

Appendix

Comments and Dissent by Transition 2001 Panel Members

“It is my view and concern that the single most important issue regarding the future of the nation’s security rests in attracting and retaining sufficient numbers of qualified people to serve in government. This deficiency extends throughout government and to all levels of seniority particularly career public servants. Therefore, restoring government service as a respected, important and rewarding calling must be one of the administration’s highest priorities. Captain John Paul Jones put this in perspective more than two centuries ago observing that “men (and by extension women) are important than guns in the rating of a ship.” That sentiment applies even more strongly today. No matter the urgency of competing and timely national security challenges, uncertainties and dangers, people are what make any organization succeed or fail.”

— *Harlan Ullmann*

While I agree with most of the report, there are several points on which I differ or dissent, and a couple of points that I feel should be added.

I am not yet persuaded that a national missile defense will increase our national security, either in its own right – given the likely impact on relations with allies and adversaries, or in relation to other uses of the funds – parts of the 050 or 150 [see, for example, the report's argument regarding procurement, pay and maintenance] accounts which promise more credible contributions to security and threat reduction. With that in mind, I disagree with the report's predisposition to embrace NMD and to debate only the alternative technologies. This also bears on the report's support for significant increases in defense modernization and compensation, which presumes continuation of current strategy. While the report urges an early and comprehensive review of that strategy, its DOD spending recommendation appears to prejudge the results of that review.

The recommendation of increased support for Colombia and neighboring states is valid as far as it goes. Given that the Colombian crisis is largely rooted in the

problem of U. S. demand for narcotics, the report should not stop short of recommending a major effort to deal with demand reduction at home. While perhaps nominally a "domestic" issue, U. S. illicit drug consumption clearly has direct consequences for international security.

The report merely references nontraditional threats. While it may be accurate to say that there is no consensus about the seriousness of these threats, I want to enter a strong individual plea that the next administration treat them – especially, disease, population and the environment – as deserving high level attention.

Not surprisingly, as a set of recommendations to the next President, the report has an executive branch bias. There is the requisite counsel to consult with, and develop the support of, Congress. We should caution, however, that the long-term efficacy of executive power in the foreign relations and national security areas depends on its being grounded in an understanding on the part of the American people and their representatives in Congress of our role in the world, of the need for our leadership, and of the limits of our power. Only the President is in a position to conduct this necessary, on-going instruction in world affairs and U. S. responsibilities.

In a similar vein, beyond dealing with the usual components of foreign and national security policy, the comprehensive review of strategy we urge in the report should also extend to an examination of the style and manner in which U. S. influence and power is exercised. It may well be that our national self-interest will be better served by an approach to other nations which is more respectful and collaborative, which might be characterized by a certain humility of power.

— *David Skaggs*

In Section 2, this report sets out all the right questions that must be answered before a decision can be made on whether to develop and deploy a national missile defense. These include effects on U.S. relations with China, Russia and Europe, assessment of alternative means of threat reduction, cost relative to other needs and the technological feasibility of an adequately effective system. The report presupposes the answers, however, by stipulating that the U.S. must have an NMD. Since in my judgment no system has yet been described that appears technologically realistic within a reasonable time frame and whose geostrategic benefits decisively outweigh its costs, I can not subscribe to this conclusion.

In its discussion of Regional Powers (Section 3), the report outlines a U.S. policy towards India which fails to mention the single issue that now most bedevils and will continue to frame the relationship. That issue, of course, is what the U.S. attitude should be towards India's new overt nuclear weapons status and its ongoing—albeit slow motion—progress on weaponization. Should the U.S. attempt to rollback India's nuclear status? Sanction it? Accept it? Try to influence its pace and scale? Try to reduce its dangers through assistance on intelligence, doctrine, safety, and command and control? How, in short, can the U.S. best reconcile the reality of India's place in the world with the U.S.'s global responsibility to curb nuclear proliferation? No discussion that sidesteps this issue can provide helpful advice on this important relationship.

Also in this section, the treatment of Iraq argues that a policy that drops regime change as an essential U.S. goal would increase the threat from Iraq's missile and WMD programs. ("The threat from Iraq, especially its missiles and WMD programs, is likely to grow in this case.") The likely outcome, I believe, is exactly the opposite. Replacing our current policy of advocating the removal of Saddam Hussein from power, a policy not supported by our allies, for a policy that focused on "building support among allies and regional states for whatever measures are needed" to constrain Iraqi WMD programs, would be far more likely to command others' support and therefore far more likely to succeed in reducing the WMD threat. This is a crucial policy choice before the next administration.

Finally, I must point out that a report that advocates a policy of "selective global leadership" but fails to mention U.S. policy toward the United Nations and other major global institutions (neither NATO nor the EU is relevant here), has missed the point. Selective global leadership appropriately implies burden sharing. Yes, our alliances should be revitalized, but there are a growing number of global problems from failed states to terrorism to climate change, that require global governance. There are global norms that must be built and strengthened that will carry part of the load. There are problems that can only be dealt with in broader fora. There is the rule of law we count on others to obey that is undermined, for example, by our failure to honor a legal commitment to pay our UN dues. In short, policies necessary to establish U.S. credibility to successfully exercise "selective global leadership" are missing here. Military strength is necessary but not sufficient.

Jessica T. Mathews

These comments do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Transition 2001 panel.