

THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

The Transformation of the United States Army

MSG WILLIAM E. BONCK

UNITED STATES SERGEANT'S MAJOR ACADEMY

SMC 58

SGM HARDIN

15 MARCH 2008

## OUTLINE

**Thesis Statement:** Developing strategies by recognizing emerging technologies while innovating, adapting and planning for future conflicts is essential to the Army's transformation and success in the future.

- I. Introduction
- II. The Threat
- III. Comparing and Contrasting the Military Transformation Efforts.
- IV. The Factors that lead to the Transformations
- V. Does the Military Achieve the Desired End State?

### Abstract

The need to transform our Army became apparent during two different presidential terms. When both Presidents Clinton and George Bush transformed the Army, it was for different reasons but both transformations held valid reasons. Some would argue that the transformation during President Clinton's administration was excessive with the downsizing but the Army had only success during these times. President Bush's success in transforming the Army remains to be seen. It is the biggest transformation the Army has ever undertaken.

### The Transformation of the United States Army

Success of one's country is unattainable unless accompanied by its battle force. In every nation, it is inevitable to have a military department. In the United States, the army has performed a crucial role in this development starting from its birth on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of June 1775. If not succeeding in battles, since the American Revolution, through the Cold War and the Gulf War, we would not be able to lead our way to the present War on Terrorism (Murray n.d). Developing strategies by recognizing emerging technologies while innovating, adapting and planning for future conflicts is essential to the Army's transformation and success in the future. It is composed of the "Regular Army" which plays as an active duty component hand in hand with the Army National Guards Reserve Components and the U.S Army reserve (Murray n.d).

### The Threat

In response to the enormous changes happening in the realm of the national security, military leaders are changing its strategies to accompany the evolving threat in the defense system. The nation learned through the September 11 bombing that our enemies are also changing its way- critically studying the actions of the US military, planning how to attack successfully, keenly noting our responses, and most of all how it will attack successfully targeting our vulnerable infrastructure. Nowadays, they use sophisticated technologies and methodologies for espionage. Even some equipment of our adversaries remains difficult for the military to monitor. Precisely, the danger of international terrorism urges continued alertness. The terrorists had learned from their committed faults and success. The future terrorists are vigilant with their destructive weapons and dangerous technologies for their dreaded vicious ambition. Likewise, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is earning a serious threat to the national security. Examples of which are the use of chemical and nuclear weapons that

may cause an adverse biological effect. Some biological and chemical agents can be very hazardous when disseminated through air ventilation systems. Also included is the popular industrial chemical hydrogen sulfide that is deadly and often use as diversionary tactic by the terrorists' to cover their primary activity. Conversely, our adversaries are dying to penetrate foreign interest by penetrating the US military and our nation's intelligence community. The role of the intelligence of the military is to trace the terrorists' activities and intelligence bounded in opposition to the United States. Their intentions are to investigate espionage and be equipped with the latest innovation in the country's science and technology sector. Included in their new tactics is changing the environmental intelligence, likewise hiring non-intelligence personnel for surveillance activity. Furthermore, there is a concern in maintaining the integrity of the information system of the country because of its vulnerability. The country's reliance on telecommunications and computer networks has been a target of cyber attackers. They might directly assault the power plants, telephone networks, banks, air traffic control systems and military networks. We classify terrorism acts into three categories. These are the state-sponsored terrorism, which draws against the international law, the international terrorists and the domestic terrorists. Also falling in the category of terrorist are the loosely affiliated extremists who pose the most critical threat to our country. These adversaries are emerging and getting near to its goal, which is to do the act of terrorism. Surely, they are preparing again for the next attack. We cannot tolerate feeling safe and secure in the absence of our enemies. Gauging the terrorists' existence is really a difficult task. However, as a pre-emptive measure, the military will not just sit and wait for another attack. In order to protect this country they are implementing transformation strategies. These will also act as preparation measures.

### Comparing and Contrasting the Military Transformation Efforts

Some people accused the Clinton administration of poor leadership due to their efforts of military transformation. At the onset of his administration, there was an excessive downsizing of the US military. According to critics, this move had excessively downsized the US defense system and seriously weakened the country's fighting mechanism. However, this was only a notion and only true for those who do not believe on him. The use of force of the previous president's administration may be questionable but his ability to retain the high state of readiness and a strong global prevention position had made him successful despite the downsizing of the military officials by 15 percent during his term. The nation credited him with success in Kosovo and Bosnia because of his initiated defense policy. However, the weakness of his defense policy lies on the military's inability to maintain their moral through such massive downsizing there was a problem in the distribution of tasks. Demanding workloads were unfairly distributed. Though this problem had been resolved by the end of the decade, it certainly detracts the achievements of the military during his term. During his term, modernization of the military was also his goal. They allotted funds for the preparation of weapons for battle and they purchased battlefield technologies even with limited funds. Overall, accusing Clinton of poor stewardship is wrong because he had vigilantly prepared his military and boldly set up the military for modernization.

Meanwhile, George W. Bush, views transformation, as more than the need for modernization, it also requires ingenuity, creativity and a bit of adventurousness. "All the advanced technology in the world will not transform our military if we do not transform our thinking (Bush n.d)." At the onset of his administration, the president, gave emphasis to the transformation of the defense strategy as a pre-cursor to the future defense of the United States.

He focuses on the large-scale innovation. Specifically he is pointing out the knowledge of space as a competitive edge and a very important advantage. The strategy is to identify the characteristics in space that will not only be an advantage for US forces but also for carrying out in the full spectrum range of operations. This will comprise billions of the National Defense budget as already allotted. This will be use to strengthen and widen the opportunities of the United States in space. It lies with the goal of projecting long distance attacks; precision based weapons, under-sea warfare capabilities, and intelligence enhancement. The country determines the need for transformation by comparing four imperatives: the strategy, risk mitigation, threat and of course preparation measures.

The efforts made by these two administrations to transform the military are a great leap from the traditional system. Both administrations valued modernization as the key to attaining confident military systems, equipped with innovative tools and facilities that will prepare the troops for the unforeseen battle. One major difference in their vision of transformation is the budget allocation to the defense system. In President Clinton's administration, there was a noted downsizing in the military system to include personnel. The military budget was very scarce at that time, but the administration was still able to maintain preparedness. Unlike in President Bush's administration wherein there is an increase in the budget allotted for the military. Another deviation is the mission of George W. Bush to use the attributes of space as a competitive edge. During the Bush administration, uplifting the moral of the military is one of his priorities. Certainly, we should credit he idea of transformation to President Bush and President Clinton. Their acts just vary in degree and intensity, although, President Bush's vigilance and radicalism is noteworthy.

### The Factors that Lead to the Transformation

Several factors lead to the actual transformation of US military. The innovation in the war technology has challenged the administration to transform. Today, we define power by mobility coupled with an immediate response. Safety is attained through stealth and force exemplified by precision-guided weapons. The following are the factors, justifying the urgent need to transform Change in the threat environment and the challenges of the pressing call for change. Transformation as a grand scale innovation is definitely a leap in the effectiveness of the military. This will just take effect and be effective through the support of the Defense Department. If they are to sustain the existing means of operations, transformation should be an integral part of the overall defense system. According to the Rumsfeld view, this is comprised of six areas. A warfare vision that will provide a sense of direction to the effort of transformation in the future is first on the list. Second is the selection of the key leaders of transformation. Third, a huge increase in funding is required in order to speed up the process of transformation because in reality, transformation regularly takes effect in a span of a decade or two. Fourth on the list are the joint field and service experimentation and exercises. Fifth, is the adaptation of the latest procurement strategy and finally, the elimination of existing poor strategy and newly introduced approach that are unfit with the emerging environment after the joint exercises and experiments has been made.

### Does the Military Achieve their Desired End State?

Indeed, the administration of President Bush had made a tremendous effort and paid a great cost in the transformation of the military. This is in effect the act of terrorism from the adversaries and their emerging new ways of attacks. The worry of the administration that the enemies are just silent for the meantime and are planning the next assault has justified the call for



transformation, previous suicide bombings against US military personnel reinforced this need. The previous events showed the perpetuation of violent terrorist activities that posed the challenge for transformation. Protecting the people and the country and leading the fight against terrorism is at the core of the Bush administration. Hence, even without the consent of the United Nations, they launched a war of aggression against the state of Iraq. Recognizing the campaigns for the future is the basic element of re-inventing the defense system. Preparing for the adversaries is an integral part of this nation- the diplomatic, the economic, the investigative, the information and the military. It is a historical opportunity to maximize revolutionary innovation that will heavily draw the opportunity of transformation. Despite the critics and disagreement from other nations, the results showed that the Bush administration did it well. Certainly, the defense system is prepared for anything that goes. Though, the character of the future environment is indescribable right now, the president and the military's initiative already identified the vision of shaping the security environment both at a national and international level. They had already built the foundation and stepping up on the ladder of triumph. President Franklin Roosevelt, in his state of the nation address in 1941 stated that in the future the military will secure the Nation, its people and give them the freedom of speech and expression, the freedom to choose the God whom they worship anywhere in the world, the freedom from want, and the freedom from fear (Roosevelt as stated in Kem 1941:2006)

## References

Freech, Louis J. Threats to Us National Security (1998). FAS Website. Retrieved on December 11, 2007 from [http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/1998\\_hr/index.html](http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/1998_hr/index.html)

**Kem, Jack D. Military Transformation Ends, Ways, and Means (2006). Air Space Power Journal.**

**Retrieved on December 13, 2007 from**

**<http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/apj/apj06/fal06/kem.html>**

Krepinevich, Andrew. The Bush Administration's Call for Defense Transformation: A Congressional Guide (2001). CSBA Website. Retrieved on December 10, 2007 from [http://www.csbaonline.org/4Publications/Archive/H.20010619.The\\_Bush\\_Administr/H.20010619.The\\_Bush\\_Administr.html](http://www.csbaonline.org/4Publications/Archive/H.20010619.The_Bush_Administr/H.20010619.The_Bush_Administr.html)

Murray, Turner. Introduction to the History and Heritage of the U.S. Army (n.d). US Army Website. Retrieved on December 10, 2007 from [www.unh.edu/army/library/HistoryHeritageArmy.ppt](http://www.unh.edu/army/library/HistoryHeritageArmy.ppt) -