

<http://www.airpower.au.af.mil/home.htm>

*We encourage you to e-mail your comments to us at [aspj@maxwell.af.mil](mailto:aspj@maxwell.af.mil). We reserve the right to edit your remarks.*

### **BEDDOWN OPTIONS FOR AIR NATIONAL GUARD C-27J AIRCRAFT**

Mr. John Conway's article "Beddown Options for Air National Guard C-27J Aircraft: Supporting Domestic Response" (Summer 2010) speaks to a bigger issue we could resolve with a transformational organizational shift within the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In a post-Cold War, post-11 September 2001, post-Katrina environment, we should model the Army / National Guard and Air Force / Air National Guard pairings after the model of the Navy / Coast Guard. By doing this, the National Guard and Air National Guard would each elevate to the status of separate services but simultaneously move from the DOD to the DHS. With this move, there would obviously be a shift in roles and missions, which would generate changes in force structure. However, within the Air Force, for example, you could still leverage the concepts of Total Force Integration to continue operating similar equipment (C-130s and remotely piloted aircraft come to mind) with the now-partnered DOD/DHS units. This move to the DHS would leave the Army and Air Force with active duty and reserves within the DOD (both of which are Title 10-funded components). It would also unite the National Guard, Air National Guard, and Coast Guard under the DHS for homeland security roles and missions such as augmenting border patrol and counternarcotics units; conducting search and rescue; and handling oil spills, hurricanes, and other national disaster responses. The "guards" are less encumbered with posse comitatus legal restrictions and are better suited for these roles than the active duty forces, but the current organizational construct of keeping them as components (and not services) within the DOD inhibits their ability to better serve in these roles.

**Lt Col John M. Fair, USAF**  
*Charleston AFB, South Carolina*

### **BEDDOWN OPTIONS FOR AIR NATIONAL GUARD C-27J AIRCRAFT: THE AUTHOR RESPONDS**

The idea of transitioning the Air Guard and Army Guard into Coast Guard-like organizations, separate from the Air Force and Army, merits serious consideration. However, one must remember that the Coast Guard has a unique peacetime mission (transitioning to the Navy only in wartime), while the Air Guard and Army Guard—currently focused on overseas combat operations—play key roles in future war plans. To extract them from the war-planning process and—as a direct consequence—the budgetary process stemming from it would reduce their ability to acquire and maintain equipment, coordinate training, and seamlessly integrate into Air Force and Army structures in time of war.

Although there must be more focus on military support to civil authorities (MSCA), the Air Force and Army simply are not organized to divest themselves of the National Guard in order to have the Guard support a still-evolving mission (MSCA).

**Col John Conway, USAF, Retired**  
*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

### **THE ART OF PERSUASION**

As someone who has worked as a journalist, proposal writer, and corporate communications professional, I can only applaud Capt Lori Katowich's tips to contributing writers in "The Art of Persuasion" (Summer 2010). Her guidance is both elegant and universal—remove the publication-specific references and the advice translates to anyone who wants to persuade. I've practiced the essence of these tips as guidelines for more than 20 years and have found what she wrote to be valuable, effective, and, unfortunately, frequently ignored. I recommend this column as required reading for every new contributor—or at least the ones I would agree with. Thank you.

**Lance Martin**  
*Waco, Texas*

## SHOULD THE UNITED STATES MAINTAIN THE NUCLEAR TRIAD?

In his article “Should the United States Maintain the Nuclear Triad?” (*ASPJ-English*, Summer 2010; *ASPJ-Chinese*, Spring 2010), Dr. Adam Lowther concludes that since the effectiveness of US deterrence and extended deterrence continues to depend on a strong and enduring nuclear triad, “weakening the nuclear triad is unwise” (*ASPJ-English*, p. 28).

We understand that revisiting US deterrence policy is necessitated by changes in the international environment. After the Cold War, nontraditional security threats emerged and became the focal point of US policy. Dr. Lowther acknowledges these environmental changes yet has no intention of proposing adjustments to traditional deterrence theory. All he does is reinterpret the old theory under the new environmental parameters and reach the same old conclusion. This prompts me to probe the foundation of traditional deterrence theory, which evolved in the 1960s to the point of mutual assured destruction (MAD). Based on classic economics, the theory presupposes independent entities engaging in international relationships, exercising rational self-restraint, and building and maintaining law and order by maximizing self-interest and game playing. Nourished by classic economics, the MAD theory gains its persuasive power. Meanwhile, however, the same theory appears very rigid in that it rejects changes in environmental parameters that might affect the assumptions upon which it is based. In other words, MAD theory assumes that international relationships have been and remain dominated by the instinctive tendency of nation-state game players to defend their self-interests. Thus, it is not surprising that Dr. Lowther, though seeing the same environmental-parameter changes as nuclear abolitionists, is not able to provide a solution that addresses the impact of such changes.

Interestingly, Dr. Lowther also cites Francis Fukuyama’s famous argument that Western liberal democracy played a vital role in winning the Cold War (*ASPJ-English*, p. 25). Readers would have benefited more had Dr. Lowther gone one step further and compared

this argument with MAD theory—as well as addressed how the current US nuclear-deterrence policy could be reshaped accordingly. Indeed, the fast-changing world is forcing people to take a new look at a number of political theories built on classic economics. Analysts try to choose between physical hard power or faith as the determinant of a nation’s behavior and relationship with other countries. Consequently, when discussing nuclear deterrence, one must keep in mind that many people attribute the collapse of the Soviet Union to the power of faith rather than that of physical strength.

**Zhang Xinjun**

*Tsinghua University, Beijing, China*

Dr. Adam Lowther’s excellent article clearly and concisely presents a solid explanation of why our nuclear triad strategy was developed and why we need to maintain it to ensure the continued security of the United States. I have been deeply concerned for a long time about what is clearly a denuclearization shift in our military strategy and do not understand why a very serious debate about the dubious merits of what is, essentially, disarmament is not being heard. I am grateful to see Dr. Lowther and *Air and Space Power Journal* bring the discussion out into the open.

Experience shows that whenever the cost and risk of engaging in “bad actions” are reduced, the result is that more such actions are undertaken. That is why, for example, we have ramped up security for air travel. Although the number of people who might want to hijack or destroy a plane has not changed, increased security has significantly increased the cost and risk that prospective hijackers now face, leading to far fewer actual hijacking attempts.

The nuclear triad has been an effective deterrent for decades, and the need for it has clearly not disappeared. In fact, one can easily make the case that both the danger of an attack on the United States and the number of organizations desiring to undertake such an attack have increased.

With this in mind, Dr. Lowther’s message needs to reach as many of the American people as possible so they can understand what is



at stake and start asking our leaders why we are following such a very dangerous path.

**Frank J. Hannaford**  
*Omaha, Nebraska*

### A CYBER PROVING GROUND

In addition to the excellent points laid out by Lt Col Kristal Alfonso in “A Cyber Proving Ground: The Search for Cyber Genius” (Spring 2010), I would add two of my own. First, there is evidence that a large part of success comes not from innate genius but simply from time spent doing a task.

For example, Malcolm Gladwell’s book *Outliers: The Story of Success* (Little, Brown, 2008) posits the “10,000-hour rule”—that one of the keys to success in any field is spending a large amount of time actively working in that field. Therefore, to truly develop and nurture cyber geniuses, military personnel should be spending a lot more time in the cyber world than they currently do—10,000 hours is almost three-and-a-half years’ worth of eight-hour days.

Second, given that developing cyber skills requires only a computer and access to the Internet (which may be the ultimate “cyber proving ground”) and that the United States has only a small fraction of the world’s population, it is highly unlikely that many of the future “cyber geniuses” will be Americans, due to simple demographics.

**Brian Weeden**  
*Montreal, Canada*

### IMPROVING COST-EFFECTIVENESS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

I would like to thank Col Drew Miller for his thought-provoking article “Improving Cost-Effectiveness in the Department of Defense” (Spring 2010). The critical thinking and focused decision-making tools he describes are important for any leader—not only when considering cost-effectiveness but also when making any critical decision.

**Col Lee A. Flint, USAF**  
*Osan AB, South Korea*

### A PERFECT STORM OVER NUCLEAR WEAPONS

In April 2009, Pres. Barack Obama announced that the United States would strive for “a world without nuclear weapons.”\* This announcement, viewed widely as a major change to US nuclear-deterrence policy, received both support and opposition in the United States. **Vice Adm Robert Monroe’s** article “A Perfect Storm over Nuclear Weapons” (*ASPJ-English*, Fall 2009; *ASPJ-Chinese*, Winter 2009) expresses a clear objection to that policy.

According to this article, **US nuclear deterrence** played a vital role during the Cold War and contributed to the collapse of the Soviet Union. **However, after two decades of unannounced “nuclear freeze,” the US nuclear arsenal** has gravely deteriorated. Meanwhile, global efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation have experienced repeated setbacks, with more states joining the nuclear club and more non-state actors seeking access to nuclear weapons. In this regard, the article is correct in raising our awareness about the reality of such threats.

On the other hand, the United States still retains the most powerful nuclear capability in the world. People therefore have reason to wonder if the US nuclear-deterrent capability is largely disproportionate to the real threat it faces today. Is it really necessary for the United States to maintain and upgrade its massive nuclear arsenal? While the United States was adjusting its nuclear policy, the world also saw the US military stepping up its conventional-deterrence capabilities in all domains. The trial launch of the X-37B space plane is only the latest example. Thus, people have more reasons to believe that “a world without nuclear weapons,” as proposed by the current US president, is based on the United States’ efforts to further upgrade its overall deterrence capacity and therefore represents a higher level of strategy to cope with “a perfect storm over nuclear weapons.”

**Niu Yinjian**  
*Shanghai, China*

---

\*Barack Obama, “Remarks by President Barack Obama,” Office of the Press Secretary, White House, 5 April 2009, [http://www.whitehouse.gov/the\\_press\\_office/Remarks-By-President-Barack-Obama-In-Prague-As-Delivered](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-By-President-Barack-Obama-In-Prague-As-Delivered).