

Chapter 1 : Project MUSE - Empire, Military Power, and Economic Decline

Military power is a result of coherent security system, which includes military, economic, political, environmental and nowadays even virtual security. The relation between these sources of security is akin, and to understand how the whole system works it is necessary to understand each source individually.

This analysis refines the analytical EHN framework into seven components Elements, Outside Forces, Complex Systems, Outcomes, Analysis, Reimagination, and Transformation , summarizes its initial application, and tests the validity of its application to another homeland security issue. Via this process, he could validate his hypothesis on what is contained in an atom of whatever element and how the components relate to one another. The EHN framework uses a similar concept: The results then allow for someone to reimagine how the relationship could be changed we are not dealing with forces of nature in this case and what steps are needed for the transformation. This essay explores the reuse of that analytical framework and tests the validity of its application to another homeland security issue. My initial exploration was based on the notion that economic security ES , or some variation thereof, has been discussed for several decades, and there was little debate on its importance. It is an assumed component of a functioning society and homeland security. However, there is no evidence to explicitly link the two in the literature. So, why is homeland security HS considered inseparable from economic security as stated in the National Security Strategy and what are the implications for this connection? If national security NS is outward facing and homeland security is inward facing, will taking steps to ensure economic security have different impacts on these two areas? Does global economic interconnectedness blur the lines between domestic and international policy? If so, do homeland security decisions impact the global economy? Understanding the tangled triangle between economic, homeland, and national security may impact decisions on domestic and foreign policy in order to ensure the success of each initiative. What if the very steps being taken to increase economic security were actually making homeland security more difficult by causing unforeseen or unintended consequences? In order to study the EHN relationship and not oversimplify the relationship in a way that distorted my analysis, I developed an analytical framework that allowed me to organize my observations and analysis of this complex topic. This essay begins with an overview of the framework and explanations of the different components. The framework is then applied to a new issue, in this case the prioritization of national preparedness and how the federal and local perspectives differ. EHN Framework Elements The first step of the EHN framework consists of identifying the elements to be studied, determining the working definitions, and outlining the suspected connections between these different elements. How are they related? How do they affect one another? Some of these definitions and connections may be unclear. Clearing up such ambiguity is part of the EHN examination process and one of the goal outcomes from the framework. There are direct and indirect forces that may need to be considered when studying the connections between the elements, both of which may be difficult to identify initially. The outside forces may also vary based on the perspective of the individual looking at the elements. One observer may see several issues that affect the relationship; yet someone else may see an entirely different set of forces at work. The key is to identify and analyze those forces that are most likely to impact the connections in order to hypothesize how they will affect the elements. While unaware at the time, Rutherford and his contemporary researchers would eventually come to discover albeit 20 years later the strong and weak nuclear forces which bind atoms together. Each of the elements and the connections between them form a system that is acted upon or influenced by the outside forces. The different connections, leads and lags, and feedback loops between different system components or elements may lead to other relationships that were not clearly understood. In *Thinking in Systems*, Donella H. Meadows and Diana Wright define a system as: Then, when there is an unintended consequence, it is unclear what affect that will have on the overall system. Sometimes the only way to know what is going on inside an unknown is to look at inputs in this case our elements and our assumptions about their relationships connections. The expected results involve the system behaving as we had originally hypothesized given the connections between the elements and the outside forces acting on them i. This is particularly important because this is the piece that will allow us to

understand the importance of the outside forces and help us identify areas that we may want to change. Direct implications are first order effects where indirect implications are secondary or tertiary and may be difficult to observe during the testing phase. In this social experiment, the inputs have been identified and the outcomes have been observed. The analysis section links those two states by hypothesizing what external forces and complex systems are at work. This section may also create more questions than it answers. How do the expected and unexpected outcomes differ? What is the impact on the overall relationship between the elements? How do the elements actually align? Would others have the same results if they were to conduct a similar examination? Rutherford, Hans Geiger, and Niels Bohr all examined the results of the foil research and hypothesized about what it meant for understanding sub-atomic particle structures. Do the elements or their definitions need to change? Is there an external force that needs to be mitigated or enhanced? What complex relationships were uncovered that may introduce previously unknown system lags or impacts? When initiating change, the researcher must consider how it will impact others and what steps those others may take to mitigate perceived negative impacts from their point of view to achieving their ultimate goal. The framework was previously used for studying the connection between economic, homeland and national security. It can also serve as a template by which a social scientist can identify the components of a problem being studied, postulate on forces and systems that may be causing observed outcomes, and analyze results in order to recommend change or create a more desirable outcome. In the next section, we will look at how this framework was applied and in the subsequent section, the framework will be applied to a novel problem to test its transferability. Economic security ES and homeland security HS are concepts that have been linked in foundational homeland security documents; however, the interrelationship between economic and homeland security is not clearly explained or justified. Figure 2 identifies the initial elements being studied, analytical observations, external forces, and system complexity that lead to outcomes and a reimagined security relationship. Elements I observed some level of definitional clarity for the security elements through the analysis. The definitions put forth in the literature examination primarily in doctrine are at odds with the scholarly research. The literature review suggests that while there is a connection between ES and HS, the more important relationship to explore for policy development lies between ES and NS. Additionally, where there are connections discussed between ES and NS, it is primarily in the literature. When ES-HS connections are discussed, it is primarily in government doctrine, and there is little explanation of why the connection exists. To understand the connections between the elements, I began by exploring the definitions of the terms and then turned to how they are linked. Figure 3 summarizes the different security elements and their connections which were explored in the research. Security Elements and Conceptual Connection Through this process, I found that journals primarily focus on investigating the ES-NS relationship, whereas federal doctrine attempts to discuss the ES-HS connection, but often ends up describing the stronger NS connection. In total, the relationship that is described in the literature is not the one that actually exists. Definitions A review of the literature and doctrine related to each element revealed that there is a difference in how economic and national security are discussed in these sources. Most of the literature focuses on the relationship between economic security and national security. None of the materials had a discussion about all of the elements together, and as such the definitions are focused more narrowly. Economic security, or some variation thereof, has been discussed for several decades. In a collection of essays on national economic security from , editors Alting von Geusau, Frans A. Pankov believes that economic security is not only the protection of national interests but also the readiness and ability of government institutions to create mechanisms to implement and protect national interests in the development of a national economy. The homeland security vision articulated in the national strategy is very broad, including everyone i. Many definitions of HS are derived from looking at the homeland security enterprise through the lens of a group with a niche set of interests. The first National Security Strategy NSS in characterizes national security as the blueprint for freedom, peace, and prosperity. In subsequent years, the NSS changed to reflect the extant and emerging threats, but posited that the overall pillars of national security came from political, military and economic strength. While it may seem that the definition would drive the relationship, the reverse is often true; by seeing how these elements are related, we can also clarify their definition. The literature review

revealed that authors are consistently inconsistent when describing the impact of economic success security and the resulting human homeland security. There is no empirical nexus between ES and HS and little research connects the two elements together. Losman makes this the centerpiece of his article Economic Security: He directly questions the emphasis that has been placed on economic security and clearly states that military resources should not be used to promote economic security. Economic strength is presented as one of the key pillars of national strength and it provides the foundation from which the U. The National Security Strategy clearly states the importance of the economy domestically and internationally: In addition to being a key measure of power and influence in its own right, it underwrites our military strength and diplomatic influence. A strong economy, combined with a prominent U. In , Shelia Ronis asked if economic security is an overlooked component of national security. She believes national security is traditionally focused on strength of infrastructure, but that national security should also include a healthy economy and policies that promote that state. It pays for our military, underwrites our diplomacy and development efforts, and serves as a leading source of our influence in the world. She posits that this is a deterrent to enemies and supports defense. Bellavita asks why we should maintain an artificial separation of homeland security and homeland defense. This approach would treat homeland security as a sub-set of national security and function as another lever of national power. A link between ES and HS exists, but is not well substantiated. ES is a cornerstone of NS and the link is well documented in the literature. Describing HS as the operational embodiment of NS policy suggest that they are part of the concept. Each element supports the other although to different degrees and with different outcomes. Figure 4 clarifies the linkages initially identified in Figure 3 and shows that, while the link goes both ways, ES and HS primarily support NS. Security Element Linkages Applying specific research methods allows a more detailed analysis of the literature and leads to some surprising results, and we can see that there is a complex network of interactions, complicated by outside forces. Outside Forces Economic, homeland, and national security elements do not exist in a vacuum; rather, they exist within a broader system and are shaped themselves by outside forces that provide subtle but substantial pressure. Globalization is the exchange of social and cultural ideals and the extension of economic ties between countries. It is also characterized by greater integration of other countries and cultures into the primarily western liberal perspective. This practice confuses the true importance of issues and is often politically motivated. Regional and bilateral trade initiatives need to be in place to ensure that international markets will be open to new entrants and support deeper integration among participants, 59 while bringing in allies and new partners to strengthen economic ties. Countries are entering a new era where economic-driven governance is superseding that of political nation-states.

Chapter 2 : National security - Wikipedia

Economic security is a major element of national security, even as and economic strength. In America's role in the world is based on its military and economic.

In contrast, it might have different consequence, like make us think about vulnerability and even feel unsafe. In international relations security is understood differently, many of us could probably imagine army, tanks and bombs when thought about state security. Military power is definitely very important source of security in international relations but it is not the only one. Military power is a result of coherent security system, which includes military, economic, political, environmental and nowadays even virtual security. The relation between these sources of security is akin, and to understand how the whole system works it is necessary to understand each source individually. Military power is definitely the most powerful source of power. It uses direct aggression and brutality; it is probably the simplest way to get rid of your enemies but probably not the smartest one, as it always requires victims of your own. From the emergence of human, until now military power is widely used, changed only the number of fighters, goals and the arsenal. There were times when horses were great advantage against your enemies. Horses helped to conquer half of the world for Alexander the Great, for Mongolians to create the largest empire in the world, but people were improving. Humans were fighting with swords and muskets and victims were calculated in thousands or hundreds of thousands, but not millions. But times have changed and weapons drastically changed. This was largely due to Industrial Revolution. International theories began to spread such as Realism or Liberalism. These theories apply different approaches and according to them states might maintain self-security and peace differently. Eriksson, Realism attaches particular importance to military power. Simply said, one says that it is enough to have sufficient amount of military resources, while other, that constant increase in military is the only way to guarantee security. United States military expenditure accounts for nearly half of the whole world spending. It is obvious that USA takes the offensive realism politics. Moreover, America is not only interested in self-secure, it clearly demonstrates its hegemony in the international political arena. Pretended with the theory of offensive Realism removing the possible treats it started the Iraq war. This war is nothing else, but the American invasion in the Middle East, and the main aim of this invasion is to profit. Such position was just a pretext to start a war and occupy the country rich in oil: Second, but certainly no less important source of security is economic security. Also wars itself always requires major economic resources, an example of that could be World War I, after such a huge military intervention Europe never recovered to the pre war greatness. But wars could not only lead to recession, in case of United States it might also cause the economic boom as it strongly enriched in both world wars. Harris, Economic power may not only help to increase military power it might also work as a weapon against the enemy. There are many examples, like American sanctions to Iran, which started in when Americans forbid to Shan of Iraq to enter the USA for medical treatment, as a result Iranians held a terrorist attack on American Embassy and responding to this America freeze huge amount of Iranian tangible assets. Askari , 70 It reminds an indirect war. The best example of economic blockade in today world is North Korea, which is practically isolated by the international community and trades only with China. It might be thought that economic sanctions might stop or prevent the aggression in both internal and external levels, but according to H. Askari this does not prevent the combativeness, according to him, as an example could be Japan invasion in Manchuria, Italy invasion to Abyssinia and etc. Economic sanctions sometimes are a good way to achieve the desired results against other states without pursue of power, however it may cause the suffer of innocent people, it might also make damage for third countries as well as cause increasing unemployment. According to Realism, state may only profit in advance of others. Liberal approach pays special attention to cooperation between states and affirms that such regime may guarantee benefits and economical stability-security to every participant. The best example of that could be European Union which includes the most important Liberalist components; juridical equality, democracy, liberty, and most importantly to free market. The EU is an economic organization, which connects all the states together for each gain, however this does not preclude competition between states. Decreasing fees, what would attract

foreign investors, might also led to the same result. Buzan political security could be defined as organizational stability of the state. In other words political security is an interaction between states at the organizational level. International politics is very complicated in the anarchical world where self-interest is the most important factor. Buzan, Waever, Wilde In general there is no clear definition of political security, everyone might interpret it in a different way as everyone sees that from different prospective. It might only be stated that politics play huge role in power policy. Environmental issues are also a type of security According to Buzan, Waever and Wilde, environmental security is the existence of two different agenda: The scientific agenda has to meet academic standards, while political agenda could be shaped by governmental, media or public standards. For instance, if scientists threatening us with the skin cancer due to problems with ozone layer, it only helps from the point that we know the issue, and we can protect ourselves, but it does not affect the main problem. The conferences about environmental issues and the desire of all states together may only affect the main cause. Buzan, Looking from the different angle, geographical conditions, such as water or mountains or swamps, could help prevent enemies or at least minimize the possible threats. In ancient history good territorial situation was the key to the victory. As the weapons changed it does not play such a huge role anymore, but the advantage is visible. However, looking back at history, sometimes even positive geographical conditions cannot help to prevent disaster. For example, when Napoleon crossed Alps and concurred the Rome in the 19th century. Living in 21st century makes us think not only about self-security, but also about the security of our personal data. Internet is widely used today, and prospective show that it will only spread in the future. This type of security is important not only for individuals. Eriksson, 7 In conclusion, military power is the main, but not the only source of power in International Relations. Military, economic and political securities are a coherent system, which could not properly function without any of these elements. Environmental issues should be important to all of the states, as the damage would affect the whole world. Virtual security is the new type of security in International Politics arena. It has just begun its way in global international world, but it might be predicted that in the future it will become one of the main sources of security. All in all Military power is not the only source of security in International Relations; moreover, history shows that new security sources are rising. Frankel, B , Realism: Restatements and Renewal, London, Frank Cass. Trend and Transformation, Belmont, Cengage Learning.

Chapter 3 : Power (international relations) - Wikipedia

Start taking away the fundamental building blocks of the international order, particularly American military power, and the results are all but certain to be major instability, increased conflict rates, rapid proliferation of nuclear weapons, economic dislocation and, ultimately, serious and growing threats to security at home.

Military security In practice, national security is associated primarily with managing physical threats and with the military capabilities used for doing so. Most states, such as South Africa and Sweden, [14] [10] configure their military forces mainly for territorial defence; others, such as France, Russia, the UK and the US, [15] [16] [11] [12] invest in higher-cost expeditionary capabilities , which allow their armed forces to project power and sustain military operations abroad. **Economic security** Economic security, in the context of international relations , is the ability of a nation state to maintain and develop the national economy, without which other dimensions of national security cannot be managed. In larger countries, strategies for economic security expect to access resources and markets in other countries, and to protect their own markets at home. Developing countries may be less secure than economically advanced states due to high rates of unemployment and underpaid work. **Environmental security** Ecological security, also known as environmental security, refers to the integrity of ecosystems and the biosphere , particularly in relation to their capacity to sustain a diversity of life-forms including human life. The security of ecosystems has attracted greater attention as the impact of ecological damage by humans has grown. The scope and nature of environmental threats to national security and strategies to engage them are a subject of debate. These include global environmental problems such as climate change due to global warming , deforestation , and loss of biodiversity. These include resource scarcities leading to local conflict, such as disputes over water scarcity in the Middle East ; migration into the United States caused by the failure of agriculture in Mexico ; [1]: These include acts of war that degrade or destroy ecosystems. **Energy security** Resources include water, sources of energy, land and minerals. Availability of adequate natural resources is important for a nation to develop its industry and economic power. For example, in the Persian Gulf War of , Iraq captured Kuwait partly in order to secure access to its oil wells, and one reason for the US counter-invasion was the value of the same wells to its own economy. The interrelations between security, energy, natural resources, and their sustainability is increasingly acknowledged in national security strategies and resource security is now included among the UN Sustainable Development Goals. **Computer security** Computer security , also known as cybersecurity or IT security, refers to the security of computing devices such as computers and smartphones, as well as computer networks such as private and public networks, and the Internet. It concerns the protection of hardware, software, data, people, and also the procedures by which systems are accessed, and the field has growing importance due to the increasing reliance on computer systems in most societies. **Infrastructure security** seeks to limit vulnerability of these structures and systems to sabotage , terrorism , and contamination. There are also commercial transportation security units such as the Amtrak Police in the United States. Critical infrastructure is vital for the essential functioning of a country. Incidental or deliberate damage can have a serious impact on the economy and essential services. Some of the threats to infrastructure include: In the November Mumbai attacks , the Mumbai central station and hospital were deliberately targeted, for example. Cyberattacks on Estonia and cyberattacks during the South Ossetia war are examples. Issues in national security[edit] Consistency of approach[edit] The dimensions of national security outlined above are frequently in tension with one another. The high cost of maintaining large military forces places a burden on the economic security of a nation. Unilateral security action by states can undermine political security at an international level if it erodes the rule of law and undermines the authority of international institutions. The invasion of Iraq in and the annexation of Crimea in have been cited as examples. If tensions such as these are not managed effectively, national security policies and actions may be ineffective or counterproductive. National versus transnational security[edit] Increasingly, national security strategies have begun to recognise that nations cannot provide for their own security without also developing the security of their regional and international context. Some argue that the principal beneficiary of national security policy should be the nation

state itself, which should centre its strategy on protective and coercive capabilities in order to safeguard itself in a hostile environment and potentially to project that power into its environment, and dominate it to the point of strategic supremacy. For example, the rights and liberties of citizens are affected by the use of military personnel and militarised police forces to control public behaviour; the use of surveillance including mass surveillance in cyberspace ; military recruitment and conscription practices; and the effects of warfare on civilians and civil infrastructure. This has led to a dialectical struggle, particularly in liberal democracies , between government authority and the rights and freedoms of the general public. The National Security Agency harvests personal data across the internet. Even where the exercise of national security is subject to good governance and the rule of law , a risk remains that the term national security may be become a pretext for suppressing unfavorable political and social views. In the US, for example, the controversial USA Patriot Act of , and the revelation by Edward Snowden in that the National Security Agency harvests the personal data of the general public , brought these issues to wide public attention. Among the questions raised are whether and how national security considerations at times of war should lead to the suppression of individual rights and freedoms, and whether such restrictions are necessary when a state is not at war.

overwhelming fighting force and combine it with economic power and leadership in global affairs to bring to bear far greater resources than any other country against any threat to the nation's security.

Chairman, Ranking Member Reed, and members of the committee: My aim today will be to clarify the geopolitical situation we face in the early 21st century, the challenges and opportunities that are likely to arise going forward, and the grand strategy concerns of the United States that derive from these. Maintaining an open global economic system is vital to continued American prosperity. Maintaining a stable geopolitical order is vital to continued American security. And promoting values of freedom and self-determination worldwide is a critical element of these two missions. These realities are still the basis of American foreign policy and national strategy today. While there are many disagreements about how these principles should be translated into policy, and while some Americans seek to turn their backs on the difficult tasks of global engagement, on the whole, the commitment to the principles of liberal world order building that have framed American foreign policy since the Truman administration continues to shape our thinking today. As the world becomes more integrated economically, and as new threats like cyberwar and jihadi terrorism combine with old fashioned geopolitical challenges to create a more dangerous environment, this postwar American foreign policy tradition is more important than ever, but we must think long and hard about how we address our vital interests in an increasingly turbulent and dynamic world. The question before us today is whether we can continue to afford and manage the global commitments this policy requires. If, as I believe, the answer is that we can, we must then address questions of strategy. How do we harness the means we possess to secure the ends we seek, what priorities do we need to establish, what capabilities do we need to cultivate, and to what allies can we look for help as we seek to promote a peaceful and prosperous world amid the challenges of the 21st century? We can begin by examining some of the advantages and disadvantages that the United States and its allies have as we consider how to adapt a 20th century strategy to the needs of the contemporary world. At the most basic level, one of the chief disadvantages facing the U. Militarily, whenever the United States innovates to gain an advantage, others quickly mimic our developments. It is not enough for us to be ahead today; we have to continue to innovate so we are ready for tomorrow and the day after. The liberal capitalist order that the United States supports and promotes is an engine of revolutionary change in world affairs. The economic and technological progress that has so greatly benefitted America also introduces new and complicating factors into world politics. The rise of China was driven by the American-led information technology revolution that made global supply chains possible and by the Anglo-American development of an open international economic system that enabled China to participate on equal terms. In this way, American foreign policy is like a video game in which the player keeps advancing to new and more challenging levels. This means that simply in order to perform at the same level, the United States needs to keep upping its game, reforming its institutions, improving its strategies, and otherwise preparing itself to address more complex and challenging issues—often at a faster pace than before, and with higher penalties for getting things wrong. The world of Islamic jihad, for instance, has been transformed by both the adaptation of information technology and adaptation to previous American victories. In the world of international geopolitics, Russia has also made much of information control and its current leadership possesses a keen eye for the weaknesses of American-fostered successes such as the European Union. This has corrosive, follow-on effects on the social fabric of nations like France, Italy, and Spain. Scotland or Catalonia are likely to strain them even more going forward. Finally, prospects for European adaptation to the 21st century tech economy are dimmer than one would like. Since the Great Recession, the European members of NATO cut the equivalent of the entire German military budget from their combined defense expenditures. More broadly, the international security system promoted by the United States is based on two principles, alliance and deterrence, that greatly amplify our military capacity—and which we have undermined in recent years. Our alliances allow us to do more with less; they also repress competition between our allies. For instance, mutual alliances with America help to keep Japanese-South Korean tensions in check today just as the American presence helped France and

Germany establish closer relations based on mutual trust in the past. Deterrence is key to the alliance system and also to minimizing the loss of U. Recent events in the Middle East demonstrate what happens when alliances fray and deterrence loses its force. Iranian and Russian adventurism across the region has undermined the confidence of American allies and increased the risks of war. American allies, like Saudi Arabia, who fear American abandonment, have grown increasingly insecure. Saudi freelancing in Syria and Yemen may lead to great trouble down the road; Riyadh is not institutionally equipped to take on the burdens it is attempting to shoulder. Another significant disadvantage facing U. As we get further and further from the circumstances in which many of these institutions were founded, they grow more unwieldy, but for similar reasons, nations who were more powerful then than now grow more deeply opposed to change. Meanwhile, many of our domestic institutions relating to foreign policy are not well structured for the emerging challenges. From the educational institutions that prepare Americans for careers in international affairs and that provide basic education about world politics to many more to large organizations like the State Department, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Pentagon, the core institutions on which we need to rely are not well suited to the tasks they face. In the Cold War era, the challenges were relatively easy to understand, even if developing policies to deal with the threats was often hard. Today, the policy challenges are no less difficult, but the threats themselves are more diverse. A revanchist Russia, competing radical Sunni and Shia jihadist movements, and a rising China all represent important challenges, but they cannot be addressed in the same way or with the same tools. In spite of these serious disadvantages and problems, the United States is much better positioned than any other country to maintain, defend, extend and improve the international system in the 21st century. We should be sober about the tremendous challenges facing us, but we should not be pessimistic. We cannot do everything, and we will not do everything right, but we can be more right, more often than our adversaries. The United States remains an adaptable society that embraces change, likes innovation, and adjusts to new realities with enthusiasm and often, an eye to enlightened self-interest. Indeed, in many ways, these truisms are more true now than ever. We remain on the cutting edge of technological development. We possess a tremendous resource base with energy, agriculture, and mineral wealth that can rival any nation on earth. Hydraulic fracturing and horizontal well drilling have fundamentally transformed the American energy landscape overnight. Oil production is up 75 percent since , and new supplies of shale gas have millions of Americans heating their homes cheaply each winter. In , the U. Energy policy debates have shifted from issues of scarcity to those of abundance: Do we sell LNG abroad? End the ban on crude oil exports? These are good problems to have. We have friendly, resource-rich neighbors; Canada is a rising power with enormous potential, and Mexico and many other countries in Latin America have made substantial progress. The United States has an unprecedented network of alliances that gives us unmatched global reach and resilience. Likewise, only two of the top fifteen military spenders are not friendly to the U. Largely, we have the kind of friends one hopes to have. Moreover, the world can see that The United States stands for something more than its own power and wealth. The democratic ideals we honor even if we do not always succeed in living up to them resonate far beyond our frontiers. The bedrock belief of American society that every woman and every man possesses an innate and inalienable dignity, and our commitment to ground our institutions and our laws on that truth inspire people around the world. This American heritage gives us a unique ability to reach out to people in every land and to work together to build a more peaceful and prosperous world. Thankfully, the American system is often smarter and more capable than the people in office at any given time. American power today rests on strong foundations. The United States, in association with its growing and dynamic global alliance system, is better placed than any other country or combination of countries to shape the century that lies before us. In Asia, a large group of countries want the same kind of future we do: In Europe, despite some quarrels and abrasions, our longstanding allies have worked together to build the kind of zone of democratic, peaceful prosperity that the U. It offers us the chance to work together with partners who share our belief in rule of law and human rights. And fortunately, the fixes that our relationships with European nations need are relatively cheap, easy, and even pleasant: Perhaps the biggest opportunity in the 21st century is not geopolitical, however, but economic and social. The tech revolution has the potential to boost standards of human happiness and prosperity as much as the Industrial Revolution did. It

will likely give our grandchildren a higher standard of living than most of us today can imagine. We should not underestimate either the extent of this coming transformation, or the enormous power it has to make our lives better. Take, for instance, the environment: The information service-driven economy is rising even as the manufacturing economy becomes less environmentally problematic and shrinks as a portion of the total economy. From telework to autonomous cars, innovations are likely to cut down on emissions in the new economy, even while improving standards of living across the world. The information economy will be more prosperous, more environmentally friendly, and more globally interconnected than what came before it. Filled with opportunity as it is, the new century also contains threats: The United States government itself is not exempt from this problem; whether one looks at the Pentagon, the Department of Homeland Security or the State Department one sees organizations seeking to carry out 21st-century missions with 20th or even 19th-century bureaucratic structures and practices. Additionally, the United States faces a challenge of strategy. While the United States has enough resources to advance its vital interests in world affairs, it does not have the money, the military power, the know how or the willpower to address every problem, intervene in every dispute, or to dissipate its energies in futile pursuits. The United States faces an array of conventional and unconventional threats, as well as several systemic dangers. Our three principal conventional challengers are China, Russia, and Iran. All aim to revise the current global geopolitical order to some extent. In the years to come, we must expect that revisionist powers will continue to challenge the existing status quo in various ways. Meanwhile, we are also confronted by an array of unconventional threats. Despite the fondest hopes of many Americans, Sunni jihadism has not proven to be a passing phase or fringe movement. Al-Qaeda was more resourceful and ambitious than the previous generation of radical salafi groups; its Mesopotamian offshoot AQIM was still more effective; today, ISIS has leaped ahead to develop capabilities and nourish ambitions that earlier jihadi groups saw only in their dreams. Unfortunately, the radical movements have lost inhibitions as they gained capacities. Wholesale slaughter, enslavement, barbaric and spectacular forms of execution: This movement could become significantly more dangerous before it begins to burn out. Yet radical jihadis may well prove to be less of a threat than the emerging dangers of the cybersphere. Cyber conflict is a new arena of action, one in which non-state, quasi-state and state actors are all present. With almost every day bringing stories of utterly lamentable failures of American cyber security, it must be clearly said that the U. But problems like these are pinpricks compared to the damage that cyber war can cause. Not only can industrial sabotage disrupt vital systems, including military command and control systems as well as, for example, the utilities on which millions of Americans depend for their daily necessities, cyberwar can be waged anonymously. Threats of retaliation lose their deterrent power when the attacker is unknown. Worse, the potential for destabilizing first strikes by cyber attacks will complicate the delicate balance of terror, and leaders could find themselves propelled into conflict.

Chapter 5 : 13 Key Pros and Cons of Military Spending | ConnectUS

Recognized as a "whole of government" doctrinal reference standard by military, national security and government professionals around the world, SMARTbooks comprise a strong comprehensive professional library designed with all levels of Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, Marines and Civilians in mind.

The money allocated for the defense budget is used to purchase sophisticated weapons that often do not make it into production, but when they do, they are just too expensive to maintain. However, military spending has become a hot topic during debates in many years now, where some people suggest of cutting it, while others are okay with increasing it. To come up with a good decision on our end for this matter, let us take a look at its pros and cons.

List of Pros of Military Spending

1. It is used for important military matters. It is used to pay the training, health care and salaries of civilian and uniformed personnel; maintain arms, equipment and facilities; to fund operations; and to develop and buy new equipment. It allocates a certain amount for emergency and supplemental spending. The invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq were largely financed through supplementary spending bills that are outside the federal budget and are also not included in the military budget figures. It is useful in deterring foreign threats. Even though the Cold War is over and the threat from the Soviet Union is already eliminated, the country is still facing threats from smaller rogue nations, such as Iraq, Iran, North Korea, Libya, Cuba, Syria and Sudan. It makes military preparation efficient. It is critical to keep the military forces ready to fight and quickly win. The fund is used for this purpose, especially for major regional wars that could happen at the same time. Remember that readiness will decline if funds are not increased for training and equipment. It supports peacekeeping in foreign regions. There are several long-term demands on US troops from other regions, such as for peacekeeping in the Balkans for example. It prevents recruitment and retention issues. The armed services in the country have been facing problems with the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel due to low benefits and pays. This can be avoided with sufficient budget for the military. It can keep defense factories operational. Increasing military spending will enable struggling defense contractors to keep their factories operational and retain jobs at military bases. It is spent to ensure national security.

List of Cons of Military Spending

For the opponents, they also have several reasons why we should not put too much focus on military spending, even suggesting cuts. Its share to global military spending is already too big. Moreover, the US spends 18 times the combined military budgets of the rogue nations. It is used to fund unrealistic wars. As opponents said, the current 2-war strategy is unrealistic, considering that the country is fighting two simultaneous wars with no help from the allies. It may support the rhetoric about readiness that may not reflect reality accurately. It is not balanced with foreign aid and diplomacy. If foreign aid and diplomacy budgets were more balanced with military spending, there would be a better chance to prevent conflict and avoid military involvement. Also, let us remember that national security means more than military power. So, to sustain a secure nation, federal spending must be balanced among military defense, economic security, healthcare, education and job training. It might be used irresponsibly. Enlisted men and women who are having difficulties in supporting their families should receive a fair wage, adequate healthcare and housing.

Conclusion

Military budgets are only one of the many gauges of military power. Now, policymakers have been debating whether the level of military spending is appropriate, considering the increasingly constrained budgets and the winding down of wars in other countries. Taking all the context of this article into consideration, are you a supporter or an opponent of military spending?