

A Word from the Chairman

In May of this year, Secretary Cohen and I appeared before the armed services committees of Congress to present the *Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review*. This report is the result of many months of hard work, incorporating extensive analysis by our brightest minds. The services and unified commands were integrated into the process at each step. It represents our best thinking to date about how to maintain a trained, ready force to support national objectives and prepare for an uncertain future.

The QDR process recognized that we face continuing instability in many parts of the world. Resurgent nationalism, the challenge of new and failing states, religious conflicts, and international terrorism make the security environment

the QDR process recognized that we face continuing instability in many parts of the world

dangerous and unpredictable. The threat from weapons of mass destruction—unleashed by either a rogue state or a terrorist or criminal organization—is of growing concern. Because we are the dominant military power, potential adversaries may seek to counter our military superiority with asymmetric means, by using chemical or

biological weapons, attacking information nodes, or through terrorism.

Our analysis reaffirmed that having the ability to fight two overlapping, major theater wars is essential in exercising global leadership. Although we will not face a peer competitor in the near or mid term, regional powers and coalitions hostile to our interests, values, and allies still confront us. While some question a two-theater strategy, it is clear that our ability to deter major conflicts, with the human tragedy and suffering they entail, is based upon our ability to project power on a global scale and overwhelm adversaries rapidly and decisively.

adversaries may seek to counter our military superiority with asymmetric means, by using chemical or

(continued on page 4)

- 1 A Word from the Chairman
by John M. Shalikashvili

■ FROM THE FIELD AND FLEET

- 6 Letters to the Editor

-
- 8 Report of the Quadrennial
Defense Review
by William S. Cohen

- 15 National Security in the
21st Century: The Challenge
of Transformation
by the National Defense Panel

- 20 The QDR Process—
An Alternative View
by Jim Courter and Alvin H. Bernstein

- 27 Whatever Happened to
Defense Industrial
Preparedness?
by Ivars Gutmanis and John F. Starns

- 34 The Sisyphus Paradox:
Framing the Acquisition
Reform Debate
*by Linda S. Brandt and
Francis W. A'Hearn*

- 39 Improving the Management
of Reserve Forces
by John C.F. Tillson

■ CIVIL AFFAIRS AND MOOTW:
FOUR BALKAN SKETCHES

- 45 Joint Endeavor—
The Role of Civil Affairs
by Pamela J. Brady

- 48 The National Support
Element in Hungary
by Bruce Castka

- 50 Transition of the
Sarajevo Suburbs
*by Kevin F. McCarroll and
Donald R. Zoufal*

- 54 The Challenge of
Civil-Military Operations
by John J. Tuozzolo

-
- 59 War Criminals—Testing
the Limits of Military Force
by F.M. Lorenz

■ OUT OF JOINT

- 66 What Exactly Is Jointness?
by Lawrence B. Wilkerson

-
- 69 Thinking About Revolutions
in Military Affairs
by Williamson Murray

- 77 Military Innovation and
Carrier Aviation—The
Relevant History
by Jan M. van Tol

- 88 On Machine Guns and
Precision Engagement
by Price T. Bingham

PHOTO CREDITS



The cover features F-15C at Jordanian air base (U.S. Air Force/Paul R. Caron). The front inside cover shows C-17 (U.S. Air Force/Andy Dunaway), patrol during Joint Guard (55th Signal Company, Combat Camera/Angel Clemons), Marines, Kernel Blitz '97 (Fleet Imaging Command, Pacific/Carl Richard), linehandlers on board *USS Stout* during replenishment in the Atlantic (U.S. Navy/Joe Hendricks). The table of contents shows helicopter crewman sharing food with Bosnian children (U.S. Navy/Chris Vickers). The back inside cover captures soldiers in Tuzla (U.S. Army/Larry Lane). The back cover renders M1A1 at Twenty-nine Palms (2^d Marine Division, Combat Camera/

R.L. Kigler), A-10 at Aviano for Deliberate Guard (U.S. Air Force/Steve Thurow), landing craft moving to *USS Denver* (Fleet Combat Camera Group, Pacific/Jeff Viano), soldiers heading for Camp McGovern after air assault in Bosnia (55th Signal Company, Combat Camera/Tracey L. Hall-Leahy).

- 91 Searching for Policy Coherence: The DOD Space Architect as an Experiment
by Joan Johnson-Freese and Robert Handberg

- 97 Information Warfare at the Crossroads
by Brian E. Fredericks



- 104 Leveraging Technology for Joint Training
by Jack Walker
- 109 Leveraging Human Interaction for Joint Training
by John Howard Eisenhower and Edward Marks

OF CHIEFS AND CHAIRMEN

- 115 Louis Emil Denfeld

THE JOINT WORLD

- 116 Organization, Lessons Learned, and History

OFF THE SHELF

- 119 A New Paradigm for the Army: A Review Essay
by F.G. Hoffman
- 121 'L' Is for Logistics: A Book Review
by Joseph E. Muckerman II
- 122 The Great War and the Birth of Armored Warfare: A Book Review
by Williamson Murray
- 123 War and Peace in the New World Order: A Book Review
by William H. Lewis
- 124 Cumulative Index (1996-97): Issues 13-16

Joint Force Quarterly

Hans Binnendijk
Director
Institute for National Strategic Studies
Editor-in-Chief

Martin J. Peters, Jr.
Production Coordinator

Robert A. Silano
Editor

William A. Rawley
Typography and Design Division
U.S. Government Printing Office
Art Director

Patrick M. Cronin
Director for Strategy and Policy Analysis
Institute for National Strategic Studies
Consulting Editor

Calvin B. Kelley
Copy Editor

JFQ is published for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff by the Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University, to promote understanding of the integrated employment of land, sea, air, space, and special operations forces. The journal focuses on joint doctrine, coalition warfare, contingency planning, combat operations conducted by the unified commands, and joint force development.

The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed or implied within are those of the contributors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any other agency of the Federal Government. Copyrighted

ISSN 1070-0692

portions of this journal may not be reproduced or extracted without permission of copyright proprietors. An acknowledgment to Joint Force Quarterly should be made whenever material is quoted from or based on its contents.

This publication has been approved by the Secretary of Defense.

The editors invite articles and other contributions on joint warfighting, interservice issues that support jointness, and

August 1997

topics of common interest to the Armed Forces (see page 128 for details). Please direct all editorial communications to:

Editor, Joint Force Quarterly
ATTN: NDU-NSS-JFQ
300 Fifth Avenue (Bldg. 62)
Fort Lesley J. McNair
Washington, D.C. 20319-5066

Telephone: (202) 685-4220 / DSN 325-4220
Fax: (202) 685-4219 / DSN 325-4219
e-mail: JFQ1@ndu.edu
Internet: <http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine>

GEN John M. Shalikashvili, USA
Publisher

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

LTG Richard A. Chilcoat, USA ■ *National Defense University*
Chairman

BG David A. Armstrong, USA (Ret.) ■ *Office of the Chairman*

VADM Dennis C. Blair, USN ■ *The Joint Staff*

A. Denis Clift ■ *Joint Military Intelligence College*

Col K.A. Conry, USMC ■ *Marine Corps Command and Staff College*

MG John S. Cowings, USA ■ *Industrial College of the Armed Forces*

Brig Gen Jerry M. Drennan, USAF ■ *Air Command and Staff College*

BG Joseph R. Inge, USA ■ *U.S. Army Command and General Staff College*

Brig Gen William R. Looney III, USAF ■ *Armed Forces Staff College*

Col David M. Lumsden, USMC ■ *Marine Corps War College*

Brig Gen Ralph Pasini, USAF ■ *The Joint Staff*

MG Robert H. Scales ■ *U.S. Army War College*

Maj Gen D. Bruce Smith, USAF ■ *Air War College*

RADM James R. Stark, USN ■ *Naval War College*

EDITORIAL BOARD

Hans Binnendijk ■ *National Defense University*
Chairman

Richard K. Betts ■ *Columbia University*

COL William D. Bristow, Jr., USA ■ *U.S. Army Command and General Staff College*

Eliot A. Cohen ■ *The Johns Hopkins University*

COL Robert A. Doughty, USA ■ *U.S. Military Academy*

Aaron L. Friedberg ■ *Princeton University*

Col Robert J. Garner, USMC ■ *Armed Forces Staff College*

Alan L. Gropman ■ *Industrial College of the Armed Forces*

Col Douglas N. Hime, USAF ■ *Naval War College*

Mark H. Jacobsen ■ *Marine Corps Command and Staff College*

Thomas L. McNaugher ■ *The RAND Corporation*

William H.J. Manthorpe, Jr. ■ *Joint Military Intelligence College*

CAPT Rosemary B. Mariner, USN ■ *National War College*

John J. Mearsheimer ■ *The University of Chicago*

LTG William E. Odom, USA (Ret.) ■ *Hudson Institute*

Lt Col Robert C. Owen, USAF ■ *Air Command and Staff College*

James H. Toner ■ *Air War College*

LtGen Bernard E. Trainor, USMC (Ret.) ■ *Harvard University*

COL Lawrence B. Wilkerson, USA ■ *Marine Corps War College*

COL Terry J. Young, USA ■ *U.S. Army War College*

(continued from page 1)

We also see a continuing requirement for forces to conduct contingency operations across the entire spectrum, from natural disasters and humanitarian assistance to peace enforcement and noncombatant evacuations. While we will not sacrifice readiness for core warfighting missions, military operations other than war will remain an important part of our strategy of engagement.

The Clinton administration's strategy of shape-respond-prepare was fully reflected in the QDR report. We shape the strategic environment with forward presence, combined exercises, security assistance, and a host of other programs that keep us engaged in critical regions and help defuse potential conflict. When necessary, we respond to crises through a combination of forward deployed forces, pre-positioned equipment and supplies, and trained, ready forces which can rapidly move to the scene.

At the same time we must prepare for the future with a well-conceived, adequately funded modernization program that provides the Armed Forces the right tools, right technology, and right systems to assure dominance over any opponent. *Joint Vision 2010*, our conceptual template for future joint operations, will help integrate new systems with evolving joint doctrine to ensure that they are synchronized for maximum effect.

Throughout the review, we realized that we could not sacrifice readiness today to generate funds for modernization tomorrow. Our challenge was to find a way to do both. In order to fund current readiness and future modernization, we recommended significant personnel cuts in both the active and Reserve components, for military as well as civilian strength. Most cuts will come from the sustainment and infrastructure parts of the force. With the increase in operational deployments that has marked the post-Cold War period, we could not make deep cuts in operating forces and continue to support our strategy.

Reductions in personnel recommended in the QDR report represent genuine savings, but those alone are not sufficient to fund the requisite level of modernization. As weapons systems age and new technologies come on line, we must modernize to realize the revolution in military affairs. With constant budgets projected for the foreseeable future, we must rely on increased efficiencies to achieve the savings needed to become a 21st century joint force.

Part of the answer to the funding dilemma is additional base closures. Some infrastructure represents capacity we no longer need; with defense budgets down by 40 percent and forces cut by a third, we have reduced our bases by only 21 percent. Although politically painful, closing bases is



DOD (Helene C. Silke)

Briefing the QDR Report.

essential if we are to preserve a ready force and engage in prudent modernization.

Funding modernization will also demand a “revolution in business affairs” to increase the efficiency of support and acquisition functions. The Deputy Secretary of Defense is now heading the Defense Reform Task Force that will recommend how to do that. Outsourcing, privatizing, and reducing the number of Federal regulations under which

we operate are important initiatives that will generate real savings and enable us to achieve readiness *now* and modernization *soon*.

The QDR report is not the end of the process but rather the start. Its recommendations are a blueprint, but much remains to be done. At present the National Defense Panel—an outside body comprised of defense experts chartered by the Secretary of Defense—is conducting an independent assessment as part of the QDR process and will release its own report at the end of the year. As the joint community continues to explore new practices and systems, we will refine our thinking to improve both the efficiency and effectiveness of joint operations.

Implementing the recommendations in the QDR report will be neither easy nor painless

Critics have begun to question the assumptions and conclusions found in the QDR report. Some claim that their service or system warranted greater attention and support. Others believe that the current force structure will fall below prudent levels. Still others want deeper force cuts to pay for new, more advanced weaponry. The fact that this criticism is distributed so evenly across the defense establishment suggests that the current review may be right on track.

Implementing the recommendations in the QDR report will be neither easy nor painless; real change never is. But we must recognize that the health and vitality of the Armed Forces depend on both current readiness and future modernization. We cannot afford to sacrifice one for the other. To achieve the goal of a trained and ready force today and tomorrow, everyone—in Congress, the Department of Defense, and the active, Reserve, and civilian components—has a key role to play. Only by working together in a spirit of cooperation can we realize the greatness the Nation expects and deserves in the new century.

JOHN M. SHALIKASHVILI
Chairman
of the Joint Chiefs of Staff