened with appropriate official military and civilian co-sponsorship. We believe that such a partnership is essential to an examination of vitally important national security issues.
Therefore, we are honored to have the United States Navy and the Defense Threat Reduction Agency as official co-sponsors of this conference. In planning this meeting, we recognized that the issues of security planning and military transformation transcend, and indeed antedate, the tragic events of 9/11, and Operation Iraqi Freedom as well.

Transformation within our military is a continuing process, as well as a state of mind, that has no clear beginning, and certainly no discernible end. Our goal in this conference is to address the most important national security issues of the day and to look into the future, as we consider the major dimensions of, and the requirements for, security planning and military transformation in the dynamic world of the twenty-first century.

Specific conference sessions examine: the changing context of security planning; assuring, dissuading, and deterring twenty-first-century threats: operationalizing the new strategic triad; combatant command views on organizing and implementing national defense strategies; transformation for the new era: service perspectives; and, coalition operations and alliance transformation.

Vice Admiral Kevin P. Green, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Plans, Policy & Operations

The most important event of the last year clearly has been Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF). It is only fitting that the topic of this conference is “Security Planning and Military Transformation After Iraqi Freedom.”

However, that operation is far from over, and we must be particularly careful not to view OIF as the model for future conflicts, nor to take any of the lessons we may derive from it as necessarily definitive in the event of future conflicts, campaigns, or engagements.

As the recent terrorist bombings (November 2003) in Turkey and Saudi Arabia, along with the ongoing conflict in Afghanistan, make obvious, the larger global war on ter-
terrorism continues. Successfully fighting this war is the top priority of the secretary of defense.

- One of the more significant initiatives as part of the long-term struggle against terrorism and the threat of weapons of mass destruction is the Proliferation Security Initiative. The U.S. Navy is only beginning to grasp the maritime implications of this new Initiative.

There have been other major changes in the command structure of the U.S. military since the 2002 IFPA-Fletcher conference that merit discussion regarding their implications for U.S. security planning.

- For example, in October 2002, U.S. Northern Command began operations responsible for the homeland defense mission.
- In the same month, U.S. Space Command was merged into the U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM). In January 2003, STRATCOM was assigned the missions of global strike, integrated missile defense, Department of Defense information operations, and command, control, communications, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance.

The past year has also been important for the U.S. Navy. Several key developments occurred including the unveiling by Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Clark, of his vision for the Navy called Sea Power 21.

- Sea Power 21 envisions future sea-based operations that will exploit revolutionary information superiority and dispersed networked force capabilities to deliver unprecedented offensive and defensive power from the sea.
- In May 2003, the Navy formally unveiled the Fleet Response Plan, a radical change to the way it deploys, trains, and maintains its forces, in order to make the fleet more responsive.
· The demands of the global war on terrorism require an agile, flexible, and responsive fleet, one that can surge forces for rapid employment in times of crisis, just as the Navy did for OIF, while continuing to prepare for forward deployments in support of global presence requirements.

· As part of the Navy's new deployment architecture for its global concept of operations, the first expeditionary strike group (ESG) deployed in the summer of 2003. A second ESG is getting ready to deploy, and a third ESG will be commanded by a Marine Corps officer, the first time a Marine will be in command of a Navy combat force.
Session One

The Changing Context of Security Planning

MODERATOR
Dr. Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr.

PRESENTATIONS
Andrew Hoehn, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Strategy
Robert D. Kaplan, author and correspondent, The Atlantic Monthly
Dr. Paul Bracken, Professor of Management and Political Science, Yale University
Mansoor Ijaz, Chairman and Chief Investment Officer, Crescent Investment Management LLC
Dr. Hans Binnendijk, Director for the Center of Technology and National Security Policy, National Defense University

SUMMARY
Andrew Hoehn
The Department of Defense is involved in a host of issues related to transformation. It needs to be underscored that military transformation is not something that began two years ago after 9/11, but has been ongoing in the Defense Department for a long time.

· The results of transformation were clearly seen in Kosovo, in Afghanistan, and most recently, and dramatically, during OIF. The operations and responses of the U.S. military to a range of stressing challenges are increasing-
ly characterized by knowledge, speed, precision, surprise, and lethality. A key trend in these recent actions is small, or smaller, military units performing functions that were once the domain of much larger formations.

- Even with these advances and progress, transformation is still incomplete. To reap the real fruits of transformation, and to adjust to the circumstances of the new security environment, the United States must reassess the types, locations, numbers, and capabilities of our military forces worldwide. What is really needed is a transformation of our global military posture.

The U.S. global military posture is not what it should be. U.S. forces are operating in places and in ways that are still largely legacies of the Cold War. The U.S. force structure does not yet fully reflect the real challenges of today.

- For example, the United States retains vast concentrations of forces in Western Europe and Northeast Asia. This is not to say that these forces are irrelevant, but that they may not be configured, deployed, and operating in an optimum manner.

- In short, the current U.S. global force posture is not sufficiently agile, lean, and high-speed to cope with the challenges encompassing global terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), and rogue states where the fault lines of conflict are not necessarily at the borders of countries, but within societies themselves.

- The new U.S. global posture must reflect a fundamental shift in thinking about how military forces will operate in the future. Forces would no longer necessarily be expected to fight in place, i.e., where they are deployed. Rather, U.S. forces would deploy into areas that may be close or distant, which obviously places a premium on force projection and optimizing troop/equipment positioning.

When discussing options for a global posture, Defense Department planners also examine several additional elements.
The issue of footprint is important. This refers to the infrastructure abroad that the United States can access either for stationary forces, rotational forces, or for logistics and support. The footprint is the infrastructure, both in the United States and worldwide, that allows and provides support for U.S. operations. The presence of U.S. forces and capabilities is meant to provide reassurance to allies and partners, or to deter and/or dissuade adversaries who would challenge the United States, its allies, partners, and/or its interests.

Another component is the pre-positioning of equipment and supply. If, as discussed above, one assumes that in the future U.S. forces will not necessarily fight in place, then the location (pre-positioning) of equipment and supplies that can facilitate rapid, timely force movement to crisis areas will be critical to thinking about the positioning of U.S. forces worldwide.

Another element explored by defense planners is the idea that forces will be sourced globally, not just regionally. This notion reflects an essential change from the past when planners thought about forces that were assigned to, and largely remained with, regional commands. In the current environment, planners need to consider the assignment of forces globally and their movement to locations where and when needed. Related to this issue is the ability to surge forces in time of crisis.

In light of these factors, how might U.S. global posture change as we look to undertake this important element of transformation?

One necessary change, given the uncertainty and likelihood of rapidly developing crises, is that the United States needs to establish standing, joint command and control in forward areas with the associated intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) assets for both planning and operations.
In addition, forward forces need to be the early arriving forces: those forces that are utilized first in crisis need to be positioned so that they arrive when needed. This refers to forces not only outfitted with traditional capabilities, but also with emerging capabilities such as missile defense in order to survive in an environment that includes ballistic missile threats.

The United States will also need to position new capabilities – the cutting edge of its transformation – forward, so that U.S. allies and partners are able to view these systems, learn how they operate, and, hopefully, develop some of the same transforming capabilities.

The United States does not necessarily pre-position assets in anticipation of a particular contingency. What it might want to do, however, is to pre-position assets along major transportation routes to facilitate movement to the fight. Such an approach would require important changes in how U.S. forces are organized.

In terms of infrastructure, or footprint, less emphasis will be placed on large U.S. bases with stationed forces while increasingly greater urgency will be devoted to the development of smaller facilities and an austere infrastructure. The goal here is to provide flexibility to contend with the uncertainty that characterizes this environment.

A final, but extremely important, element is to give more attention to the surging of forces, including heavy ground reinforcements, from the United States to wherever they are needed.

President Bush recently made an announcement on the transformation of our global posture. In that statement, the president emphasized the need to discuss these issues with our allies and partners.

These discussions were initiated in December 2003 in Europe as part of the NATO ministerials. They will continue with allies and partners.

in Asia, the Middle East, and elsewhere in the upcoming weeks and months.

- This dialogue not only underscores the importance of transforming that U.S. global posture but it is also critical for helping to put U.S. alliances and partnerships on a viable path to meet the kind of challenges that will arise in the future.

**Robert D. Kaplan, author and correspondent, The Atlantic Monthly**

Al-Qaeda, the Taliban, Jemaah Islamiyah, and Abu Sayaf are terrorist groups that are part of a worldwide insurgency. It is similar to El Salvador in the 1980s but writ large. In essence, the United States is fighting a classic counterinsurgency, except that it spans the globe. To combat this worldwide counterinsurgency, the United States has more to learn from its experiences in El Salvador, the Philippines of 100 years ago, and Nicaragua in the nineteenth century, than it can from the two world wars, the Korean war, and the two Gulf wars.

- An insurgency is a dispersed battlefield, relatively empty of troops. Operation Iraqi Freedom was not that type of war. It was the shaping operation. The real war is taking place there now, and it is a small war. The Marine Corps Small War Manual of 1940 defines a small war as a situation where a military deploys with large numbers of infantry, the enemy disperses and disappears, regroups after several weeks in smaller numbers, and then conducts pinprick, hit-and-run attacks. A counterinsurgency means military operations never stop. No victories are declared. At the same time, diplomacy never stops either.

- Counterinsurgency means smaller and more far-reaching advanced operating bases and forward operating bases. When Washington speaks of combined arms, and jointness, what it often can mean is “pile-on.” For example, if there are U.S. operations in the Philippines being undertaken by Army Special

---

Operations Forces (SOF), the special forces of the other services are also likely to want a piece of the action.

- However, an instance of real combined operations is one where Air Force SOF are embedded in an Army SOF A-team. An even better illustration is in southern and eastern Afghanistan where a typical fire base is a mud-walled fort comprised of three or four Army SOF A-teams (approximately forty to fifty troops), a Navy SEAL team, personnel from other government agencies (e.g., the CIA, and DIA), with a civil affairs unit in the next mud fort. Combined operations should extend down to the unit level with different services operating together. It does not mean vertical pile-on.

- In certain circumstances, the use of relatively low-tech systems can be more effective in counterinsurgency operations. For example, U.S. non-commissioned officers (NCOs) in Afghanistan preferred the A-10 Warthog aircraft, first introduced in the 1970s, than more advanced aircraft because in encounters with the enemy in small numbers in mountain valleys, they believed that older and slower planes such as the A-10 are more effective for close air support.

Ultimately, an effective counterinsurgency means powering down to a flat hierarchy. Consequently, significant transformation can occur by cutting away vertical layers of micromanagement. The fewer instructions the better, and no instructions is optimal.

- The United States achieved highly successful transformation in late 2001 with the Fifth Special Forces Group based at Fort Campbell, Kentucky. Several A-teams, approximately eighty to ninety troops, were sent into Afghanistan from Uzbekistan and other places. They were preceded by a smaller number of CIA operatives. Each of these teams had embedded Air Force SOF and was given no specific instructions except to link up with the indigenous troops, in this case, the Northern Alliance and friendly Pushtuns in the south.
· Within six to eight weeks, these eighty troops essentially conquered Afghanistan. For all intents and purposes, the bureaucratic layers between the secretary of defense and the Fifth Special Forces Group had been removed. They were operating with near total autonomy.

The Marine Corps Small War Manual states that in a small war, written orders should be eliminated. To maximize efficiency, orders should be provided rapidly and verbally.

· Two years ago in the Afghanistan conflict, the approval of concepts of operations (CONOPs) was practically done away with, or at a minimum, granted within half-an-hour.

· Regrettably, it now takes seventy-two to ninety-six hours for CONOPs approval. The consequence in Afghanistan is that a number of targets are being hit four to five days later than they should be, resulting in squandered opportunities.

· After Afghanistan was conquered, the United States stood up the combined joint task force, with approximately 10,000 troops now deployed in Afghanistan. Almost half of these troops are located in Bagram or Kandahar with small numbers spread out in fire bases throughout Afghanistan. The opposite should be true. Bagram and Kandahar should have much smaller troop levels while we should proliferate the number of small fire bases in the rest of the country.

· This situation has recreated a vertical management of middle- and high-level officers at the major bases where, to the detriment of the overall mission, decision making and the approval of CONOPs have become far too time consuming. The troops at the fire bases should be conducting unconventional war, ranging from digging water wells, building schools, and conducting search missions for the remnants of Al-Qaeda and the Taliban with the indigenous groups inside the Pakistan border. For this last mission to succeed, however, the United States would need to
develop a diplomatic approach to gain the consent of the Pakistani government.

· Finally, a point about language skills and their role in counterinsurgency operations: two years into the war on terrorism, languages such as Pushtu (spoken by the Pushtuns in Afghanistan) and Urdu (the national language of Pakistan) should no longer be considered exotic languages in Washington. Yet, even the counterintelligence officers from Special Forces have not received adequate training in these languages and are forced to work through translators. The United States should be mass producing speakers with these capabilities.

There has been much discussion that the United States is engaging in imperial over-stretch with its operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, and the Philippines.

· However, imperial over-stretch really depends on the number of people involved in these places. U.S. troop deployments represent force multiplication, not imperial over-stretch. Today, one sees ten U.S. soldiers in one country, twenty in another, accomplishing truly remarkable things. And in fact, when we only have one or two major operations in a theater, it encourages Washington pile-on, because every service wants to participate in that operation.

· It stands to reason then that if the United States had more operations it would mean enough work for each of the military services which would result in much more efficient operations. So logically, the number of countries in which the United States is conducting operations has nothing to do with whether it is over-stretched or not. Neither does the gross number of troops in Afghanistan or Pakistan. As indicated earlier, what the United States needs is a few hundred more people at smaller and smaller bases in the hinterlands (i.e., a lean flat hierarchy versus vertical layers of micromanagement).
Dr. Paul Bracken, Professor of Management and Political Science, Yale University

An important field in economics and political science research at present is called behavioral economics. Games and related exercises in behavioral economics help demonstrate the salient factors concerning why people select particular strategies under certain conditions.

- Previous economic/political theory suggested that people choose strategies for an expected payoff, managed by the perceived risks. In fact, behavioral economics studies show that the main factor why people pick strategies is the context, not the payoffs.
- This fact has important implications for the development of all types of strategies, including security strategy.

Today’s overall security framework could be termed “the second nuclear age.” The first nuclear age was the Soviet/American competition during the Cold War.

- The second nuclear age is characterized by the proliferation of WMD to other powers. It is difficult to date when the second age actually began. However, when historians look back at the Cold War period, it will likely be diminished in importance while the spread of high technology systems to countries particularly in Asia will be considered one of the most important trends. There are several features that stand out regarding the second nuclear age. First, it has more players interacting. The first nuclear age was a two-player competition (France and the United Kingdom possessed nuclear weapons but few believe that their inventories really had a serious impact on either Soviet or U.S. strategic calculations). Today, however, a multiple player game exists where Israel, Pakistan, India, China, and North Korea also possess nuclear weapons.
- Game theorists believe that, because the complexities build up so much faster in a multiple-player game than in a two-player game, it becomes incredibly difficult to understand and control. In other words, even if all sides had per-
fect command and control, and perfect intelligence, the complexity would still overwhelm the decision-making system, which would not be the case in a two-player game. A simple way to think about this is if it is a two-player situation and both sides have WMD, you can launch them, or not launch them. Not firing them is better. It is called stable deterrence if both sides refrain from launching.

- However, in a three-player situation, if one side waits while the other two are firing at each other, it takes on the obvious, much more ominous interpretation that it is waiting to clean up as the first two sides kill each other off. So, one of the key features of the second nuclear age is an enormous increase in complexity for which the two-player standards of deterrence and escalation control are for the most part inadequate.

A second major difference between the two nuclear ages is that the nuclear weapons programs in many of these second-age nuclear countries are thoroughly related to their concept as a nation-state.

- For example, as outlined in Avner Cohen’s book,† from its origins as a state in the late 1940s, Israel had decided to go nuclear.

- There is probably a comparable impetus in other countries in Asia, as they try to transition from huge, post-colonial armies, to smaller, high-tech forces.

A third difference from the first nuclear age is that these second-age nuclear nations, apart from Israel, are generally poor.

- And, unlike the Soviet Union and the United States which could deploy expensive, robust conventional forces that acted as a shock absorber for escalation control, India, China, and Pakistan (and even Israel to a certain extent) are robbing their conventional forces to pay for these costly, higher-technology nuclear forces and delivery systems.

Moreover, these nations are not carefully thinking through the relationship of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons to their conventional posture.

A fourth feature of the second nuclear age could be termed “Asian roots.”

It is no coincidence that the nuclear-proliferating countries are primarily located in Asia. This introduces radically different personality types into a deterrent equation that U.S. and Western analysts do not understand well. It was generally very easy to comprehend the Soviet Union, because both superpowers came out of the Enlightenment tradition and were European-based. While both nations had a different view of mankind, the terms of the debate were common.

In the Asian states, however, there exists extreme nationalism from India to North Korea. In no crisis of the first nuclear age were there screaming mobs on the Mall in Washington or in Times Square, demanding that the president annihilate the Soviet Union. The prospect of nuclear war was considered appalling, to be avoided at nearly all costs. Sadly, it is not difficult to imagine mass mobs in India demanding the annihilation of Pakistan. This reflects a dynamic that did not exist in the U.S.-Soviet relationship.

A final feature is differences in historical timing. That is to say that there was no nation or international institution capable of preventing the United States and the Soviet Union from doing the things they did. Today the United States is the sole superpower. Consequently, before acting, nations as diverse as North Korea and Israel must think seriously about the consequences of what the United States is going to do in response.

Many nations, including India and North Korea, have developed their nuclear weapons programs almost as a type of stock market “call” option.
· That is to say, these states want to have the nuclear infrastructure in place, along with the requisite scientific personnel and knowledge, and sufficient technology, so that if the international security situation worsens, they can quickly execute the nuclear “call” option. It could be said that Japan also has a call option on a nuclear weapons program.

· What does behavioral economics indicate about the security environment when financial games are played with call options? In long periods of equilibrium, followed by sudden disequilibrium (i.e., when signs indicate that the security environment is changing), then countries can suddenly execute the “call” option and go nuclear. In addition, long periods of stability and good relations can disguise an inherent danger which has been institutionalized in the system simply by such nations possessing nuclear call options.

**Mansoor Ijaz, Chairman and Chief Investment Officer, Crescent Investment Management LLC**

The United States and the West may be two or three steps behind the thinking process of Islamist terrorist organizations throughout the world. Without a fundamental understanding of their mindset and worldview we cannot hope to develop effective strategies to combat them.

· Before 9/11, Al-Qaeda was a hardened, hierarchical organization. It had a very carefully defined leadership structure that was able to communicate through various channels and to utilize the international banking system to move financial resources from one part of the world to another.

· Following the overthrow of the Taliban and other successes in the war on terrorism, however, Al-Qaeda cannot be defined in the same way. Today, Al-Qaeda’s leadership could be viewed as a software overlay providing tactical support to its worldwide terrorist cells. They deliver financial support through the overlay, and, although not to the
extent one might expect, they also furnish instructions/guidance for various terrorist activities.

- After it was forced out of its safe haven in Afghanistan, Al-Qaeda flattened its organizational apparatus. Its previous hierarchical structure was largely shattered. To combat this new structure, the United States must shape its internal organizational structures in much the same way.

There are three major types of global terrorist activities today. Each has a different level of planning, a different timeframe over which that planning is completed, and a different type of thinking about how to achieve their particular objectives. Each of the three types of global terrorism activity seeks to undermine or destroy U.S./Western values and institutions.

- The first is *nuisance terrorism* which encompasses the types of acts that have taken place recently with the bombings in Iraq, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and Indonesia.
- The targets (sometimes soft, sometimes hard) are most frequently located in areas where the terrorists can operate with impunity or near impunity. The purpose of these attacks is to keep the U.S./West engaged, to ensure that all their military and intelligence assets, thinking processes, and political focus, are fully occupied and stressed. Normally, nuisance terrorism attacks take approximately one week to three months to plan and execute.
- The next type is *symbolic terrorism*. It should be noted that at times nuisance terrorism crosses over into the realm of symbolic terrorism. Nothing, however, has crossed over to the level of symbolism that was defined by the attacks against the United States on September 11. Those incidents were designed not only to kill people but, more importantly, to attack U.S. institutions and pillars that symbolically define Western society, power, and economic values.
- A second symbolic terrorist attack, the ricin poison network in London was fortunately uncovered and foiled in early 2003. Poorly planned and organized, the terrorist cell
linked to Al-Qaeda left numerous clues, including airplane tickets, fingerprints, and laptop computers that allowed authorities to unearth the entire network. Experts believe, however, that had the intended ricin attack succeeded, there would have been mass deaths resulting in a day of infamy similar to 9/11.

- Generally, it takes between one and two years of detailed planning to organize and carry out a symbolic attack. It also requires more substantial financial resources in order to maintain the cell structures for the lengthy planning period. The relatively free movement of individual cell members, normally necessary to conduct such an attack, also suggests that the terrorists have enjoyed state sponsorship somewhere along the way.

- The third, and most dangerous type threat, is structural terrorism. It is aimed squarely at dismantling or damaging significant segments of the global economy. Terrorist groups would prefer to conduct such attacks in the United States, in the United Kingdom, and in other major European countries where the terrorists currently have the weakest presence. Since 9/11, terrorists have had great difficulty conducting operations in these nations. However, the terrorists are now attempting to attack the West’s economy utilizing other tactics (more below).

- Planning for a structural attack requires two to five years. It entails much greater resources than nuisance and symbolic attacks. Because of the extensive planning period needed, we still have the opportunity to counteract this third type of threat. Successes at disrupting/dismantling terrorist funding resources since 9/11 have also given time to uncover structural attack schemes. The senior leadership of terrorist enterprises is now solely responsible for planning structural attacks. By and large, this leadership is no longer involved in the first and second category of attacks.
A couple of points need to be emphasized when discussing the terrorist mindset and their intellectual capabilities. The people planning these three types of acts, particularly the senior leadership responsible for masterminding structural terrorism, are extremely smart and innovative.

- They have figured out our way of life. They understand how our economies operate. And they have spent decades dismantling, unraveling, and getting educated inside our system. Therefore, we cannot underestimate the enemy or its capabilities. To do so would severely hurt us.
- Each of the individuals in the global terrorist enterprise has a “God complex.” Essentially, they believe that God anointed them as individual saviors of their distorted religious beliefs. This ideology/belief, coupled with their intelligence and knowledge of our vulnerabilities, makes the terrorists a formidable danger that we must not underestimate.

A specific maritime threat exists which could be exploited by the terrorist enterprise described above. There are five principal choke points consisting of the Panama Canal, the Suez Canal, the Strait of Hormuz, the Strait of Gibraltar, and the Strait of Malacca.

- Of these choke points, the Suez Canal and the Panama Canal represent the most difficult problems because they are defined channels through which only ships of a certain size can pass. The closure of one or both of these canals would create an economic crisis. To illustrate, approximately 80 percent of the six billion tons of globally traded cargo is transported by ship each year. Sixty percent of annual sea trade passes through one of these five choke points. Imagine if a terrorist group seized control of a liquefied petroleum gas tanker, or another type of large vessel, piloted it in or in close proximity to the Suez or Panama canals and blew it up. This is not a far-fetched proposition when one remembers that few considered the
possibility that terrorists would turn hijacked planes into flying missiles.

- Another plausible floating bomb scenario is a terrorist group acquiring uranium waste material from a state such as North Korea or Iran, or from sympathetic elements within the Pakistani government. Were this to occur, the terrorists would have the potential to create the world’s largest dirty bomb. If they sank the ship in or at key points near the two canals or in the proximity of a major port, the resulting psychological impact would produce calamitous economic implications including surging insurance rates, freight rates, and costly changes in the ways cargo is transported. If this event occurred, it would alter the entire dynamic of the global economy.

These scenarios are highly plausible. Indeed, there are indications that such events are actually being planned by terrorist groups.†

- What makes these maritime threats even more disturbing are several relatively recent episodes. For example, over the past year, on at least a half dozen occasions, people have boarded and taken control of tankers in Southeast Asian seas apparently to learn how to operate and pilot these ships. They have not looted or stolen anything from the tankers.

- In addition, tugboats have also been commandeered presumably for the purpose of learning how to move sizable ships, perhaps in a harbor or in some other location, to position a large ship/tanker to produce an optimal terrorist result.

- Finally, there are reports that individuals with deep-sea diving expertise were kidnapped from resort islands in Southeast Asia and forced to provide Abu Sayaff terrorists deep-sea diving instructions. The same reports state that these terrorists were only interested in learning how to descend, not the techniques.

for ascending and the associated decompression processes. This is ominously reminiscent of the 9/11 terrorists who purportedly told aircraft flight instructors they only wanted to learn how to fly a plane, not how to land. Descent-only deep sea divers could be intent on a suicidal mission to attach bombs to the underbellies of ships/tankers for detonation in strategic locations such as the Suez or Panama canals or in major harbors and ports. In addition, countless other maritime targets of opportunity exist for the terrorist enterprise.

- In the Gulf of Mexico off the Mississippi coast, there are approximately 750 billion cubic feet of gas reserves, and 160 billion barrels of oil. Blowing up just one of the well heads in any of the many oil installations located there would create an economic and environmental catastrophe.

How can the United States and the world community combat these types of threats? At least three possible approaches should be considered.

- First, we must use our substantial technology base and capabilities to focus on the global terrorist threat. Moreover, we need to share these technologies and systems with our allies in such a way that ensures they have the capacity to help us conduct the war on terrorism but does not compromise our national and economic security.

- The second approach is to create joint command and control structures in the front-line fields. U.S. intelligence officials need to become more aware of the maritime threats, monitor more closely the shipping industry, and infiltrate terrorist organizations, industries, and other venues in order to obtain firsthand, raw information that is more accurate, more timely, and better suited to counter terrorist plans.

Terrorists, when their plans are exposed, tend to discard that particular plot and move to another scheme. They cannot afford to allow any of their global cells to be compromised. This pattern reflects the fact that terrorist organizations are patient. They do
not necessarily think in terms of immediate results but instead in ten- to twenty-year timeframes. They seek to destroy our way of life and are not concerned about the time it takes. As long as this mindset persists, we cannot allow ourselves to think in terms of immediate results.

· Finally, the United States needs to bolster the language capabilities resident in its intelligence services and Special Operations Forces, with particular emphasis on Arabic, Urdu, Pushtu, Indonesian, and Tagalog.

Dr. Hans Binnendijk, Director for the Center of Technology and National Security Policy, National Defense University

Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom have clearly demonstrated the successes of U.S. military transformation, particularly at the high intensity level of conflict. However, the current situation in Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as in Kosovo, underscores the need for the United States to undertake another type of military transformation that deals with the requirements for post-conflict contingencies – what can be termed “stabilization and reconstruction.”

· In a traditional model of warfare, there is a planning phase and a fairly slow buildup of forces in theater. Once high intensity hostilities begin, there is a large in-theater force. Therefore, you have the time and people to provide a bridge to the next phase, which is nation-building.

· Due to the success of force transformation, today’s warfare model is generally characterized by more rapid planning, a speedy in-theater buildup, often with a smaller force compared to the traditional model. In addition, as demonstrated in both Iraq and Afghanistan, the high intensity portion of the conflict does not usually last as long. In this model, while there is an apparent military victory, there are also fewer forces in theater. In fact, the number of forces in theater during this phase is nowhere near the number required to carry out nation building. Consequently, one confronts a stabilization and reconstruction gap.
To rectify this problem the United States should seriously consider the establishment of a separate stabilization and reconstruction force (S&RF) that would not involve excessive layering or bureaucracy, but rather act as a force multiplier.

- The proposed S&RF would essentially allow for concurrent planning of both the warfare and S&R post-conflict phases. It would be deployed to theater either concurrently or shortly after the high intensity combat force.
- The S&RF needs to be ready immediately after the successful conclusion of the high intensity fight to serve as a link to the nation-building mission – a mostly civilian operation.

The U.S. experience shows that it is possible to have success in S&R operations across a number of different cultures and regions.

- Experience also indicates that since U.S. forces left Somalia in 1994, S&R operations are becoming both more frequent and more complicated. However, the lessons learned also indicate that success depends on several factors. First, and most importantly, the situation has to be stabilized. Forces cannot undertake significant reconstruction in an environment of ongoing low intensity conflict.
- Another important factor is the history and background of the country in question. While these factors cannot be controlled, their impact can be offset if the United States and its coalition partners put the requisite energy into the overall S&R effort. For example, U.S. experience shows that with adequate forces, funding, and the correct operational concepts, success can be achieved.

The S&RF would require some new operational concepts that reflect the necessity for a unity of effort and planning for the high intensity portion of the conflict and the ensuing S&R mission.
This did not happen in Iraq. Planning for the S&R effort began early in 2003, whereas preparations for military operations began well over a year prior to that. Consequently, the United States did not have in theater the types of forces needed to carry out the S&R mission effectively.

Moreover, America did not collaborate efficiently with indigenous forces. Certainly this was the case in Iraq, and to a large extent, in Afghanistan also. Thus we were unable to glean the kind of cultural intelligence to make the Iraqi S&R easier in the months immediately following the destruction of the Saddam Hussein regime.

A new capability to deal with some of these S&R issues in either one large- or two medium-sized post-conflict operations with a minimal degree of difficulty and with reasonable risk would require essentially an S&RF of two division equivalents.

While it would be preferable if both S&RF divisions were active duty forces, this is probably unlikely at present. More realistically, one S&RF division would be active duty, while the other would come from the reserve component.

Today, as stated earlier, the United States does S&R planning on an ad hoc basis late in the overall planning cycle. A more structured approach is needed, beginning with a standing headquarters, modular, scalable capabilities, and importantly, a force that is joint. In all likelihood, the Army would take the lead. The S&RF should also include a civilian component which has been, to a large degree, missing in Iraq.

The heart of the organizational structure for the two division equivalents are the following groups: military police, civil affairs, engineers, psychological operations, medical units, intelligence, and military intelligence. These groups would combine and train in advance, perhaps at the Joint Readiness Training Center, Fort Polk, Louisiana, with a different kind of a training operation than presently exists there. The goal is to create new synergies among these
groups. Civilian capabilities that need to be further developed could be pulled into these groups as necessary.

This proposal is not very radical. Looking at currently available forces, and comparing them to the proposed S&RF, much of this capability already exists in the Army, and to a lesser extent, in the other services.

- Creation of the S&RF would require some re-balancing both in civil affairs, a capability primarily resident in the reserves, as well as in the engineer corps. Some reorganization of the military police would also be needed, along with the development of some new capabilities, especially in the training and security systems support area.
- However, the main point is that this effort would revolve more around focusing, reorganizing, and re-balancing than around generating a range of new capabilities.
- One area of particular concern that needs heightened attention is the military’s lack of expertise – especially in language skills – in the Middle East region. For example, of the 1,000 or so foreign area officers (FAOs) that exist in the Army, less than 15 percent are Middle East experts. We still have a Cold War focus when it comes to these kinds of capabilities, which must change quickly.

To perform this mission effectively, the Army will have to alter its culture considerably. Basically, the Army does not envision itself performing S&R operations, and with some good reason, given the history of Somalia and Vietnam. However, in the current strategic environment it will have to adapt.

- This cultural change must originate from the top down. It has to come from the leadership and through professional military education.
- Six characteristics are particularly important to develop: vision of the politico-military environment; interactions with nonmilitary partners and building consensus; negotiations; broad intellectual background (e.g., sociology, law,
etc.); interpersonal skills; and understanding historical and cultural contexts.

There are a number of technologies that are available to enhance the capacity to conduct these kinds of operations.

- Civilian and military forces must be able to better communicate with one another. This difficulty is both a technological one and a cultural one: civilian and military components must utilize compatible and interoperable technologies and systems and they must realize they are part of a joint team that must work together. Biometrics, tagging, and non-lethal weapons are examples of technologies that can be used to enhance security.

- The use of civil infrastructure simulations that enable the S&RF to make judgments about the infrastructure in which it is working is also important. Finally simple items such as translation equipment would help to enhance human relations between the indigenous population and the S&RF.

Other requirements include the need to link the U.S. interagency structure together more closely as well as to harness the capabilities of the international community.

- The current U.S. interagency apparatus is not well equipped to deal with the S&R mission. Therefore, the United States should create a new interagency structure encompassing the formation of: a National Security Council-level National Interagency Coordination Group (NICG) to assure early S&R planning; Combatant Command Joint Interagency Coordinating Groups (J-10s) to interface with the NICG; new, deployable civilian S&R capabilities; and a civilian-military action cell to embed interagency-enhanced capabilities directly into the new S&RF. Various individuals in the interagency process need to be responsible for pieces of this effort.

- Finally, the international community has to be brought into this effort. That requires diplomacy as well as the identification of niche S&R capabilities that exist among...
our allies. NATO also needs to do more in this arena. The Alliance recently created a new NATO response force, but it should be augmented by creation of a NATO SR&F. Thus, as the United States develops and refines its S&R capability, the NATO allies can do the same thing.
Luncheon Address

The Honorable John R. Bolton
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Introduced by Dr. Charles M. Perry, Vice President and Director of Studies, the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis

SUMMARY

Progress by rogue states towards a nuclear weapons capability, while often slow and uncertain, concealed and camouflaged, must nonetheless engage American attention in a sustained and systematic fashion.

- Efforts to attain nuclear weapons, frequently undertaken in conjunction with ambitious ballistic missile programs, pose a direct and undeniable threat to the United States and its friends and allies around the world.
- Whether the nuclear capabilities of states such as North Korea, Iran, and others are threats today, or “only” threats “tomorrow,” there can be no dispute that our attention is required now before the threats become reality, and tens of thousands of innocent civilians, or more, are killed.

Our information about WMD programs in other countries is not perfect. No one is more aware of the uncertainties that we face than the senior American intelligence officials and policy makers who deal with these life-and-death issues.

- Some analysts have said that not finding WMD in Iraq – to date – proves that Saddam was not an imminent threat, and that our coalition military action was therefore not justified. These criticisms miss the mark that our concern was not the imminence of Saddam’s threat, but the very existence of his regime, given its heinous and undeniable
record, capabilities, intentions, and long-standing defiance of the international community.

- Given the right opportunity or incentive, Saddam could have easily transferred WMD capabilities to terrorist groups or others for their use against America, with potentially catastrophic results.
- While Saddam’s removal from power has unquestionably improved the international security situation, we face significant challenges in other parts of the world.
- Rogue states such as Iran, North Korea, Syria, Libya, and Cuba, whose pursuit of WMD makes them hostile to U.S. interests, will learn that their covert programs will not escape either detection or consequences.

While we will pursue diplomatic solutions whenever possible, the United States and its allies are also willing to employ more robust techniques, such as the interdiction and seizure of illicit goods, to meet our nonproliferation objectives.

- If rogue states are not willing to follow the logic of nonproliferation norms, they must be prepared to face the logic of adverse consequences. This is why the Bush Administration repeatedly cautions that no option is off the table.

Although it possesses biological, chemical, and missile programs, Iran has acknowledged that its nuclear weapons program has been underway for at least eighteen years in violation of its obligations under the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT).

- For nearly three years, U.S. strategy towards Iran has been to use bilateral and multilateral pressure to end its nuclear weapons program and to secure an international consensus against Tehran’s pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability.
· In what can only be an attempt to build a capacity to develop nuclear materials for nuclear weapons, Iran has enriched uranium with both centrifuges and lasers as well as produced and reprocessed plutonium.

· Iran attempted to cover its tracks by repeatedly, and over many years, failing to report its activities, and in many instances providing false declarations to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). For example, the IAEA director general reported that Iran conducted uranium enrichment experiments with centrifuges using uranium which Iran told the IAEA was “lost” due to its leaking valves. Moreover, Iran delayed IAEA inspectors until key facilities had been sanitized.

· On November 26, 2003, the IAEA Board of Governors unanimously adopted a resolution that “strongly deplors Iran’s past failures and breaches of its obligations to comply with the provisions of its Safeguards Agreement....” There was also unanimous agreement that “should any further serious Iranian failures come to light, the Board of Governors would meet immediately to consider...all options at its disposal, in accordance with the IAEA Statute and Iran’s Safeguards Agreement.”

· This decisive action followed successive reports by the IAEA’s director general, which established beyond doubt Iran’s multiple violations.

· While Iran has consistently denied any program to develop nuclear weapons, the IAEA has amassed copious and compelling evidence that makes this denial increasingly implausible.

· The United States believes that the long-standing, massive, and covert Iranian effort to acquire sensitive nuclear capabilities can only make sense if it is seen as part of a program to develop nuclear weapons.

· Iran is trying to legitimize as “peaceful and transparent” its pursuit of nuclear fuel cycle capabilities that would give it the ability to produce fissile material for nuclear weap-
ons. This includes uranium mining and extraction, uranium conversion and enrichment, reactor fuel fabrication, heavy water production, a heavy water reactor well-suited for plutonium production, and the “management” of spent fuel – a euphemism for reprocessing spent fuel to recover plutonium.

· The IAEA director general’s report confirms that Iran has been engaged in all of these activities over many years and that it deliberately and repeatedly lied to the IAEA about it.

The international community must decide how to react to the large number of serious violations to which Iran has admitted and whether Tehran is now in fact sincere about meeting existing NPT obligations.

· Iran has already indicated that it has mixed feelings about its obligations to adhere to the IAEA’s resolutions.

· Just recently, Hasan Rowhani, head of Iran’s Supreme National Security Council and the man who concluded the October 2003 deal in Tehran with the three European foreign ministers, gave Iran’s most recent interpretation of the IAEA’s actions. He said, “Our decision to suspend uranium enrichment is voluntary and temporary. Uranium enrichment is Iran’s natural right and [Iran] will reserve for itself this right... .There has been and there will be no question of a permanent suspension or halt at all.”

· Rowhani went on to say, “We want to control the whole fuel cycle. Since we are planning to build seven nuclear fuel plants in the future, we want to provide fuel for at least one of the plants ourselves.”

The IAEA’s November 26, 2003 resolution should leave no doubt that one more transgression by Iran will mean that the IAEA is obligated to report Iran’s noncompliance to the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations, in accordance with Article XII.C of the IAEA Statute.
· This Statute explicitly states that when non-compliance is found, the “Board shall report the non-compliance to all members and to the Security Council.”

· Iran’s Safeguards Agreement similarly provides that if the Board finds “the Agency is not able to verify there has been no diversion of nuclear material required to be safeguarded,” the Board may report to the Security Council.

· The real issue now is whether the Board of Governors will remain as united in its insistence that Iran’s pursuit of nuclear weapons is illegitimate or whether Iranian efforts to split the Board through economic incentives and aggressive propaganda will succeed.

· The United States will continue its efforts to prevent the transfer of sensitive nuclear and ballistic missile technology to Iran, from whatever source, and will monitor the situation with great care.

With regard to North Korea, President Bush’s objective is quite clear: the United States seeks the complete, verifiable, and irreversible dismantlement of North Korea’s nuclear weapons program.

· The United States seeks to bring this about through diplomatic dialogue in a multilateral framework, the so-called six-party talks, that include the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK), China, Russia, Japan, and the Republic of Korea (ROK), in addition to the United States itself.

· The North Korean nuclear program is not a bilateral issue between the United States and the DPRK. It is a profound challenge to regional stability and to the global nuclear nonproliferation regime.

· The United States looks forward to the earliest resumption of the next round of six-party talks. Secretary of State Colin Powell has repeatedly emphasized a special thanks to China for its efforts to encourage North Korea to come to the negotiating table.
· South Korea and Russia have both pressed the Bush Administration to consider offering some kind of formal security guarantee to North Korea to persuade it to reverse the decision to restart its nuclear weapons program.

· The United States is prepared, together with other participants in the talks, to provide a written document on security assurances to Pyongyang that the U.S. has no plans to attack North Korea.

· Such assurances can only be provided, however, in the context of agreement and implementation of an effective verification regime that would include assurances that North Korea will not reconstitute its nuclear weapons program. For the United States, irreversibility is a paramount goal.

· America is determined that bad behavior on the part of North Korea will not be rewarded. North Korea will not be given inducements to reverse actions it took in violation of its treaty commitments and other international obligations.

· Moreover, attempts to delay or postpone the six-party talks simply because one or more of the parties wishes to raise issues of vital concern should be rejected. Japan, for example, feels strongly that it should have the right to bring up the issue of North Korean abductions of Japanese citizens over the years. For Japan, this is a fundamental issue and its desire to broach it should be respected.

· Whether North Korea yet understands these fundamental precepts of American policy remains to be seen.

To roll back the proliferation activities of rogue states and to ensure that WMD and/or related technologies are not transferred to terrorist groups or their state sponsors, the United States employs a variety of diplomatic and other methods. One such example in creating a more robust approach to preventing the transfer of such devices is a new and promising U.S. effort called the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI).
· PSI was signed by President Bush on May 31, 2003, in Krakow, Poland. It was established in response to the growing challenge posed by the proliferation of WMD, their delivery systems, and related materials worldwide.

· PSI builds on existing nonproliferation efforts by the international community including existing treaties and regimes. It is consistent with and a step in the implementation of the UN Security Council Presidential Statement of January 1992, which asserts that the proliferation of WMD constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security, and underlines the need for UN member states to prevent proliferation.

· The PSI is also consistent with recent statements of the G-8 and the European Union emphasizing that more coherent and concerted efforts are needed to prevent the proliferation of WMD, their delivery systems, and related materials.

The United States and ten other close allies and friends created this initiative which seeks to combat proliferation by developing new means to disrupt WMD trafficking at sea, in the air, and on land.

· PSI membership includes Australia, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

· PSI participants, deeply concerned about this threat and the possibility that these items could fall into the hands of terrorists, are committed to working together to stop their flow to and from states and non-state actors.

· The PSI has been a fast-moving effort, reflecting the urgency attached to establishing a more coordinated and active basis to prevent proliferation.

To date, PSI participants have agreed on a series of ten sea-, air-, and ground-interdiction training exercises.

· Four have already taken place, and the remaining exercises will occur in the coming months. Australia conducted
the first exercise in October 2003 in the Coral Sea, involving both military and law enforcement assets.

· The United Kingdom hosted the first PSI air interception training session, a table-top exercise to explore operational issues arising from intercepting proliferation traffic in the air.

· In mid-October 2003, Spain hosted the second maritime exercise, this one in the western Mediterranean Sea.

· Finally, France recently hosted a third maritime exercise in the Mediterranean Sea.

· PSI nations have now trained for maritime interdictions in both the Mediterranean and the western Pacific Ocean, two areas that are particularly prone to proliferation trafficking.

As PSI moves forward, the United States expects that other countries will join in training exercises to enhance global capabilities to respond quickly when governments receive intelligence on proliferation shipments.

· President Bush has made clear that our long-term objective is to create a web of counterproliferation partnerships, making it far more difficult to proliferate WMD and missile-related technology.

PSI interdiction efforts rest on existing domestic and international authorities. The national legal authorities of each participating nation will allow us to act together in a flexible manner, ensuring actions are taken by the most robust authorities in any given case.

· By coordinating efforts with other countries, we draw upon an enhanced set of legal authorities for interdiction.

· At the December 2003 operational meeting, experts analyzed their legal authorities against real world scenarios and examined any gaps that need to be filled either through national legislation, policy change, or international actions.
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· Experts are also working to enhance the ability to share information with law enforcement and military operators in a timely and effective manner in order to increase the number of actual interdictions.

On September 4, 2003, the United States published the PSI “Statement of Interdiction Principles” and shared it with countries around the world. More than 50 countries have signaled that they support the PSI and are ready to participate in interdiction efforts. These Principles, created by the participants of PSI, call on all states concerned with the threat of WMD proliferation and its threat to international peace and security to join in similarly committing to:

· Undertake effective measures, either alone or in concert with other states, for interdicting the transfer or transport of WMD, their delivery systems, and related materials to and from states and non-state actors of proliferation concern.

· Adopt streamlined procedures for (1) rapidly exchanging relevant information concerning suspected proliferation activity; (2) protecting the confidential character of classified information provided by other states as part of this initiative; (3) dedicating appropriate resources and efforts to interdiction operations and capabilities; and (4) maximizing coordination among participants in interdiction efforts.

· Review and work to strengthen relevant national legal authorities where necessary to accomplish these objectives, together with international law and frameworks as appropriate to support these commitments.

· Take specific actions in support of interdiction efforts regarding cargoes of WMD, their delivery systems, or related materials, to the extent that their national legal authorities permit and are consistent with their obligations under international law.
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The strategic defenses of the United States are being reshaped to address the threats of the early twenty-first century. This panel attempts to connect threats and strategy given that they are directly linked.
An effective response to a threat requires a strategy. On the other hand, however, it is difficult to craft a strategy unless one has a good understanding of the threat.

The United States is in the midst of a transition, both in terms of the strategic threat environment and in our national security response to that environment.

Today’s strategic environment differs markedly from that which existed during the forty-plus years of the Cold War. The second half of the twentieth century was dominated by two superpowers, each leading a cadre of other states with shared interests.

- The breakup of the Soviet Union changed this picture dramatically. Democracy swept the nations of Eastern Europe and much of the rest of the world. Nations formerly part of the Soviet bloc are now members of NATO.
- Moreover, Russia is no longer considered a threat to the United States, and President Bush has announced deep reductions in the numbers of deployed nuclear weapons. Weapons, more than anything else, characterized the tensions of the Cold War.

The conclusion of the Cold War, however, did not usher in a time of global peace, prosperity, and cooperation. On the contrary, the global security environment has become more complex than it was during the second half of the twentieth century and arguably more complex than ever before.

- Communications and transportation technologies are improving and changing at an astonishing rate. Weapons of mass destruction have proliferated to new states while sub-state groups have expressed strong interest in acquiring them.
- Such developments mean that horrible events can happen quickly with little, or no, advance warning producing history-changing consequences. The United States no longer has the option to allow a threat to realize itself before preparing a response. As was clearly demonstrated on September 11, 2001, the rapidity with which a threat can be
actualized producing horrific consequences is far too great. Nor can America retreat behind its borders: 9/11 also eliminated that option.

To secure our future, it is vital that the United States develop, in cooperation with its allies and friends, a new global strategy designed to deter aggression, and if necessary, to defeat it.

- Over the past several years, the United States has begun to craft such an approach. The Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), released to Congress in 2002, is a critical document in this process, redefining the very character and nature of U.S. strategic forces.

- For example, strategic weapons are no longer defined simply as offensive nuclear attack systems. The U.S. strategic arsenal now embodies nuclear and non-nuclear weapons, precision global strike assets, ballistic and cruise missile defenses, and the requisite infrastructure and technology to support these assets.

- In the near future, transformation and technological advances will allow the United States to project warheads great distances with near-perfect accuracy. Indeed, targets that would have previously required a nuclear weapon to interdict will be put at risk by precision conventional weapons. If nuclear weapons are required, for example to destroy a reinforced underground bunker, their yields could be significantly lower than those in the current U.S. inventory because of the dramatic gains in lethality afforded by precision targeting.

- Operation Iraqi Freedom unmistakably confirmed the capacity of precision weapons to inflict devastating damage while minimizing collateral damage. In addition, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency has demonstrated the ability to provide new weapon systems in an expedited fashion (e.g., within 30 days to a year).
These advances in precision, and thus lethality, will not, as some critics claim, blur the distinction between conventional and nuclear weapons.

- The nuclear threshold should be heightened, not lowered, because it is in the interest of the United States to keep any conflict at the conventional, non-nuclear level, where the superior capabilities of America’s advanced technology can be brought to bear.

- It is not to the U.S. advantage to use nuclear weapons that can cause significant damage to its forces and interests. However, the United States needs to take a hard look at its nuclear force structure, which was designed for a set of conditions no longer extant, and determine what types of forces are required for the future.

Weapons technology is not enough, however. To hold a target at risk, one must first determine whether the target exists and then find it.

- Battlefield supremacy will be determined less by a weapon’s explosive force than by the quality of intelligence. If a target is located, the United States will have the capacity to destroy it.

Admiral James O. Ellis Jr., USN, Commander, U.S. Strategic Command

While mindful of previous deterrence successes, even when the scrutiny of the past coupled with the knowledge of the present casts a slight shadow over the clarity many felt classic deterrent theory provided, today the United States must turn its attention to the creation of deterrent concepts for a dramatically changed strategic environment. Current and future threats deserve the same attention to deterrence concepts and real capabilities as those of the Cold War decades.

- If strategic deterrence is defined as the prevention of an adversary’s aggression or coercion threatening U.S. vital interests and those of its allies and friends, then strategic deterrence convinces adversaries not to take radical courses of action by maintaining a decisive influence over their
decision making. Some pundits state the equation that deterrence equals capabilities, plus intent, plus perception.

- While both these descriptions embody elements of deterrent concepts, it really is not that simple. It is increasingly evident that a new, broader range of approaches and capabilities – e.g., worldwide situational awareness and the ability to strike an adversary quickly, anywhere on the planet – are needed if America is to have basic deterrence resources to meet the deterrence requirements for the tumultuous world of the early twenty-first century.

The new threats of the early twenty-first century can be deterred. General concepts of deterrence still apply, but the United States must fully define what new adversaries value or, stated differently, what outcome they hope to avoid at all costs.

- A new, more complete set of tools better suited to the task of deterrence is needed in this changed security setting. Traditional approaches to deterrence may not work against a terrorist seeking martyrdom, whose avowed tactics are hatred, mass destruction of property, and the targeting of innocents.

- The United States needs to think of deterrence in new, innovative ways to provide the president with a wider range of military deterrent options that transcend departmental or even governmental boundaries, and that bring to bear every element of national power.

- Our focus today is meeting new global challenges and aggressively incorporating deterrent capabilities now resident in our broadened command to protect the security of the United States, our forces around the world, and our friends and allies.

The U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM) supports deterrence through its cohesive package of both new and legacy missions. STRATCOM’s deterrent strength extends from the bottom of the ocean to the vast realm of space. However, its missions
and deterrent duties have expanded dramatically over the past fourteen months.

- STRATCOM and the U.S. Space Command were combined on October 1, 2002. In January 2003, President Bush added four previously unassigned mission areas to STRATCOM. These missions include global strike, integrating Department of Defense (DOD) information operations, global missile defense, and global command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance or C4ISR. Each of these missions has deterrent dimensions further highlighting the support STRATCOM provides to all the regional combatant commanders.

- We are beginning to reshape the nation’s deterrent paradigm by exploring options to deny terrorists and rogue states their objectives, and by examining issues encompassing their societal, religious, cultural, and/or personal perspectives. If potential adversaries are convinced that the United States has the capacity to deny their goals, we may be effective in deterring future threatening acts. We can also deter state sponsors of terrorism, particularly those who retain some rational beliefs.

- While the U.S. nuclear capability continues to serve as a valuable deterrent, it is also important to investigate the potential of existing and evolving conventional weapons, as well as kinetic and non-kinetic capabilities, for our global strike mission. STRATCOM is working closely with U.S. Special Operations Command (more below) to provide the regional combatant commanders with the means to strike an adversary anywhere on this planet.

Integrating DOD information operations (IO) is a new STRATCOM mission encompassing an array of deterrent capabilities. The IO mission includes everything from electronic warfare and military deception to psychological operations and operations security, even as it is commonly perceived as only incorporating computer network attack and computer network defense.
When one contemplates how pivotal IO systems are to every segment of society, one begins to appreciate the importance and scope of this mission area. The United States can theoretically deter an adversary who is not able to trust the security or accuracy of his own information systems. Our deterrent strategy must also integrate efforts to induce adversary restraint and credibly deny them benefits of pursuing actions harmful to the United States.

While our nuclear and global strike capabilities maintain the threat of overwhelming and decisive retaliation, we can utilize IO to influence an adversary who is not fully cognizant of what he is confronting. To illustrate, the United States can employ IO assets to improve an adversary's situational awareness allowing the enemy to better comprehend the deterrent capabilities arrayed against him and thus the futility of attempting certain hostile actions.

An adversary needs to appreciate the full range of resources, capabilities, and perhaps most importantly, the resolve possessed by the United States. In today's networked world, the synchronization of that effort on a global scale is essential, just as the potential of information operations in this deterrence role is enormous.

Deterrence is also at the core of STRATCOM’s global missile defense mission. The U.S. missile defense system is designed to convince an adversary it would be futile to launch a limited missile attack on the United States, its forces, or our allies.

The U.S. system is slated for initial operations in the December 2004 timeframe but will continue to evolve and improve. The initial ground-based missile defense interceptors will become operational at Fort Greeley, Alaska, and Vandenberg Air Force Base in California.

While the Missile Defense Agency is developing the system, STRATCOM and U.S. Northern Command (more in Session Three) will bring a warfighter focus to missile defense and actually make the system operational. The
two commands will tie the disparate missile defense elements into one smart, integrated system.

- President Bush has directed that missile defense be designed and organized with a global perspective. However, there is no single system capable of stopping every possible threat, and the solution is therefore termed “multidimensional defense.”

- In this regard, STRATCOM is also focusing on the integration of offensive and defensive assets. Coupling the new missile defense systems with existing and planned offensive capabilities will be an important STRATCOM contribution to deterrence. STRATCOM’s ability to strike rapidly will rely initially on bombers, the Tomahawk land attack missile, and evolving weapons systems such as the Trident nuclear-powered guided-missile submarines (SSGNs) equipped with conventional cruise missiles.

- In addition, new advanced conventional and IO tools will be incorporated into the inventory as developed.

Given that combatant commanders rely on increasingly sophisticated and integrated ISR, STRATCOM is charged with furnishing unprecedented situational awareness to provide U.S. fighting forces battlefield dominance.

- STRATCOM views ISR assets as a weapons system that not only informs and enables operations, but also possesses a unique deterrent value of its own. As indicated earlier, if a potential adversary knows he is being watched and understands that the United States has the capability to respond to any threat, it can be a great incentive to change behavior. This is true for both rogue states as well as for terrorist groups.

- Future systems such as space-based radar have the potential to provide levels of persistent ISR previously unimaginable. We must create mechanisms to share, analyze, and assimilate the collected intelligence. When the United States cannot target terrorists themselves, it can surely
endeavor to deter their actions through the states and organizations that support them.

The United States is planning to reduce its operational stockpile as directed by President Bush and outlined in the Nuclear Posture Review.

· Two years into the NPR, a strategic capabilities assessment has been initiated in the Office of the Secretary of Defense to evaluate progress and provide midcourse guidance regarding the nuclear stockpile. Moreover, in order to continue providing an effective deterrent, Congress recently allocated funding to study elements of the U.S. stockpile.

· Such efforts will help determine the size and character of the stockpile required to continue protecting America, its forces, and allies. A weapon is only a deterrent if it retains credibility. In that regard, the United States is also examining the deterrent value of nuclear and conventional niche weapons, such as nuclear earth “penetrators,” and an earth-penetrating, guided, conventional weapon, Big BLU.

Dr. J.D. Crouch, Professor, Department of Defense and Strategic Studies, Southwest Missouri State University, and former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy

The Nuclear Posture Review is an extremely important document albeit frequently misunderstood. The debate flowing from the NPR has been reduced to stale questions of deterrence versus war fighting, and “no first use” versus preemption. These were not, however, the principal ideas emanating from the NPR.

· The NPR stated that deterrence remains very important today but that it is also uncertain. Therefore, the United States requires a broader range of appropriate capabilities to deter an adversary. The U.S. strategic inventory must encompass conventional global strike capabilities, missile defense, information systems, including robust space-based assets, and an adequate nuclear stockpile in order to perform the missions needed for the future. In essence,
deterrence should not depend exclusively on nuclear weapons but rather a mix of conventional and nuclear assets, as well as offensive and defensive capabilities.

- In addition, the NPR declares that deterrence of conflict is not the only goal of the U.S. strategic arsenal: it should also assure allies and dissuade actual adversaries as well as potential competitors. Moreover, our strategic inventory must possess the capacity to defeat adversaries if deterrence should fail. While these goals are not especially new, the emphasis placed on them as force structure drivers in the NPR is indeed a departure from previous strategic postures.

- Crafting the appropriate strategic force mix will be a challenge. U.S. decision makers must define criteria beyond that which existed previously (principally damage expectancy from nuclear weapons) for strategic capability. In all likelihood, declaratory policy, where nuclear weapons are deployed, how visible they are, and the specific type of U.S. capabilities, may become far more significant than the actual quantity of nuclear weapons and damage expectancy estimates, although the numbers of nuclear weapons will continue to be important for assurance and dissuasion purposes.

How should U.S. decision makers approach the development of a strategic arsenal that is commensurate with the expanded deterrence requirements of the early twenty-first-century security setting?

- The fundamental questions posed during the Cold War remain relevant, i.e., whom are you trying to deter? Whom are you trying to dissuade? What specific actions are most worrisome? What are you attempting to accomplish?

- However, today U.S. decision makers must also address exactly what behavior is to be deterred, understanding that not every action is easily deterred or able to be deterred in a similar fashion. They must consider how various actors can be deterred across a variety of scenari-
The United States must, as a result, develop capabilities and combinations of capabilities that can be brought to bear and communicated to potential adversaries. Several critical questions revolve around what happens should deterrence fail, e.g., what are the responses, what capabilities can be marshaled?

- Moreover, as the United States moves forward, a deterrent posture based on denial may be more consistent with the kinds of regional contingencies that it will confront. In such circumstances there is a higher premium on enhancing and communicating U.S. credibility, particularly if we have initiated the conflict.

The differences between Cold War deterrence and today’s deterrence requirements must be assessed and clearly understood.

- During the Cold War the United States expended considerable intellectual effort trying to understand the Soviet Union, its motivations, goals, and values. A similar effort must be undertaken for current and anticipated U.S. adversaries. America must conduct a detailed analysis of these regimes and actors in order to determine how to deter specific actions.

- As already noted, reassurance of U.S. allies was a key component of Cold War deterrence. The U.S. approach included assurance and dissuasion, i.e., if the United States presented a credible deterrent, then allies would be assured, opponents dissuaded. In contrast, today a combination of several problems, including rogue states possessing WMD, terrorist and rogue state alliances, regional security problems that could develop quickly, unknown combinations of countries, either working together clandestinely or openly, and unforeseen crises, all place greater demands on our deterrence posture than was the case during the Cold War.

- Cold War deterrence was designed to prevent direct attacks, primarily with nuclear weapons, on the United States and U.S. allies by the Soviet Union. To a lesser
extent, America was also attempting to utilize nuclear weapons to deter attacks by the Soviet Union and its allies on other states. In effect, the U.S. deterrent sought to prevent particular Soviet actions, and if unsuccessful, to control escalation.

- Currently, the United States is still concerned about direct attacks on its territory, no longer from Russia but from terrorists and rogue states. This creates a situation that could be called reverse extended deterrence. In the future the United States could increasingly find itself in a situation where it is deterring WMD in the midst of defeating a nation while actually fighting on its territory, as was the case during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

- Finally, if deterrence fails, what are U.S. objectives? During the Cold War we sought to control escalation, to end the conflict as quickly as possible, and then to deter post-conflict threats. The current/projected security environment, however, may well include the use of chemical or biological weapons resulting in U.S. and/or allied casualties in the tens of thousands, possibly even hundreds of thousands.

- In such a circumstance, how can the United States deter the re-strike capability of potential opponents? How can deterrence be reestablished? And how does America respond both to assure allies and dissuade others from believing that the initial chemical/biological attack was an advantageous tactic? These questions need to be thought through in painstaking detail because our responses will have a substantial impact on casualty figures, postwar goals, and stability and reconstruction activities.

These factors have numerous implications for U.S. strategic forces and policies.

- The United States needs to devote heightened attention to the credibility of the U.S. strategic arsenal. In some cases this will entail greater visibility of certain strategic forces, while in others, more limited exposure. Capabilities must
be secure and safe from potential terrorist attacks and sabotage. In addition, we require an infrastructure that can tailor small capabilities in near-real time, which will enhance the ability of the United States both to dissuade adversaries and assure allies.

· U.S. declaratory policy should also be reconsidered especially with regard to potential WMD use by terrorists, as well as to the linkage between terrorists and rogue states. We need to recognize the enduring strengths of deterrence and its limitations. Finally, the United States should pursue multilateral approaches to missile defense, to offensive force suppression, and to consequence management.

Dr. William Schneider, Chairman, Defense Science Board
In assessing how best to modernize, reform, and transform U.S. strategic systems, it is instructive to reflect on the rationale and motivations underlying our existing strategic inventory in light of previous needs, in other words, how we evolved Cold War needs and subsequently created the present force structure.

· The Eisenhower Administration, like the current Bush Administration, confronted a fundamental shift in the threat that had previously existed. America’s World War II ally, the Soviet Union, had become a mortal adversary while at the same time, the technology environment in the 1950s changed dramatically.

· This decade also saw the widespread introduction of thermonuclear weapons, ballistic missiles, communication satellites, naval nuclear propulsion, and computation capabilities. During these years, the United States developed a refined appreciation of the mortal danger posed by Moscow and undertook a posture to deploy U.S. strategic nuclear forces against that threat. The posture adopted by the Eisenhower Administration became the basic approach followed throughout the Cold War.

In the post-Cold War period, the Bush Administration faced circumstances that were precisely the opposite. The United States
could not predict the shape of future threats with great certitude, and as a consequence, had to consider completely novel approaches to organizing military forces.

- This situation required a substantial change in the way in which we managed our strategic capabilities. U.S. strategic forces are no longer a force separate and apart, dedicated solely to the deterrence mission. Today, they are increasingly integrated with overall national security requirements, evolving toward much more coordinated operations. The notion of a “system of systems” is an appropriate term depicting the type of strategic force the United States needs to develop.

- The Defense Science Board has undertaken a study to ascertain the capabilities needed to meet current and future deterrence requirements, including how best to dissuade countries from acquiring WMD. To meet this goal, a much more integrated set of capabilities is required that includes an offensive and defensive system mix capable of long-range preemption (sometimes referred to as pre-boost interdiction), but also providing for interception in the boost, ascent, midcourse, and terminal phases.

- A dynamic C4ISR system is required to achieve such capabilities. Unlike during the Cold War, however, today the United States cannot optimize its forces against one overarching threat. Future capabilities have to be integrated in order to cover threats posed by several different possible adversaries.

The United States must develop enhanced capabilities in areas where it is deficient. This includes intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance.

- We will need persistent, global, and on-demand surveillance. In addition, the United States requires more than episodic reconnaissance that may miss critical data. For example, the U.S. must have a comprehensive and near-real time capacity for battle damage assessment (BDA) to manage the conflict environment more effectively.
The vulnerability of certain critical U.S. space systems such as the global positioning system (GPS) must be rectified. The communications system connecting these components must be extremely robust.

With regard to nuclear posture, a paradox exists because there is a reduced dependence on nuclear weapons for deterrence. The capabilities offered by nuclear weapons that are unique have a much narrower range of applicability today. U.S. nuclear posture and nuclear capabilities remain central to the effectiveness of this strategy.

Consequently, we have to explore new ways of modernizing our nuclear posture. The paradigm followed throughout much of the Cold War, represented by the incremental modernization of nuclear weapons coupled with increasing improvements in the accuracy of delivery systems, is giving way to a more nuanced strategy – a capabilities-based approach founded on the just-in-time development of nuclear weapons and delivery systems that meet specific operational requirements.

These would encompass interdiction of hardened, deeply buried targets in conjunction with other non-nuclear capabilities.

The issue of delivery systems is less urgent because of the longevity of assets such as bombers, submarines, and land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) as well as the concomitant ability to extract long-term economic value for the performance of strategic missions.

However, a capabilities-based approach means that the United States must develop an effective path to modernize its strategic platforms. It needs to emphasize the diversity of the platforms to conduct a variety of missions. For example, there may be circumstances where ICBMs might be called on to deliver non-nuclear payloads, and tactical platforms to carry nuclear payloads.
The ability to adapt U.S. strategic strike platforms for diverse missions is the key to modernization as well as to meeting the policy demands of the Nuclear Posture Review.

The prospects for reducing the impact of weapons of mass destruction on international politics are growing because of technological advances in a number of weapon areas.

- For example, significant improvements in component technologies for active defense, advanced conventional weapons, and nuclear systems are beginning to present real utility barriers to adversaries who may be attempting to acquire/develop WMD and/or their means of delivery.
- We could be on the verge of realizing what many had hoped for in the multilateral non-proliferation agreements concluded during the Cold War. What is different in the twenty-first-century environment, however, is that non-proliferation goals may be attained via a completely different path, and perhaps with a much higher probability of success.

Dr. Keith B. Payne, President, National Institute for Public Policy, and former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Forces Policy

The rise of hostile rogue states armed with weapons of mass destruction has eliminated most of the talk about a new world order and highlighted the continuing requirement for a capability to deter attacks. Indeed, in the emerging strategic environment, a single deterrence failure involving weapons of mass destruction could inflict casualties 1,000 times greater than those suffered on 9/11.

- The need for deterrence is obvious. However, the fundamental question for the second nuclear age is how to deter new and emerging threats. Some suggest that nuclear deterrence worked during the Cold War and remains valid today. While it is true that the basic mechanism of deterrence endures, i.e., making threats to control another’s
behavior without fighting, compared to the Cold War era, the deterrence goals of the United States are now quite different.

- What, who, and how we want to deter is different, as is the context within which the U.S. deterrent must operate. In this new environment, much of our Cold War thinking about deterrence now needs to be reconsidered.

An important starting point in any rethinking and reconsideration of deterrence is to recognize that Cold War notions about deterrence reflected specific Cold War conditions. They are not timeless truths.

- Unfortunately, perhaps, what we believed about deterrence in the Cold War is of questionable value now, because the specific details of time, place, culture, politics, leadership decision-making, and even leadership personality – the local conditions – can be decisive in determining if and how deterrence operates successfully.

- Because these local conditions typically differ so dramatically over time and place, an approach that was relevant against a past foe may be wholly ineffective against future adversaries. During the Cold War, the United States tended to assume that local conditions would favor the predictable functioning of deterrence, and that the lethality of the U.S. nuclear deterrent threat would neutralize the significance of any local conditions that might undermine deterrence.

- Confidence in nuclear deterrence was so high that many in the civilian leadership called it “existential deterrence.” Short of insanity, the “balance of terror,” it was believed, could not fail to deter.

However, the Cold War conditions that gave rise to such confident notions about deterrence have changed dramatically, and as a result of these changes, much of what was believed to be timeless about deterrence is now an anachronism.
The United States defined strategic deterrence during the Cold War largely in terms of the interaction between U.S. and Soviet nuclear forces. We believed the way to ensure a stable strategic deterrent relationship was to choreograph each superpower’s retaliatory nuclear capabilities to ensure mutual vulnerability, i.e., a secure balance of terror. This became the working definition of what constituted a stable strategic deterrence relationship.

Because we came to define strategic deterrence and stability largely in terms of nuclear forces, we generally debated which nuclear forces would ensure deterrence, not whether the nuclear force posture really determined stability, and how deterrence might function. Most experts shared the general belief that deterrence could be managed with great confidence by adjusting nuclear force postures. This belief was made possible by the assumption that the local conditions in the Soviet Union would be conducive to deterrence working reliably, or simply would be overshadowed by the lethality of the U.S. threat.

These local conditions have to do with time, place, culture, politics, and leadership decision-making. For deterrence to work predictably and consistently, it requires the presence of leaders (1) who understand and accept the U.S. deterrent threat; (2) who are capable of absorbing and assessing information about the external world in a manner sufficiently accurate to support reasonable cost/benefit calculations; (3) who are capable of linking means to ends in their decision making; i.e., conduct cost/benefit calculations, and understand when tradeoffs have to be made; (4) who are attentive to and understand the intentions, interests, commitments, and values of the opponent, and can communicate with each other; (5) whose cost/benefit calculations can be dominated by the deterrent threats that the United States can generate; and (6) who operate in a political system that allows individually rational cost/benefit
calculations to establish corresponding state policies that in turn determine their actual behavior.

In its approach to deterrence during the Cold War, the United States generally assumed that these six local conditions were present. However, these necessary conditions for deterrence to function predictably are hardly universal. Indeed, several are frequently absent in the midst of international crises.

- Their absence does not necessarily mean that deterrence will not function. It does mean that deterrence cannot operate predictably or reliably, as we had mainly assumed in the Cold War. There is no basis for assuming the presence of these necessary conditions in efforts to deter a range of present-day rogue states, nor can we be fully confident that the U.S. deterrent threat will be universally decisive in the decision-making of the willing martyr, the desperate gambler, the incommunicado, the ignorant, the self-destructive, the foolish, or those rogue leaders who are motivated by absolute and immaterial goals and who regard such sacrifice as the noblest of endeavors.

- At present, the United States is simply insufficiently familiar with the countless pertinent local conditions to make such simplifying assumptions with any confidence.

Nevertheless, highly confident generalizations about deterrence remain commonplace, including with respect to rogue states.

- For example, those who oppose deployment of U.S. ballistic missile defense typically insist that there is no need for it because deterrence will work. Others offer equally confident claims that the U.S. nuclear deterrent is no longer credible, and therefore we should step back from nuclear deterrence altogether. Such confident generalizations, in the absence of a close examination of local conditions, reflect no more than intuitive guesses, whether the assertion is that nuclear deterrence will indeed work, or that it surely will not.

- These claims are based on that old Cold War simplifying assumption that we can make confident predictions
about deterrence based simply on the character of the military threats involved. This is not true. The problem is that local conditions can be decisive in the functioning of deterrence, and unfortunately, we probably will not know in advance when those local conditions will be decisive, or how they may affect the functioning of deterrence.

The most vivid historical illustration of this problem is the exchange between Cuban and Soviet leaders during the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. Historical documents now available reveal that Fidel Castro and Che Guevara encouraged the Soviet leadership to start a nuclear war using the missiles stationed in Cuba with an apparent willingness to accept Cuban national martyrdom as an acceptable price for destroying capitalism. Soviet Vice Premier Mikoyan’s response to these demands offers an important lesson for thinking about deterrence in the post-Cold War period. He said: “We see your willingness to die beautifully, but we do not think it’s worth dying beautifully.” This example clearly exemplifies the extremely different calculations of a relatively cautious Soviet leadership and Cuban ideological zealots. Both may have been rational, but they had different priorities, and only one could be deterred. Luckily, in 1962 the Soviet leadership was in control of the networks. In the future, however, zealots willing to die beautifully may be in control of weapons of mass destruction.

This troubling anecdote underscores why deterrence needs to be modified to meet the demands of today’s security environment. Deterrence remains important, but as previous speakers have noted, its functioning is now uncertain to a degree that may not be acceptable, let alone predictable.

This conclusion carries a number of significant implications regarding how we should think about and prepare for deterrence. First, we should immediately challenge any force posture recommendations that come from a highly confident assertion about how deterrence will work. The United States needs to recognize that opponents will eval-
uate the credibility of our deterrent threats differently than it does.

- Perceptions of what is and is not credible, what is and is not a credible deterrent, are driven by culture, which in turn is determined by context or the local conditions. During the first Gulf War, for example, the United States attributed little credibility to its nuclear deterrent, but it was highly credible to Saddam Hussein, and so it worked.

- Second, America should stop defining the concept of deterrence stability in the narrow Cold War terms of mutual societal vulnerability, i.e., the balance of terror. In some cases, that Cold War approach may be viable. In other cases, it will be irrelevant while in others it may actually engender conflict. There are alternative approaches to deterrence and deterrence stability that may now serve U.S. and allied security interests far better.

- Third, we no longer have the luxury of calculating deterrence requirements by reference to a single opponent because we may need to deter across a wide spectrum of local conditions and contingencies. Key elements to crafting a robust U.S. deterrence policy will be flexibility, adaptability, and a broad range of deterrent threat options. In some cases, nonmilitary approaches to deterrence may work. In other instances, conventional force options may be adequate. In still others, nuclear deterrence may be necessary. Having such a variety of capabilities and threat options will not ensure deterrence, but it may help make certain that we possess the capability to tailor our deterrent threat across a diverse range of foes and contexts.

- Fourth, because the United States can no longer assume that deterrence will operate reliably, we no longer have the luxury of focusing so exclusively on deterrence to the detriment of broader force requirements. For example, we must not only seek to deter, but we must also prepare to limit damage (employing missile defenses and other measures) to our civil society, our forces, and our allies, in the
event that deterrence fails. Recognition of this require-
ment would be a dramatic departure from the U.S. Cold
War approach to deterrence where we sought to codify the
condition of mutual vulnerability.

· Finally, an effective deterrence policy will require under-
standing the local conditions for each potential opponent
before we can address the secondary question of how we
should attempt to deter them. In the absence of a compre-
hensive assessment of local conditions, little confidence
can be attributed to any assertion that a particular threat
option will or will not deter, or that a particular condition
will or will not be stable.

The Bush Administration’s Nuclear Posture Review was a sig-
nificant initial effort to take into account these various chang-
es in the strategic environment. This may be most obvious by
the subsequent presidential decision to integrate a broader range
of deterrent threat options, including nuclear and non-nuclear
options, as well as to deploy missile defense.

· Each of these initiatives is critical when deterrence is
important, but also uncertain. Our capabilities for deter-
rence will need to adapt over time, as circumstances and
local conditions change. The NPR was a major step for-
ward in this regard. It heralded a much needed and long
overdue shift away from our Cold War model toward a
much more adaptive approach to deterrence.

· A great deal of work remains in order to develop approach-
es to deterrence and new threat options that are better
suited to the emerging security environment. Cold War
deterrence matured over about a twenty-five-year period of
intense debate. Today, the United States is discarding the
debris of Cold War thought and developing a new deter-
rence paradigm. While the NPR represents a first-rate start
it is unlikely that the United States will have twenty-five
years to get it right this time. We need to move forward as
fast and as thoughtfully as possible.

day one
Session Three

Combatant Command Views on Organizing and Implementing National Defense Strategies

MODERATOR

Captain Peter M. Swartz, USN (Ret.), Director, Strategic and Operational History Studies, CNA Corporation Center for Strategic Studies

PRESENTATIONS

General James T. Hill, USA, Commander, U.S. Southern Command
Vice Admiral Eric T. Olson, USN, Deputy Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command
Lieutenant General Edward G. Anderson III, USA, Deputy Commander, U.S. Northern Command

SUMMARY

General James T. Hill, USA

U.S. Southern Command’s (SOUTHCOM) area of responsibility or AOR includes Latin America south of Mexico; the waters adjacent to Central and South America; the Caribbean Sea, its 12 island nations and European territories; the Gulf of Mexico; and a portion of the Atlantic Ocean. It encompasses 32 countries and covers about 15.6 million square miles. In many ways, SOUTHCOM is a model command for modest forward presence backed by forces based in the continental United States together with daily military-to-military contact.

- SOUTHCOM moved its headquarters from Panama to Miami in 1997. Along with the U.S. Navy, SOUTHCOM
is in the process of closing operations in Puerto Rico. SOUTHCOM’s Navy and Special Operation Forces components will move some time within the next year. SOUTHCOM’s three forward operating locations in El Salvador, Curacao, and Ecuador offer great flexibility to conduct its missions.

- Joint Task Force (JTF) Bravo, located in Honduras, will play a major role in SOUTHCOM’s transformation efforts. A regional training facility will be built at JTF Bravo to allow Central American countries to come together for training in one location.
- SOUTHCOM’s drug detection and monitoring flights, previously conducted from Panama, are now flown from Ecuador, El Salvador, and Aruba/Curacao. The United States has improved the airfields in these locations, making them better suited to the drug detection and monitoring mission.

SOUTHCOM has several key priorities, including:

- The war on terrorism and the Joint Task Force at Guantanamo in Cuba. The global war on terrorism (GWOT) requires that SOUTHCOM fully identify the threat in its AOR.
- Colombia, the Andean Ridge, and drug interdiction.
- The quality of life for SOUTHCOM personnel.
- Increasing the awareness and importance of SOUTHCOM’S AOR.
- The transformation process and the need to capitalize on DOD initiatives including the reorganization of internal SOUTHCOM headquarters.
- Expanded regionalization and cooperation that takes into account the fact that waging the campaign against a sophisticated transnational threat in ungoverned spaces in the region requires more than bilateral approaches.
And finally, SOUTHCOM has added other contingencies designed to look closely at several likely scenarios that could occur in the AOR.

Terrorism in SOUTHCOM’s AOR is the product of three primary groups:

• The first is the three narco-terrorist organizations in Colombia: the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), all cited on the State Department’s list of terrorist organizations. Another group, Shining Path (known in Spanish as Sendero Luminoso) in Peru, is attempting a comeback using the FARC/narcotics business model.

• The second comprises the Islamic radical groups, particularly the two largest groups: Hamas and Hezbollah. There is no evidence that they have conducted acts of terrorism in the AOR. However, their illicit activities, encompassing drug trafficking, smuggling of weapons and people, providing safe havens, money laundering and counterfeiting, and document forgeries, all serve to funnel cash back to the Middle East. Given that there are six million people of Middle Eastern origin in Latin America, Hamas and Hezbollah can easily blend into established and law abiding Middle Eastern populations.

• The third group consists primarily of gangs in ungoverned areas of the countryside or in some of the ungoverned parts of large cities. These gangs, all of which are in the drug business and are becoming strong and volatile, can shut down large parts of cities at will and are increasingly doing so.

Joint Interagency Task Force (JIATF) South is a national treasure.

• JIATF South is unique in that all aspects of our government, i.e., military, diplomatic, intelligence, law enforcement (to include partner nations), come together in one session three
area under the command of a Coast Guard two-star admiral in Key West, Florida.

- JIATF South collects, fuses, and analyzes intelligence, and then hands off the results to U.S. and partner nation law enforcement to intercept, arrest, and prosecute wrongdoers. In addition, it possesses the capabilities and assets to implement operations. JIATF South also works with the French and the Dutch in a counter-drug function. Increasingly, JIATF South is becoming a counter-illicit-trafficking and counterterrorism organization.

SOUTHCOM works very closely with other Combatant Commands. This includes, for example, coordinated planning with U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM) and the new U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM), two commands that border SOUTHCOM’s AOR.

- JIATF West carries out the drug operation on the Pacific coast. JIATF South, which used to be JIATF East, had responsibility for the Atlantic coast, but with today’s technology and capabilities, a single JIATF can manage the whole operation.

- The three involved commands produced an agreement that increased the joint operational area with SOUTHCOM, via JIATF South, taking the lead for the drug effort. This agreement is illustrative of an effective solution to cross-regional jurisdiction issues, or what has been called “sealing the seams.”

SOUTHCOM’s major effort in the war on terrorism is focused on Colombia. The conflict there is no longer simply about drugs, it is also about terrorism and the narco-terrorists who threaten both Colombia and the entire region. Colombian narco-terrorists have become a large drug cartel intent on taking power to further their own interests.

- With the aid of Plan Colombia, a six-year U.S. assistance package, new Colombian President Alvaro Uribe Velez and the Colombian military are gaining momentum against
the narco-terrorists. The military is professionalizing the force and becoming more joint. Moreover, the Colombian military is beginning to think for the long term and how it will sustain its fight against the drug lords.

- The fruits of these efforts are demonstrated in the number of FARC desertions, which total close to 3,000 this year. Coca plant eradication has also increased, which is beginning to produce a noticeable financial impact.

- SOUTHCOM has been granted expanded authority to use counter-narcotics funding to fight counterterrorism. However, SOUTHCOM is still encumbered by the caps placed on military and civilian personnel, limited to 400 of each category, permitted to conduct this mission. General Hill is attempting to increase the current personnel ceilings.

- The fight against narco-terrorism is not Colombia’s alone. It requires a regional approach (to include Ecuador, Peru, Brazil, Venezuela, and Panama) to combat the Colombian narco-terrorists who cross these nations’ borders almost at will. They must participate actively to stop the narco-terrorists on their side of the border as well.

- Continuous efforts and focused theater security cooperation today build the needed systems to bolster the collective security of the United States. In addition, this approach helps prevent failed states from becoming magnets for international terrorist organizations.

Joint Task Force at Guantanamo in Cuba is where detainees from the war in Afghanistan are held. Initially two joint task forces were formed, one for detention and one for interrogation.

- The two tasks forces lacked synergy. As a result, in November 2002, SOUTHCOM combined the task forces and brought in an Army two-star general and a permanent staff. The effect has been better intelligence. This intelligence, shared with the other combatant commands and U.S. national agencies, has averted terrorist attacks and led to several arrests.
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Finally, the questioning of detainees does not incorporate any type of torture or inhumane interrogation techniques. No detainees are being mistreated.

**Vice Admiral Eric T. Olson, USN, Deputy Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command**

In a sense, U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) is a geographic Combatant Command: its AOR being the planet Earth. SOCOM is responsible for filling the seams between the other combatant commands.

- SOCOM is a unique combatant command, established in a manner different from the other commands, with functions and responsibilities that were intentionally created as one of a kind. SOCOM has evolved from a field mission following the failed Desert One mission to rescue American hostages at the embassy in Teheran in 1980† with the other services involved, to the creation of Special Operations Command in 1987.

- The law creating SOCOM stated that special operations forces of each of the services would come under the combatant command of United States Special Operations Command.

- As a functional combatant commander, SOCOM is a provider of special operations forces to the geographic combatant commanders for employment under their operational control. However, the commander of SOCOM can be designated by the president or the secretary of defense to serve as an operational commander anywhere in the world.

- In addition, the SOCOM commander also functions like a service chief in that he has responsibilities for organizing, training, equipping, and deploying Special Forces. He is also charged with developing strategy, doctrine, and tactics for SOF and with ensuring interoperability across the joint† Desert One was thrown together using special operations elements of each of the services. However, they had not trained together, and when they were assembled for this operation they did so without completing even a full mission profile rehearsal. Many of the people involved in that mission met for the first time as they were preparing for Desert One.

† Desert One
special operations force, as well as between the SOF and the conventional service forces.

- He is also responsible for monitoring assignments and promotions, which means he has influence over the career paths of people assigned under the Special Operations Command. Finally, in a situation unique to this command, the SOCOM commander programs and budgets for special operations forces, develops and procures special operations force-peculiar equipment, material, supplies, and services, and has control over a separate force program budget line.

SOCOM has nine major mission areas, encompassing:

- Combating terrorism, which was one of its original missions; counter-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, added a few years ago; foreign internal defense, including the training of another nation’s forces to conduct its own operations; special reconnaissance; direct action; psychological operations; civil affairs; unconventional warfare; and information operations, another mission that was also added in the past five years. These mission areas are all important in the war against terrorism.

- Since its inception in 1987, SOCOM has in effect been preparing for the war against terrorism by focusing its energy, time, and intellectual and fiscal capital on those nine core mission areas. Consequently, SOCOM was ready to respond rapidly to the events of September, 2001.

In 2003, SOCOM was designated by the secretary of defense as the supported command to serve as the lead agent for planning the war against terrorism. Given that this war is truly global, it became clear that a single command was needed to transcend the boundaries of the global combatant commanders for campaign planning against an adversary whose presence and networks are worldwide.

- The nature of the adversary coupled with its early successes of SOCOM’s forces during Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) in Afghanistan made SOCOM the logical
choice as the lead planner for the war against terrorism as well as reinforced the fact that SOCOM was the supported commander for conducting and executing specific operations.

- In this regard, SOCOM’s mission statement now also stipulates that it “plans, directs, and executes special operations in the conduct of the war on terrorism, in order to disrupt, defeat, and destroy terrorist networks that threaten the United States, its citizens, and interests worldwide.” This is in addition to its existing mission to organize, equip, train, and deploy the force.

- SOCOM understands this new type of conflict. It recognizes that in an environment of asymmetrical threats, an asymmetrical counterforce is needed. SOCOM provides that force.

As a result of this new mission as the supported command, SOCOM undertook several organizational changes, most significantly establishing a new Center for Special Operations with a two-star director.

- The Center functions as a joint task force for planning the global war on terrorism within SOCOM headquarters. It has over 100 liaison officers from across the interagency arena to ensure that connections with the other involved agencies of government are seamless.

- The Center focuses on those adversaries that it can identify, thus enabling SOCOM to take the fight directly to that enemy.

As part of its changed responsibilities, SOCOM is focusing on transformation, particularly in the area of intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, and related pre-strike functions.

- Increasingly, it is very difficult to find the terrorist enemy but, when identified, relatively easy to interdict. This is a reversal from the past when, for example, it was a simple matter to locate a target such as a motorized rifle company but harder to destroy.
Consequently, SOCOM funding investments are migrating from the target prosecution/interdiction portion to the finding-the-target piece. Thus SOCOM’s transformation efforts are focused on developing improved intelligence and surveillance/reconnaissance capabilities as part of the global war against terrorism.

Although its main priority is the global war on terrorism, SOCOM retains responsibilities across the full spectrum of conflict.

- SOCOM assets remain a key element of each regional command’s theater engagement plans. Moreover, SOCOM continues to conduct other activities such as humanitarian de-mining and medical training.
- These activities, however, given the demands of the war against terrorism, are increasingly conducted by exception.

SOCOM is in a marathon moving at a pace it can sustain for the long term. Approximately one fourth to one third of SOCOM forces are deployed.

- The global combatant commanders would like to have more special operations forces available but there is a limited supply.
- It takes at least two and a half years for a sailor to become a Seal, a soldier a Green Beret, or an airman a combat controller in the special operations forces.

**Lieutenant General Edward G. Anderson III, USA, Deputy Commander, U.S. Northern Command**

U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM) is the newest regional combatant command with approximately 500 civil service employees and uniformed personnel representing all service branches. Headquartered at Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado Springs, Colorado, NORTHCOM became fully operational on September 11, 2003. It has two primary missions:

- First, homeland defense, specifically to conduct operations to deter, prevent, and defeat threats and aggression aimed at the United States, its territories, and interests within the assigned area of responsibility.
Second, in accordance with U.S. laws, and as directed by the president or secretary of defense, to provide military assistance to civil authorities (MACA) including consequence management operations. NORTHCOM military assistance would always be in support of a lead federal agency, such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Department of Homeland Security, or the Justice Department, never as the lead agency itself. Generally, an emergency must exceed the management capabilities of local, state, and federal agencies before NORTHCOM becomes involved. Because NORTHCOM has few permanent forces, additional assets would be assigned as necessary to execute specific missions.

NORTHCOM’s AOR encompasses the United States, the approaches to the United States including Canada to the north, Mexico to the south, and all maritime approaches. As a result its AOR boundary extends at least 500 miles from the U.S. shore, including part of the Caribbean. NORTHCOM’s AOR does not include Greenland, Hawaii (although it does support PACOM for the homeland defense of Hawaii), or Cuba. NORTHCOM’s area of interest is global because threats will originate outside NORTHCOM’s AOR.

Becoming fully operationally capable in September 2003 consumed much effort. NORTHCOM was directed by the secretary of defense and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs to achieve this status no later than October 1, 2003.

In retrospect, there were three capstone events that shaped how the command has emerged and enabled NORTHCOM to achieve full operational capability. Two of those events were planned, one unplanned. The first planned event was NORTHCOM’s initial operational capability that occurred on October 1, 2002, approximately eight
months after the decision to form Northern Command was announced. It was an intense effort that could not have been completed without the assistance and support of U.S. Joint Forces Command, the services, and the Joint Staff.

- The next planned event was an exercise called Determined Promise ’03, designed to test the command with multiple and simultaneous homeland defense and MACA events. The exercise gave NORTHCOM the ability to assess its readiness. It also allowed the new command to exercise for the first time with all of its partners in homeland defense and homeland security, specifically the Department of Homeland Security, the assistant secretary of defense for homeland defense, both of which became operational in March 2003. Determined Promise also afforded the valuable opportunity to work with state officials from Nevada, as well as with local officials at both the county and city level in Las Vegas.

- The third event, unplanned, was Operation Iraqi Freedom. NORTHCOM began preparing for it even before it was clear OIF would occur. It was obvious that there could be a threat to this nation once hostilities began. It forced NORTHCOM to become a battle staff organization. Even more importantly, however, OIF helped establish a mindset and a culture within the command that homeland defense was real and that NORTHCOM’s mission was vital.

The threat is real. Enemies exist with the intention to bring great harm to our institutions and people on the same, or even larger, scale than 9/11.

- These adversaries are intelligent, determined, and well financed. They must not be underestimated. In addition, time is not a concern to them. They are results-orientated and will take as long as needed to achieve their goals. Disturbingly, weapons of mass destruction are their preferred means. They may not possess WMD now but they covet them and are actively seeking their acquisition.
Consequently, it is imperative that NORTHCOM and its other homeland defense partners not let their guard down in carrying out the “deter and prevent” mission. This is the most important element of the homeland defense mission because if NORTHCOM can deter and prevent, then there is no need to defeat, even though it is prepared to defeat if and when required.

Having achieved an operational capacity, NORTHCOM is now attempting to refine many of its procedures for the new strategic environment.

- One effort is Operation Noble Eagle, which is the domestic portion of the global war on terrorism. NORTHCOM conducts this mission in conjunction with the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD), also located at Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado, which performs the air portion of Noble Eagle.
- NORTHCOM is also working with SOUTHCOM and the Joint Staff to address the maritime security issues. Quick reaction forces and ready reaction forces are identified and on a state of daily alert. These forces conduct exercises during deployments to a variety of locales. In addition, NORTHCOM established a futures group at Sandia National Laboratory that examines the future environment and emerging and likely threats, and identifies a full spectrum of possible technological solutions in order to remain ahead of potential adversaries.
- A key element of NORTHCOM’s current efforts is strengthening and exercising its relationships with homeland defense partners such as the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). To meet this objective, NORTHCOM, in conjunction with DHS, is in the initial stages of developing a national exercise plan that involves exercises similar to Operation Noble Eagle, to be conducted with numerous federal, state, and local agencies and officials.
NORTHCOM has established several priorities indicative of the diverse range of issues that the new command must address, including:

- Missile defense; maritime interdiction operations; CONPLAN 2002; organizational refinements; relationships with homeland defense and homeland security partners; total force integration; anti-terrorism/force protection; critical infrastructure protection; theater security cooperation; and, situational awareness improvements.

- In addition, NORTHCOM will be the operator of the new missile defense system for North America. It is working with U.S. Strategic Command and the Missile Defense Agency to make missile defense a reality.

NORTHCOM’s vision entails a layered and integrated defense across the full spectrum of domains – air, land, sea, and cyberspace – which will allow it to anticipate events and provide sustained, responsive, and seamless support for military assistance to civil authorities.

- A key challenge will be the capability to manage information and then to share it in a timely fashion with interagency partners. To implement its vision, NORTHCOM is attempting to transform the way it operates. It has established a combined intelligence fusion center that takes the products of collection agencies and fuses them into information and intelligence germane to NORTHCOM’s missions.

- Other changes include the creation of a Joint Force headquarters for Washington, D.C.; the evolution of Joint Task Force-6, a counter-narcotics group providing support to law enforcement agencies, into Joint Interagency Task Force (JIATF) North (along the lines described earlier by General Hill for JIATF South); and the establishment of a standing Joint Force headquarters.

- NORTHCOM believes that the reserve components should play a major role in homeland defense. Toward this end, it is participating in a study conducted by the assis-
tant secretary of defense for reserve affairs. It also has
commissioned its own independent effort, the Total Force
Integration Study, to examine various reserve options.

In the context of continental security, NORTHCOM is working
closely with Canada and Mexico.

· The United States has a very strong and long-standing
  relationship with Canada, in large measure because of
  its presence at NORAD. The U.S.-Canadian Bi-National
  Planning Group was created to go beyond the mission of
  NORAD, which is responsible only for aerospace defense,
  to incorporate land, maritime, and civil support. A deci-
  sion will be made in December 2004 whether to continue
  the Bi-National Planning Group.

· Consideration will also be given to the possible creation
  of a North American Defense Command that encompass-
  es the full spectrum of responsibilities, not just the aero-
  space mission. It is possible that Mexico could eventually
  become a partner in this endeavor.
Dinner Address

Congressman Curt Weldon, Vice Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, and Chairman, Tactical and Land Forces Subcommittee
Introduced by Dr. Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr.

SUMMARY
The focus of the IFPA-Fletcher Conference is transformation. In discussing transformation, it is necessary to have a Congressional perspective because Congress has played a key role in the process of military transformation by providing both critique and support. For example, many in Congress did not believe many of the key findings of National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) 9519 presented by the Central Intelligence Agency in December of 1995.

- Produced by the National Intelligence Council, NIEs are the chief means by which intelligence information is disseminated from intelligence services to the appropriate government officials. The Council reviews the reports of the intelligence community and outside organizations such as universities – and drafts them into a formal estimate. The Foreign Intelligence Board, composed of the heads of the various intelligence agencies, meets and reviews the document before it is given to the president and other top policymakers. In theory, that process should, but does not always, produce unbiased and accurate intelligence reports.

NIE 9519, entitled Emerging Missile Threats to North America During the Next 15 Years, provided estimates on the threat to the United States posed by foreign missile systems. The main judgments of national intelligence estimate 9519 were:

- No country will develop or otherwise acquire a ballistic missile in the next 15 years that could threaten the contiguous 48 states.
· North Korea is unlikely to obtain the technological capability in order to be able to develop a longer-range operational ICBM.

· American intelligence agencies are likely to detect an indigenous long-range ballistic missile program many years before deployment.

This analysis should have set off alarms bells in the Clinton Administration because implicit in the NIE was the omission of Hawaii and Alaska, thus suggesting that both were vulnerable to a missile strike.

· Furthermore, this intelligence estimate did not take into consideration the impact of proliferation of missile technology from Russia and elsewhere that would assist in the development of Iranian, North Korean, and Chinese next generation missile systems.

· The estimate was released to Congress by the CIA’s congressional affairs office during debate on the national defense authorization bill, which contained funding for ballistic missile defense research.

· The release of the document, clearly optimistic about the ballistic missile threat to the U.S., had obvious political advantages for the Clinton Administration. The estimate helped it stand solidly by its deployment plan for a national missile defense system, instead of supporting a more ambitious program sponsored by many in the Congress.

In an effort to obtain an untainted threat assessment, Congress included a provision in the 1997 Defense Authorization Act that established the Commission to Assess the Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States. This independent commission, composed of nine experts in the field of national security appointed by both the majority and minority leadership in Congress and reflecting a diverse set of views on strategic issues, was
given a wide scope and allowed unprecedented access to classified information from the intelligence community. The Rumsfeld Commission – as it is commonly referred to because it was chaired by Donald Rumsfeld – issued the unanimous findings of its members in both classified and unclassified reports to Congress in July 1998.

- The findings of the Commission’s report and implications for missile defenses reverberated throughout Congress and the U.S. national security community at the time.
- Donald Rumsfeld and I were able to convince Congress that the threat was going to be real much sooner than fifteen years from then, which was the initial estimate in the NIE.
- The vote for the HR-4 bill passed with 103 Democrats and all but 2 Republicans voting in favor of the bill. Therefore, in 1998 the Congress gave this country a veto-proof margin to move the country forward concerning missile defense.
- Fueled by the Rumsfeld Commission’s report, continued reports of proliferation, Chinese espionage efforts, and the North Korean launching of a missile that demonstrated a capability to strike U.S. cities, Congress again took up the missile defense debate. With the help of increasingly favorable public opinion, both the House and the Senate passed legislation making it the official policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense.

It was necessary to pass HR-4 when Congress did because Iran had by then already deployed the Shahab-3 system. The Shahab-4 was under development while the Shahab-5 was in the planning stage.

- The Shahab-3 is a single stage, intermediate range ballistic missile based on North Korea’s Nodong-1 surface-to-surface missile. It has a range of 1,300 km (780 miles) and can carry a warhead weighing up to up to 800 kg (1,760 lbs).
- Unlike its predecessor, the Shahab-4 is the product of exclusively Russian ballistic technology and can carry bio-
logical, chemical or nuclear warheads. Its ostensible purpose is to launch satellites into orbit.

Another example of Congress’ role in military transformation came in 1996 when the Pentagon objected to our idea to arm the Predator unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV). Congress was able attach a provision to the defense bill stipulating that an option to equip Predator with a missile was researched and developed.

- The Predator can observe enemies in high-risk areas without endangering an aircrew. They have been operational in Bosnia, flying over 600 missions in support of NATO, UN, and U.S. operations. Predators were also deployed in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.
- In 2001, in large part due to Congressional intervention, a Hellfire-C laser-guided missile fired from a Predator was successfully tested at Nellis air force base, Nevada. In November 2002, a Predator fired a Hellfire which destroyed a civilian vehicle carrying terrorists.

Congress is a staunch supporter of the U.S. military. Congress demonstrated this support during the 1990s when both Democrats and Republicans stood up to the Clinton Administration and provided the additional resources that U.S. warfighters needed to maintain the capability to address existing and likely threats facing America.

- Due to the continual decrease of resources and a dramatic increase in deployments through the 1990s, it was necessary to provide additional funds to the armed services.
- The U.S. military now has increased funding for family, housing, healthcare, environmental mitigation, and other quality of life items included in its annual budget.
- For example, $12 billion is being spent on environmental mitigation. This is money that is not going to be used for improvement of military systems or for modernization, but instead to clean up old military sites and to address other environmental concerns.
From 1991 to 2000, we had thirty-eight major military deployments around the world, and for only one, Desert Storm, were we able to get our allies to reimburse us for a large portion of the operation. In every other deployment, we put U.S. troops in harm’s way, and then Congress was left to find a way to pay the bill.

- In comparison, from the end of World War II until 1991, the United States had a total of 10 major deployments at home and abroad.
- Even though we were cutting defense budgets in the 1990s, we had to go through the appropriation process to find a way to raise more money to fund those added costs.
- To obtain this needed funding, reductions were applied to all Department of Defense operations and cuts were made in modernization and some programs were canceled.

Currently, Congress feels that the United States does not have a clear nuclear strategy. Despite agreement that nuclear weapons are still a major part of our military strategy and doctrine, no clear strategic plan has been presented that a majority of Congress can agree upon.

- For example, both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees could not reach consensus, as shown by the frequent one-vote margins, on whether or not we should deploy robust earth penetrators, or if we should do research on low yield nuclear weapons.
- Many members of Congress had no clear idea of how they should vote on these. As the current Vice Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, I had to cajole many of my own Republican colleagues to support the Bush Administration’s position.
- Regrettably, the administration did not do an effective job of articulating its nuclear strategy to the members of Congress.

As a result of the administration not clearly defining its nuclear strategy, Congress decided to invite the testimony of experienced experts and academics at hearings in order to make informed decisions on many critical nuclear policy questions.

dinner address
• Such former government, academic, and industry experts recommended that Congress create a Strategic Nuclear Commission to take a long-term look at the future of U.S national security. Specifically, the commission will analyze the role of nuclear weapons in the twenty-first century, assess if the U.S. needs smaller, tactical nuclear weapons, and determine whether research on low yield penetrators is needed.

• Such a commission would help Congress more fully understand what our nuclear posture is and what it should be.

Presently, the bulk of the weapons of mass destruction that both rogue states and terrorist organizations want to obtain are in Russia.

• Weapons of mass destruction ranging from chemical weapons to weapons grade plutonium were developed in bulk by the Soviet Union throughout the Cold War.

• Therefore, it is necessary for the United States to focus its attention on securing and/or destroying those weapons of mass destruction that still exist in Russia and which are loosely guarded and inadequately supervised.

In the period following the breakup of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1991, championed through Congress by Senators Nunn and Lugar, has achieved historical significance. However, improvements to the program are still needed.

• The act, renamed the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program in 1993, is designed to help the countries of the former Soviet Union destroy nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and their associated infrastructure, and to establish verifiable safeguards against the proliferation of those weapons.

• Since its inception, the program has substantially reduced the WMD threat by helping to provide a more accurate accounting of the numbers, types, and locations of Russian WMD.
However, we believe that Russia has not revealed the full extent of its chemical agent and weapon inventory, and that its declaration to the Chemical Weapons Convention is incomplete with respect to chemical weapons production, development facilities, and chemical agent and weapons stockpiles.

- There are a handful of WMD infrastructure sites that Russia will not allow the United States to visit and inspect.
- Gaining access to sites of concern is not only critical for the programs that have been identified. It also underscores the need for transparency that will define our relationship with Russia in the future.
- In addition, lax security at some WMD stockpile sites in Russia is of grave concern. For example, during the war in Chechnya, rebels demonstrated their ability to steal nuclear materials by placing radioactive cesium in Moscow’s Gorky Park.
- Hundreds of metric tons of plutonium and highly enriched uranium bomb-usable nuclear material are still inadequately protected in Russia and other former Soviet republics.
- Therefore, we must use the Cooperative Threat Reduction program more effectively to work with Russia and ensure the reduction and control of WMD.

We need a seamless intelligence system that allows us to access data and use it. Unfortunately, despite making progress, we are not there yet.

- In this regard, Congress has failed to act on critical data-mining and intelligence integration proposals. A government-wide data-mining agency, proposed two years ago as part of the fiscal 2001 Department of Defense budget, could have detected and helped to prevent the 9/11 attacks.
- The proposed agency, the National Operations and Analysis Hub, would have been responsible for supporting the intelligence community in developing threat profiles of terrorists and global hot spots.
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The plan had been to model the agency after the Army's Land Information Warfare Activity at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, which is credited with having one of the most effective operations for mining publicly available information in the intelligence community.

Unfortunately, Congress did not accept the legislation that would have created the National Operations and Analysis Hub.

It is essential that our military and public safety personnel have a wide band capability in order to ensure communication and the use of information technology during either combat or crisis management.

The Public Safety Wireless Advisory Committee recommended in 1995 that the 20 megahertz band be set aside for the military and public safety. Unfortunately, this recommendation was unheeded. Subsequently, additional wide band capability was given to the media industry instead of to the military or public safety personnel.

Although it was decided that additional megahertz capability should be set aside for the military and public safety sector, the amount agreed upon still did not meet their needs. Moreover, the agreed-upon megahertz capability still has not been actually provided to the military/public safety sector.

It is necessary to invest more money in transformation for new technologies, and to incorporate it rapidly. Increased funding must be allocated to the various government labs as well as to the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency to prepare for the future.

Many of the threats the United States envisages are going to require cutting-edge technology.

Congress wants to invest in these dynamic, high-payoff technology areas. Indeed, future military capabilities depend on a higher investment in science and technology funding.
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Security Planning and Transformation

Vice Admiral Arthur K. Cebrowski, USN (Ret.), Director, Office of Force Transformation
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SUMMARY

Three types of issues confront the Department of Defense as it seeks to transform the way it manages military operations.

· First, there are “issues of regret,” i.e., those issues that, if not pursued, could result in our feeling regret in the future.
· Second, there are questions relating to achieving a balanced force.
· Third, there are issues regarding what the future force will look like.

The most important issues of potential regret encompass the warfare elements of fire, maneuver, protection, command, control, communications, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (C3ISR), and logistics.

· With respect to fires, DOD wants to achieve transformational progress with non-lethal weapons, directed energy weapons, and redirected energy weapons.
· In the area of maneuver, we are exploring sea-basing, the vertical battlefield, lift, and operational maneuver.
· Regarding force protection, DOD is seeking to transform the way it deals with urban operations and battlefield medicine.

† With redirected energy weapons, an in-orbit relay system would be developed to redirect the initial directed-energy salvo, in effect allowing over-the-horizon targeting. Redirected energy weapons would serve as a shield against incoming ballistic rounds in the form of missiles and artillery.
In the C3ISR arena, DOD is analyzing how best to achieve joint interdependency as opposed to simply joint interoperability. We also seek to develop demand-centered intelligence and more responsive space weapon systems.

With respect to logistics, we want to move toward joint demand-centered logistics.

Drawing on insights from the corporate sector, the Office of Force Transformation envisages defense transformation as requiring many exploratory jumps that will help develop further DOD doctrine, organization, and systems. We also want to focus on a few areas that could result in significant changes in the management of future operations. Past examples of such changes include stealth, nuclear-armed ballistic missiles, and the Global Positioning System.

Candidates for future exploratory jumps encompass urban operations, lift for operational maneuver, and robotics.

Potential future high-payoff areas include demand-centered intelligence, directed energy weapons, and demand-centered joint logistics.

Achieving a total force balance requires that we understand that defense-related activities alone only partly ensure security.

Effective military operations are required to win the battle in combat operations.

Combat power and military intelligence will provide essential contributions to achieving such decisive operations.

Winning and maintaining the peace, however, requires that we develop effective alliances and other partnerships with friendly governments.

Social intelligence and other non-military elements of power play vital roles in achieving success in the political and strategic domains.

Our experience since the end of the Cold War shows that the U.S. strategic posture will involve exporting security to other regions. Most of these areas lie in parts of the world that have been the least integrated into the globalization process, i.e., in
those nations (especially in Africa and the Middle East) that have been unwilling or unable to participate in the globalization phenomenon. The most important top-level issues relating to the character of the future force lie in the realm of culture. What will be the values, beliefs, and attitudes of our future warriors and professional citizen soldiers?

- The warrior sees himself or herself as an enforcer who will project power on specific occasions to punish aggressors and achieve victories on the battlefield.
- The professional soldier considers his or her role to be that of “systems administrator.” The professional soldier exports security on a continuous basis to help prevent conflicts and provide the basis for political victories.
- Together, this combination of power and moral principle will produce favorable policy outcomes for the United States.

Successfully exporting security requires that Americans appreciate the value of engagement, the civil component of national security, and the valuable contributions of allied governments and international organizations to ensuring international peace and security. The essential question confronting the United States today is which policy choice to emphasize as we try to meet the rising demand for the export of U.S. security.

- As the number of military personnel participating in a conflict become smaller, the number of people involved in war increases. For example, when armies represent a smaller fraction of society, enemies target each other’s civilian populations.
- As the volume of data (especially electronic transmissions) that U.S. intelligence systems collect increases, the more important it becomes that we employ automated analysis, accept the
necessity of analytic triage, and that everyone becomes an analyst.

Operation Iraqi Freedom provides key insights into the future of warfare and the process of military transformation.

- The coalition advance to Baghdad went so rapidly that the communications links between the combat units and the rear supply points could not keep up. For example, requests for supplies did not always reach the depots in the rear.
- The coalition adapted to this challenge. At the theater level, the logisticians shifted to a “push” system. Using operational and intelligence data and other techniques, and working closely with both the J-3 staffs (Operations Directorate) and the J-4 staffs (Logistics Directorate), logisticians in effect “sensed” supply needs and responded accordingly.
- Estimates of supply needs were not completely accurate because of gaps and lags in information, and the resulting surpluses and shortages at the tactical level, forcing combat units to resort frequently to cannibalization and cross-unit supply in order to fill shortages.
- The overall effect was the emergence of a proto-sense and respond logistics capability (SRLC). This capability was unplanned, unsystematic, and of limited effectiveness, but it demonstrated that a more organized application of SRLC could work.
- A full-fledged SRLC is different at its core because it is not supply-centered but demand-centered. It focuses on the effect on the enemy that a military wants to achieve. It would be adaptive, position inventory dynamically, and use transportation flexibility and robust information technology to support distributed operations. Its primary characteristics would be speed and quality of effects rather than days of supply or flow time.
In the new security environment, understanding network relationships is critical.

- The frontiers of national security can be everywhere; they are not necessarily territorial borders but now can be the fault lines within societies.
- These new boundaries mean that intelligence constitutes the nexus of foreign and domestic security policy.
- We must be able to look and operate deeply within societies.
- There are no clear centers of gravity for military operations.

U.S. military officers increasingly appreciate the challenges of the new security environment.

- In a recent survey, numerous military officers stated their belief that attacks against computer networks will become a central feature of military operations within the next twenty years.
- They expect that attacks on computer networks will become as important as the delivery of munitions to military operations.
- They also anticipate that, within the next ten years, some adversaries likely will have the ability to use long-range precision strike weapons, such as ballistic and cruise missiles, to deny the United States the use of fixed military infrastructure such as ports, airfields, and logistical sites.

Clear trends have emerged in the contemporary security environment. These will dramatically affect the attributes necessary for victory.

- In the new era of globalization that began in the 1990s, the rules of competition have changed encompassing shorter cycle times and adaptive planning. Market opportunities have increased, new customer bases have emerged, and security involves much more than defense.
- In the information age that superceded the industrial age, cycle times have become shorter, new competencies have
replaced well-developed tools and processes, adaptive planning has become more important than deliberate planning, jointness requires true coherence rather than just deconfliction, and effective military operations demand true interdependence rather than tortured interoperability.

- The barriers to space launch are declining drastically thanks to advances in information technology and miniaturization. This trend has resulted in the increased use of microsatellites that are strategically and operationally responsive.
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SUMMARY
General Michael W. Hagee, USMC
A salient feature of the emerging strategic landscape is the arc of instability that runs from Central America through Africa to Asia.

· This area contains one-third of the world’s population, and its share is increasing. The nations in this arc are largely characterized by weak governments that cannot
meet their populations’ basic needs for sanitation, jobs, education, and water. The population is both young and alienated.

- These conditions create an environment conducive to the growth of radical ideologies.
- Both the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Marine Corps have an important role to play in this area because 80 percent of its population lies within 200 miles of the coastline.

The nature or essence of war has not changed. It is still characterized by uncertainty, danger, and deception. The manner in which we prosecute war has changed, however.

- The U.S. military confronts a lack of assured access in many regions where it may become involved in conflict. Not only can sovereign governments deny access to their territory or air space, but U.S. adversaries are also developing specific anti-access strategies.
- Moreover, the military confronts a world characterized by the proliferation of both weapons of mass destruction and inexpensive weapons.

However, the Marine Corps, and the other U.S. military services, will continue to manage these challenges successfully.

- The service chiefs have made it a priority to train and educate the individual marine, soldier, airman, or sailor. The most impressive transformation in the past fifty years was to transition from a conscripted to an all-volunteer force.
- The Marine Corps and the Navy are developing the concept of sea-basing to overcome the access problem. This will allow us to use the oceans and the seas as true maneuver space. We want the capability to assemble and integrate our forces, and commence military operations, without access to land bases.
- The sea-basing concept relies on continued transformation in four pillars: strike, defenses, logistics, and command and control. We want to be able to expand or contract all these elements at sea as the situation requires. These pil-
lars must also be joint. Every service must be able to plug into sea-basing. In addition, the pillars should be accessible to coalition forces. They will be useful at all levels of war, from high-end conflicts to security cooperation exercises.

**General Peter J. Schoomaker, USA, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army**

The U.S. Army, like the other military services, appreciates the continued significance of certain enduring realities. We must remember these as we transform the active and reserve forces. They include:

- The Soldier’s Creed remains relevant.
- The focal point of the Army is the individual soldier, not a platform or system.
- Working with our foreign counterparts remains important. After meeting with the army chiefs of seventy-one countries, they have all stated that they look to the U.S. Army as a model in one sense or another.
- The Army has been transforming itself – at different rates and at different times – throughout its history.
- Great uncertainties and ambiguities characterize our current strategic landscape.
- The military must remain relevant and ready.
- The institutional Army still provides the basis for generating the fighting force.

The Army has two essential core competencies. First, we must train and equip soldiers and develop leaders. Second, we must provide relevant and ready land power to the combatant commanders and the joint team. The Army also has sixteen focus areas. This list was derived from surveys, study, and discussion. These represent those areas that we must address in the

† *The Soldier’s Creed*

I am an American Soldier.
I am a Warrior and a member of a team. I serve the people of the United States and live the Army Values.
I will always place the mission first.
I will never accept defeat.
I will never quit.
I will never leave a fallen comrade.
I am disciplined, physically and mentally tough, trained and proficient in my warrior tasks and drills. I always maintain my arms, my equipment and myself.
I am an expert and I am a professional.
I stand ready to deploy, engage, and destroy the enemies of the United States of America in close combat.
I am a guardian of freedom and the American way of life.
I am an American Soldier.
near- to mid-term in order to sustain the Army transformation process and keep it ready and relevant.

· In the category of training and equipping soldiers and growing leaders, the focus areas are: the soldier; the “bench” (i.e., junior Army leaders); Army aviation; leader development and education; and combat training centers and battle command training programs.

· The focus areas in the area of providing relevant and ready land power to the combatant commander and the joint team are: current-to-future force (which includes the Stryker system – more below); the network; modularity; joint and expeditionary mindset; active/reserve component balance; force stabilization; and actionable intelligence.

· Under the final category of enabling the force, the focus areas include: installations as flagships; resource processes; strategic communications; and authorities, responsibilities, and accountability.

· The most important focus areas to the army’s transformation are: the joint and expeditionary mindset which requires us to become more agile; the active/reserve component balance which involves restructuring the components in light of evolving needs; and modularity which will reduce reliance on large corps and division structures and help us transition to structures based on brigade combat teams.

· The above list makes clear that military transformation involves more than just equipment. It also encompasses changes in doctrine, organization, training, leadership development, people, and facilities.

We are now an army at war. This situation requires us to fight and win with the current force. However, we also need to move toward the future force. The solution lies in spiraling the knowledge and capabilities that we are now developing into the future force, and at the same time, as we develop technologies and capabilities for the future, pulling them back sooner into our current
force. Instead of jumping to new capabilities with great leaps, we want to improve the force every day.

· This is what we are doing with such transformational developments as the **Stryker** system, which is a family of eight-wheel drive combat vehicles, transportable in a C-130 aircraft. The **Stryker** vehicle enables maneuver in close and urban terrain, provides protection in open terrain, and transports infantry quickly to critical battlefield positions.

· The **Stryker**’s innovation lies in more than just the vehicles. It concerns the whole construct, the entire organization.

· The **Stryker** is now entering the current force in Iraq, but it also will inform us as to what the Future Combat System should and will look like.

The evolving army transformation involves the development of fully networked battle command capabilities that will provide a bridge from the current to the future force and enable interdependent network-centric warfare.

· We want the Army to become increasingly integrated, expeditionary, networked, decentralized, adaptable, decision superior, and lethal.

· Consequently, the characteristics of Army transformation entail great improvements in the following areas: responsiveness, deployability, agility, versatility, lethality, survivability, and sustainability.

· The goal of the Army is to achieve fully the desired attributes of the future joint force.

As we restructure the active/reserve component mix, we are guided by a construct that links structure to strategy.

· Part of the army must be ready to fight every day. The bulk of the active component must be able to deploy within fifteen days.

---

† The Future Combat System (FCS) program will develop network centric concepts for a multi-mission combat system that will be overwhelmingly lethal, strategically deployable, self-sustaining and highly survivable through the use of networked manned and unmanned ground and air platforms, sensors, and weapon systems. This system of systems will be capable of adjusting to a changing set of missions, ranging from warfighting to peacekeeping. An FCS-equipped force will be capable of providing mobile-networked command, control, communication, and computer functionalities; autonomous robotic systems; precision direct and indirect fires; airborne and ground organic sensor platforms; and adverse-weather reconnaissance, surveillance, targeting and acquisition.
Part of the reserve component also needs to be extremely responsive to meet the homeland security and homeland defense requirements of the state and federal authorities. However, we need to minimize the requirement to mobilize reserve component elements for expeditionary operations.

The entire pyramid rests upon an institutional Army that generates all the things required to sustain an army: to develop leaders, to access assets, and to train and retain soldiers.

**Vice Admiral Thomas J. Barrett, USCG, Vice Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard**

It is important to understand the context in which transformation is occurring. We are in the midst of a global war on terrorism (GWOT).

- This war involves more than just the United States. Terrorism has manifested itself in many countries. Their governments confront the same challenges we do. This feature adds a critical international dimension to everything we do.
- Our adversaries are strategic actors and thinkers who are highly adaptable and can quickly shift their focus. We must be able to respond to these challenges.
- The threat is operating at multiple, interconnected levels. Terrorism, illegal migration, drug trafficking, and arms smuggling are connected or potentially connected to each other. People exploit these vectors, whether they are moving persons or weapons. If you can transport drugs, you can move other items too.
- From the perspective of the U.S. Coast Guard, many of the threats move through the commercial world, through global shipping.
- The interconnected nature of these threats means that you cannot segregate them into separate baskets that can
be managed independently. We must remain sensitive to the connections between them.

- Some issues that we consider lying outside these vectors could easily be swept into them. For example, the Coast Guard continues to worry about environmental disasters from the perspective of safety. We now must factor security and terrorism into our approach to environmental risk.

The Coast Guard has benefited from its incorporation into the Department of Homeland Security. It is now better aligned with the other agencies involved in our mission.

- When it was part of the Department of Transportation, the Coast Guard had approximately 40 percent alignment with other agencies within DOT.
- That alignment has probably risen to 60-70 percent within DHS given its intense focus on security.

The Coast Guard remains concerned with its traditional missions as it deepens and broadens its involvement in homeland security. For example, the Coast Guard participates in search-and-rescue operations around our coasts every day. Our objective remains putting an asset, whether a ship or airplane, on scene within two hours. We are now exploring how to leverage this unique capability for other missions. Obviously, in the post-9/11 environment, we need better visibility of what is moving on, over, and under the waters. The vast amount of commercial shipping moving into and out of our country creates a problem from a security perspective.

- We need better maritime domain awareness: we need to know what a ship is carrying, who is on it, point of origin, previous stopovers, and where it is going. In effect, we need to consider the creation of what Admiral Clark has appropriately called “a maritime NORAD.”
- Solving this problem will require enhanced international cooperation, particularly since most ships are foreign-flagged.
We also need to increase our operational presence and improve response capacity.

We need a stronger security regime that is international in character and reach and addresses such thorny issues as “flags of convenience.”

The Coast Guard has identified four “baskets,” or areas in which we are working transformation. The first basket involves transforming authorities. In this area, we are working aggressively at both the international and domestic levels.

- The Coast Guard blends military and civil authorities. At sea, there are overlapping jurisdictions, so you have to address the issue of international authority.
- In December 2002, the International Maritime Organization adopted the International Ship Port Security (ISPS) code, which strengthens the security regimes for shipping and port facilities.
- President Bush’s new Proliferation Security Initiative has resulted in agreements with other countries to take steps to limit the transportation of WMD and their related components at sea.
- Last year, the Congress passed the Maritime Transportation and Security Act that will more tightly regulate shipping and port facilities in this country. The Coast Guard is preparing to execute the act by next summer. If a ship does not comply with the ISPS code or U.S. laws, we will turn it away or delay its entry while we conduct additional investigations. This posture is significant: business depends on velocity; delays translate into significant costs.

The second transformation basket involves enhancing our capabilities, especially in the domain of situational awareness.

- As we recapitalize our ships and aircraft, we are improving our command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance systems. They are becoming more interoperable and more interconnected.
· We are also transforming the Coast Guard to become a full partner with the intelligence community. We want to provide the community whatever we can while leveraging the capabilities that intelligence brings to our missions. This is an ongoing effort. Operating jointly with the Navy at the Intelligence Coordination Center is one example of how we have improved our overall maritime awareness.

The third basket encompasses efforts to transform our capacity.
· All the services face this challenge. We can never “full up” all of our missions at the same time on the same day. We are a surge organization.
· We are constantly balancing the ability to accomplish our missions in the areas of counter-drugs, counter-terrorism, search and rescue, migrant interdiction, and other domains. Given the risks – the very high risks – of the war on terrorism, we need more capacity.
· Congress and the administration have been very supportive in helping the Coast Guard transform its ability to operate in the coastal zones. We are transforming our ability to operate in coastal zones with the addition of patrol boats and airborne assets.

The fourth basket involves transforming our partnerships, perhaps our most important objective since it could provide the most leverage.
· Traditionally, improving jointness means enhancing our inter-service interoperability. We have all made great strides in this area.
· However, in the GWOT, the definition of “joint” needs to extend beyond the domain of the military services to encompass improved partnerships with foreign governments, other U.S. government agencies, as well as with state and local authorities.
· These partnerships must expand beyond traditional missions to include cooperation against terrorism.
Lt. General Duncan J. McNabb, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Programs, U.S. Air Force

Recent combat operations in Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq have provided excellent laboratories for military learning. We can draw insightful lessons to help guide us as we reshape our forces during the upcoming Base Realignment and Closure process and the 2005 Quadrennial Defense Review. The services should work and learn together as we proceed with the transformation process. The first lesson from these recent campaigns is that truly joint operations can produce tremendous transformational effects.

- New joint concepts of operations allow us to work together in ways untried before.
- For example, in the race to Baghdad, the Marines, Army, and the Special Forces all depended on air power to an unprecedented degree. This cooperation included more than just direct strike capability. It also encompassed Air Force intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, logistics support, and secure space-based communications.

The second lesson is that we must have an expeditionary mindset. Although each service has accomplished remarkable successes in the past, we must get away from a Cold War mentality.

- The U.S. Air Force is becoming a truly expeditionary force centered on our new Air Expeditionary Forces (AEFs).
- These AEFs have created a sustainable rotation base for contingency operations and provided an essential surge capacity. In addition, they provide our troops with greater better predictability, thereby helping to promote retention.
- The Air Force does need to improve its ability to establish new, often very bare, bases to support the forward operations of joint force commanders. We recently established Exercise Eagle Flag at McGuire Air Force Base to examine what kinds of tailored packages would be required by joint task force commanders in future operations.
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The third lesson is the importance of “kill chain compression,” or reducing the time it takes to place bombs on targets.

- Kill chain compression produces dramatic effects. We need to make the decision cycles involved in targeting and weapons delivery much more rapid, thinking in terms of minutes rather than hours.
- Compressing the kill chain will require faster command and control processes and better infrastructure support, especially in the areas of space, intelligence, and communications.
- It also will require building confidence in one another. This trust can arise from both actual combat operations and from joint training and exercises.

The fourth lesson is that military transformation has tremendous budgetary implications. Transformation has increased demands on Air Force assets. Everybody wants more of what we can provide: joint enablers such as space-based assets, ISR, airlift, and tankers. Only continued transformation efforts will allow us to manage this growing demand.

- The Air Force must recapitalize its forces/assets given the chronic under-funding of the 1990s. The problem is that we need to recapitalize our foundation. We can no longer live off the legacy forces built during the Cold War.
- We also must cover the costs of sustaining these legacy assets as well as the increasing expense of providing for operations and maintenance of our aging aircraft.
- Unfortunately, the bill for this sustainment will occur at a time when the country will need to pay for the baby boomers who will begin to retire during the next decade.

Transformation involves utilizing new innovations and assets as well as using older assets in new ways.

- Past examples of ground-breaking technologies and systems include stealth and precision weapons.
- Examples of using old things in new ways include the use of precision weapons fired from B-52s and providing sup-
port for the Army, Marines, or Special Operations Forces with novel, innovative approaches.

Military transformation encompasses three components.

- The first component is technology. The combination of stealth, speed, and precision weapons has already demonstrated the revolutionary effects of new technology.

- The second element is the development of new concepts of operations. CONOPs need to be truly joint because everybody is transforming at the same time. Moreover, we will have to tolerate redundancies in some crucial areas.

- The final component is organization. The creation of the AEFs was essential for making USAF personnel more deployable, thereby developing a truly expeditionary Air Force. We will continue to refine the AEF concept, ensuring that airmen receive the appropriate equipment and training. We also must ensure that we adequately resource that equipment.

Finally, new blending relationships between the Air Guard, the Reserves, and the Active Force might be necessary to exploit fully our investments in transformation.

- The wide range of new missions and technologies means that everyone in the total force, even those based in the continental United States, can play a role.

Admiral Vernon E. Clark, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, U.S. Navy

Transformation affects the Navy in five fundamental areas: people, in a broader sense, the human resources structure; force structure; organizations; the way we do things; and the joint operational concepts that are going to be required for us to have the kind of force that is able to fight the right way in the twenty-first century.

In this uncertain world, military readiness becomes increasingly valuable. Operation Enduring Freedom required U.S. armed forces to rapidly surge to conduct operations in an unanticipat-
ed region against an unexpected foe. The Commander in Chief must always have robust military options.

- The September 11 terrorist attack compelled us to rethink the way we approach readiness. The Navy, for example, has developed the Fleet Response Plan that will provide as many as six carrier strike groups (CSGs) available to respond to a crisis or conflict within 30 days and two additional CSGs ready to respond shortly after that.

- Maintaining ready forces requires that the nation invest sufficiently in the military.

- The Navy had become too predictable. When a force becomes too predictable, adversaries can exploit that. Ready forces must be highly adaptable and capable of rapidly adjusting to meet rapidly changing threats.

- The first transformation that the Navy is working on now is how we create a ready force that is able to respond anytime and provide the Commander in Chief the kind of options that he needs.

OEF and OIF have underscored the power of joint operations.

- Joint operations give us the essential speed and agility to deploy and fight rapidly and effectively.

- For any new program, the first questions the Navy must ask are: can we get it to the fight and how quickly can we do so?

OEF and OIF also make clear that our force structure should be smaller, lighter, and more easily deployable.

- U.S. forces should have the smallest possible footprint.

- Flexibility and agility are essential attributes of modern military operations.

- Special Operations Forces, drawing on experience and training from
operations in Haiti, again proved their worth in OEF and OIF.

- OEF and OIF also illustrate the importance of precision fires. A significant challenge for the future is learning how to exploit and apply precision fires in a more effective manner. Investing in DD(X)† and the rail gun will revolutionize our capabilities in this area.
- We must make further progress in realizing a “pervasive awareness,” improved command and control, and “persistence.”
- Combat range translates into persistence. Joint Strike Fighter will revolutionize our capability in this area.

Issues of sovereignty will likely persist in the future. The Navy provides credible and persistent combat power, able to deploy to the far corners of the earth, anywhere, anytime, without a permission slip. The Navy provides the president a broad range of options not constrained by issues of national sovereignty.

- Understanding these issues of sovereignty will be critical as we develop the joint operational concepts and define the transformational force structure for the twenty-first century.
- Our task is to exploit all the utility that we can from the freedom of maneuver that we have operating from the maritime domain.

Our most important asymmetric advantage is the genius of our people.

- However, we are unnecessarily burdened with a cold-war human resources system – in both our military and the civilian communities.
- The Navy can get the job done with fewer people. Sixty-five percent of the Navy’s total obligated authority is spent paying salaries. If we do not transform the way we do things, we will not realize the capabil-

---

† DD(X) is the next-generation surface combatant ship being developed for the U.S. Navy that will harness the full power of twenty-first-century network and systems technology. It is the centerpiece of a family of ships that will operate within the construct of the Surface Combatant Navy to deliver a wide range of warfighting capabilities to maximize and revolutionize the combat capability of the Fleet.
ities of our future force. New technologies and organizations will also help reduce our manpower requirements.

- The Navy has taken steps to reduce personnel demands through pilot programs such as Sea Swap and Optimum Manning. The Navy will also need to develop a set of tools and incentives to compete in the marketplace for talent in the twenty-first century.

‡ The purpose of the Sea Swap program is to increase the time ships can remain on station during a period when Navy forces are stretched by growing operational requirements. By rotating three crews through a single ship, the ship can remain forward-deployed for eighteen months before returning to home port. By flying crews to the ship, the Navy can save weeks of transit time and millions of dollars in fuel. Optimum Manning is another pilot program that examines options for using technology to reduce crew size.
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SUMMARY

One of the biggest challenges facing the U.S. military today is that we need to conduct current operations and transform simultaneously. Achieving victory in the global war on terrorism will take a long time and require an approach that encompasses our military, political, and economic resources. This war is unlike any we have fought before because the enemy is unlike any we have fought previously.

- The enemy knows no borders.
- Our adversaries have no ambassadors at the United Nations.
- They have no regard for life, liberty, or anything else civilized nations value.

Transforming the armed forces is essential both to combat the terrorist threat and to prepare for unknown future challenges.

- We must create a climate for transformation to ensure that it occurs even at a time when we are so busy and focused on fighting a global war.
- We must encourage people to think innovatively.
- We must also inspire them to take risks to turn innovative, novel ideas into practical solutions, even if mistakes are sometimes made in the process.

Transformation involves harnessing technology, but it also entails providing new solutions and conducting business in new ways.

- The Army’s Stryker brigade is transformational not simply because of its new vehicles, but also because it represents
a novel way of organizing a brigade to take advantage of the new capacities for networking C4ISR.

- The Stryker brigade, like any transformational program, incorporates a whole spectrum of changes in the realms of doctrine, organization, training, material, leadership, personnel, and facilities (DOTMLPF). Although we tend to focus on the “M” – the material solutions, the technology – more transformation typically occurs in the other areas.

- Transformation requires hard intellectual work. Innovative ideas often do not require revolutionary new technologies.

- The disproportionately large benefits we have achieved with Dragon Eye, a small battery-power unmanned aerial vehicle, and the Joint Protection Enterprise Network, which facilitates real-time information sharing regarding security at military installations, illustrate the value of innovative approaches in the use of existing technologies.

- Transformation also has a cultural element. It requires an entirely new level of trust and cooperation among traditionally disparate organizations.

Operation Iraqi Freedom represented the first truly joint major combat operations. Interdependence characterized operations on the battlefield, both among the services and their capabilities.

- In Operation Desert Storm, we merely deconflicted the components by sector or altitude. Military operations in OIF, however, involved integration rather than just deconfliction.

- OIF also demonstrated the importance of enhanced joint warfighting involving not just the U.S. military, but also coalition partners and non-DOD agencies.

- Every U.S. government agency and department has a role to play in the GWOT.
Fostering a transformational mindset requires breaking smaller groups away from the larger organization.

- The Department of Defense has been able to exploit the insights generated by the federally funded research and development agencies, U.S. Joint Forces Command (JFCOM), and the various battle laboratories of the services.

- Experts in the services and the joint community are conducting ground-breaking experiments to generate transformational concepts and convert them into operational solutions for the warfighters. The creation of Standing Joint Force Headquarters constitutes one recent successful experiment. The objective of this transformation is to eliminate the time required to establish an ad hoc headquarters to respond to a contingency. The concept was successfully tested in Millennium Challenge 02, a major simulation exercise that focused on the military’s ability to conduct rapid decisive operations against a determined adversary.

- The last Unified Command Plan institutionalized the process of experimentation by assigning that role to the JFCOM. This command coordinates experiments designed to enhance joint warfighting with all the services, the other combatant commands, U.S. government agencies, and our allies.

We also need to transform the way we develop and educate our leaders.

- In the past, joint military education only involved a limited number of officers at the rank of major, lieutenant colonel or above.

- But the GWOT has seen senior non-commissioned officers or NCOs and junior officers from all the different services working together in unprecedented ways.
· For this reason, we are developing courses that will help people at this level understand the business of joint warfighting.

· We also need to expand the educational opportunities available to the vast majority of people in the National Guard or the Reserves. We have established a pilot program to do this.

· We also are changing the way we educate our senior officers.

Another element on our transformation agenda is to develop some joint operations concepts that would embody guiding principles for developing capabilities and concepts to meet the military challenges of the next two decades. We are still grappling with some major challenges that require further transformation efforts in other areas.

· We need to improve how we gather and share intelligence.

· We must strengthen our mobilization and deployment processes significantly.

· We also need to become more adept at integrating our interagency and coalition partners into our operations and plans.
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SUMMARY

Lieutenant General Robert W. Wagner, USA

The U.S. Department of Defense has established a clear set of ten priorities designed to promote military transformation. The U.S. Joint Forces Command has assumed a lead role in promoting the first four of these priorities. The ten priorities are:

- Successfully pursue the GWOT
- Strengthen combined/joint warfighting capabilities
- Transform the joint force
- Optimize intelligence capabilities
- Counter WMD proliferation
- Improve force manning
- Develop new concepts for global engagement
- Enhance homeland security
· Streamline DOD processes
· Reorganize DOD and the U.S. government to deal with pre-war opportunities and post-war responsibilities

JFCOM’s mission is to maximize future and present U.S. military capabilities by leading the transformation of joint forces through:
· Joint concept development and experimentation
· Identifying joint requirements
· Advancing interoperability
· Conducting joint training
· Providing ready continental U.S.-based forces and capabilities to support the combatant commands.

Military transformation is comprehensive. It concerns both culture and product.
· Military transformation involves changing the nature of military competition and cooperation through new combinations of concepts, capabilities, and organizations.
· It includes a range of issues ranging from developing new high-tech weapons, to changing the way we organize, train, exercise, and fight, to thinking about new partnerships in a complex world.
· It also involves all defense-related organizations and functions, including the military, other government agencies, and foreign countries.
· Transformation incorporates changes in doctrine, training, resources, employment, and lessons learned.
· We want to develop a full-spectrum, capabilities-based joint force. We must proceed from service deconfliction and service coordination to service integration.

A comparison of Operation Iraqi Freedom with Operation Desert Storm high-
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lights the changing nature of warfare. OIF was characterized by fewer land and air forces, the extensive use of Special Operations Forces, the first use of a land component commander, a robust collaborative planning effort, greater maneuver distances, fewer Iraqi missile launches, fewer oil wells set ablaze, fewer munitions used, and reduced costs. The reasons for these differences include:

· Our twelve-year experiences with Northern and Southern Watch in Iraq.
· The experience gained and the lessons learned during Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan.
· The existence of established land, sea, air, and SOF components, as well as the prior creation of a Joint Task Force headquarters and command-and-control facilities.
· The extensive prepositioning of military stocks on land and at sea.
· The $48 billion spent on lift improvements.
· The availability of greater bandwidth capability.
· Conducting numerous mission rehearsal exercises.
· Our overmatching power, including air and sea supremacy, precision fires, and our speed and depth of maneuver.

A closer examination of OIF reveals key lessons about U.S. military capabilities.

· Some capabilities reached new levels of performance, and need to be sustained and improved. These capabilities demonstrated joint integration and joint force synergy and included adaptive planning, and SOF-conventional force integration.
· Some capabilities demonstrated considerable effectiveness, but need enhancement. These capabilities were urban operations, information operations, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance.
· Some capabilities fell short of expectations or needs, and must be improved through new initiatives. These include battle damage assessment, fratricide prevention, deploy-
ment planning and execution, reserve mobilization, and coalition information sharing.

JFCOM is working closely with NATO as the Alliance pursues its own military transformation efforts.

- The commander of JFCOM, is dual-hatted as head of Allied Command Transformation (ACT).
- In the near term, JFCOM is sharing its joint force training model and lessons learned with NATO. It is also assisting with training the NATO Response Force and with multinational concept development and experimentation.
- Over the long term, JFCOM plans to help NATO: transform its military capabilities; prepare, support and sustain Alliance operations; implement the NATO Response Force and other deployable capabilities; achieve ACT full operational capability; and transform the military capabilities of partner nations.

Transformation is essential because the nature of the threat is changing. Our adversaries will fight by any means, seek to deceive us, exploit opportunities, and become increasingly adaptable and agile.

- To meet this challenge, JFCOM plans to deliver rapid prototyping of new military capabilities to improve joint warfighting.
- It also aims to provide actionable recommendations from experimentation results to senior leaders to help develop options for future force investments.
- JFCOM will collaborate on its two primary activities, concept development and experimentation, with the combatant commands, the services, the defense agencies, and America’s multinational partners.
- JFCOM’s area of responsibility is not a geographic or functional area: it is the future.
Tony Brenton, Deputy Head of Mission, British Embassy, Washington, D.C.

We learned seven lessons from our experience in Operation Iraqi Freedom, several of which also pertain to Operation Enduring Freedom.

· The first lesson is the value of the close political understanding that existed between the United States and the United Kingdom in the months before OIF. This understanding helped us manage the great planning uncertainties, in terms of timing and allies, which existed prior to the commencement of military operations in Iraq.

· The second lesson is the importance of the long history of military cooperation that has developed between the United States and the United Kingdom. The British and American militaries are probably as close as any two militaries in the world in terms of doctrine, operational experience, equipment, and other attributes. We also benefited from our shared cooperation in enforcing the no-fly zones over Iraq and the maritime sanctions in the Persian Gulf, as well as from our combined military operations in Afghanistan. Cooperating in these operations meant that our forces were intimately acquainted with each other and could more easily transition towards an offensive posture in Iraq.

· The third lesson is the need for military agility. Until the last week before the commencement of OIF, we had expected the war to come from a completely different direction. We had anticipated Turkey’s involvement in some capacity, and had expected we could operate primarily from the north rather than the south of Iraq. At a very late stage, we had to shift the whole operation around.

· The fourth conclusion is the importance of handling the media. The system of embedded journalists worked well in OIF. It enhanced our ability to convince the media and the public that the military campaign was succeeding.
My fifth conclusion, which also applies to OEF, is the necessity, from the point of view of avoiding a political backlash, of showing that we were not inflicting arbitrary and unnecessary civilian casualties. It is also essential not to appear to be too brutal in inflicting casualties on the enemy’s military personnel. In short, the killing has to be kept to the absolute minimum.

The sixth lesson concerns the issue of losses from so-called “friendly fire” or “blue-on-blue” incidents. Many such incidents occurred early in the campaign. They were particularly visible because the Iraqi military was rather invisible. Admittedly, they are hard to avoid, but we should continue to examine systems and procedures to minimize them in the future.

The final lesson is the importance of planning for the transition from the war to the postwar situation. Both OIF and OEF highlight the need for the military to have good links with civilian agencies as well as with international bodies and nongovernmental organizations.

I would also draw three more comprehensive lessons about helpful steps to enable coalitions like ours to work in the future.

The first global conclusion is the importance of military transformation. In many respects, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq represent the types of future conflicts in which we are most likely to engage. They will not require massed tank armies. Instead, the most valuable military attributes will be rapid mobility and excellent intelligence support. Although the United States and Great Britain have probably the two best-equipped militaries in the world, most of our allies’ militaries lack such characteristics. We want our allies to undertake the same kinds of military transformations as we have.

My second global lesson concerns how we design militaries. Cooperation with allied militaries must be built-in from the beginning. In the past, countries would first construct their militaries and then consider how to make
them interoperable with other countries. Now we must from the start design national militaries for coalition operations.

- The final global lesson is somewhat surprising: the continued importance of NATO. The alliance provides the sort of key test-bed for combined interoperability, combined training, and combined planning that we will increasingly need. NATO has established its own command for transformation that will push the member governments to develop the kinds of capabilities that we will require. The alliance also is developing its Response Force to provide the sort of highly mobile power-projection forces essential for winning future conflicts.

**Ovidiu Dranga**, Deputy Secretary of State for Euro-Atlantic Integration and Defense Policy, Ministry of National Defense, Romania

The Romanian military is also making an effort to transform itself.

- Romanians want their forces to participate in NATO-led operations. Such participation requires that our forces become smaller, better equipped, more easily deployable, and better trained. Expeditionary capabilities rather than heavy territorial forces will best meet the requirements of future military operations.

- Romania’s military is developing the tools to become more capable at projecting power. For example, our forces are acquiring better strategic airlift. Romania seeks to meet many of the capability commitments established at NATO’s Prague summit in November 2002.

Romania’s military is actively promoting international peace and security.

- Romanian forces from the different services have participated in Bosnia, Afghanistan, and Iraq. They stood side by side with NATO during the Kosovo crisis, and with the United States after September 11, 2001.
Romanian officials are also pursuing defense diplomacy and military cooperation with neighboring countries.

The Romanian people understand that with NATO membership, they are joining a community of values and a community of action. They recognize that NATO membership involves responsibilities and commitments.

Romania is preparing to meet the new security challenges, especially terrorism, by enhancing both its military and its non-military capabilities, including intelligence and civil emergency planning.

Romania represents a strategic bridge between the Balkans and the Black Sea area and, by extension, Central Asia.

Romanians appreciate NATO’s important role in promoting peace and security in the countries located around the Black Sea and in Central Asia. Public support for NATO in Romania remains high. Bucharest itself hosts a NATO Partnership-for-Peace training center.

Romanians also value the transatlantic link. They see NATO as the embodiment of meaningful transatlantic defense cooperation. The United States and the European Union should be seen as an integrated defense community. In today’s strategic environment, military, political, and economic challenges have become too intertwined for a single institution to manage them successfully. We can envisage combined NATO-EU actions involving both hard and soft security preemption measures in stability operations in Southeastern Europe.

**Nobukatsu Kanehara, Counselor for Political Affairs, Embassy of Japan, Washington, D.C.**

Japan continues to face regional security threats. Northeast Asia remains a troubled region despite other changes in the international security environment.

During the Cold War, Japan was most concerned with the threat posed by the Soviet Union, specifically, their military forces, which included strategic and tactical nucle-
ar weapons deployed in the Soviet Far East. The Japanese military was focused on homeland defense and Japan relied on the U.S. nuclear umbrella and U.S. conventional forces for its ultimate protection. For this reason, Japanese spoke of the “American Spear and the Japanese Shield.”

- In contrast to Europe, Northeast Asia today remains a threatening region. Japan has nuclear powers as neighbors. Several nearby countries also possess enormous conventional forces. Few democracies exist near Japan. Moreover, nationalism and inter-state rivalry exert a far greater sway in Northeast Asia than in Europe.

- Continued U.S. military involvement in Northeast Asia is essential for maintaining peace in the region. The alliance between Japan and the United States, as well as defense ties between the United States and South Korea, play an essential role in deterring aggression and sustaining regional prosperity.

The Japanese military is actively engaged in a process of transformation.

- Since the end of the Cold War, Japan increasingly has been contributing to maintaining international stability. Japan’s pacifism has become less passive. Indeed, the Japanese military has assumed a lead role in several international peacekeeping operations. It also has helped combat terrorism and counter WMD proliferation by participating in such measures as the Proliferation Security Initiative, Operation Enduring Freedom, and post-conflict stability operations in Iraq.

- Japan’s future military transformation agenda should include the acquisition of long-range transportation aircraft, multi-
mission maritime aircraft, special units for anti-terrorism, enhanced intelligence capabilities, improved jointness, and ballistic missile defenses. The development of missile defenses by the United States and Japan will help negate the threat emanating from those governments that continue to develop ballistic rockets and weapons of mass destruction.

Brigadier Mark Kelly, Royal Australian Army, Director, Combined Planning Group, U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM)

Australia’s military history is truly one of participation in military coalitions. Its typical role has been that of a contributor of troops to operations led by a powerful friend or senior ally.

- These conflicts often occur in distant theaters of war, as seen in the examples of World War I and Desert Storm.
- Sometimes Australia participates in combined military operations that occur much closer to our home region. Some of these campaigns have included our involvement in the Pacific campaign during World War II, the Korean War, the Malaysian emergency, the confrontation in Borneo, and the Vietnam War.
- Australia has also played prominent roles in peacekeeping operations, often conducted under UN auspices. In such campaigns, Australia has often assumed a lead role, such as during the operations in Cambodia, East Timor, and the Solomon Islands.
- Since September 11, 2001, Australia has been a very active member of the coalition of the willing involved in the global war on terrorism.

Operation Enduring Freedom and the GWOT are “walk-on” coalitions. Contributing nations bring what they want, or what they can afford, and not necessarily what the coalition most needs at that time. They will place restrictions in terms of where they will operate and what specific tasks they will perform.

- Coalition commanders need to remain flexible and adjust their plans to accommodate these requirements.
Sustaining coalitions of the willing, as in the current GWOT, requires dialogue, consultations, and mutual support among allies.

The GWOT is a marathon, not a sprint, so sustaining the coalition will be a lengthy and important task. The senior coalition leader, the United States, will play an essential role in holding the coalition together.

In July 2002, Commander of CENTCOM General Tommy Franks, USA, set forth his intent to establish a multinational headquarters: “I envision a Combined HQ capable of executing military operations that leverage all elements of the OEF Coalition.”

The objective was to build on the success of coalition contributions to OEF as well as to sustain that coalition. General Franks also sought to increase international contributions to headquarters planning.

CENTCOM is now integrating such combined planning into the headquarters staff. The CENTCOM Joint Planning Group directs tasking to the Combined Planning Group (CPG) to ensure coherence in its planning and analysis tasks.

The CPG is becoming involved in a range of planning and analysis, ranging from near- to long-term activities, the strategic to the operational, and from military operations to humanitarian assistance. As a Headquarters CENTCOM staff element, it will directly advise the combined forces commander with strategic assessments and operational, political-military, and civil-military analyses.

The CPG provides a complementary rather than a replacement planning capability for CENTCOM. It focuses primarily on OEF and the GWOT. A smaller, select staff undertakes the bulk of planning related to OIF, and the CPG is regularly briefed regarding its efforts.

The officers comprising the CPG, who come from more than twenty nations, bring a range of operational and professional backgrounds to the planning process. These officers serve in a manner similar to that of the integrated
staff officers working for CENTCOM and the commander, rather than as bilateral representatives of their countries.

- The CPG anticipates playing additional lead or support roles in the development of specific products such as CONOPS for future phases of OEF and the GWOT.
- The CPG also represents a model to other combatant commands involved in combined operations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Allied Command Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEF</td>
<td>Air Expeditionary Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>area of responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDA</td>
<td>bomb damage assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTCOM</td>
<td>U.S. Central Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'ISR</td>
<td>command, control, communications, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONOP</td>
<td>concept of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPG</td>
<td>Combined Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTR</td>
<td>Cooperative Threat Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD(X)</td>
<td>next-generation surface combatant ship being developed for the U.S. Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOTMLPF</td>
<td>doctrine, organization, training, material, leadership, personnel, and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPRK</td>
<td>Democratic People's Republic of Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELN</td>
<td>National Liberation Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>expeditionary strike group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARC</td>
<td>Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>foreign area officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWOT</td>
<td>global war on terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICBM</td>
<td>intercontinental ballistic missile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>information operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISPS</td>
<td>International Ship Port Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFCOM</td>
<td>U.S. Joint Forces Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIATF</td>
<td>joint interagency task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTF</td>
<td>joint task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACA</td>
<td>military assistance to civil authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCO</td>
<td>non-commissioned officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICG</td>
<td>National Interagency Coordination Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIE</td>
<td>National Intelligence Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORAD</td>
<td>North American Aerospace Defense Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHCOM</td>
<td>U.S. Northern Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>Nuclear Posture Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEF</td>
<td>Operation Enduring Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIF</td>
<td>Operation Iraqi Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACOM</td>
<td>U.S. Pacific Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>Proliferation Security Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROK</td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCOM</td>
<td>U.S. Special Operations Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOF</td>
<td>Special Operations Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;RF</td>
<td>stabilization and reconstruction force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRLC</td>
<td>sense and respond logistics capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSGN</td>
<td>nuclear-powered guided-missile submarine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATCOM</td>
<td>U.S. Strategic Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAV</td>
<td>unmanned aerial vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMD</td>
<td>weapons of mass destruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>