Naval War College Review

Volume 49
Number 4 *Autumn*

Article 14

1996

Ballistic Missile Defense in the Post-Cold War Era

Dale K. Pace

David B.H. Denoon

by the Congress, the executive branch, and the press. They are written by, respectively, James M. Lindsay, professor of political science, University of Iowa; Jane E. Holl, executive director of the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict; and Andrew Kohut, director of the Times Mirror Center for the People and the Press, with his associate, Robert C. Toth. Lindsay's "Congress and the Use of Force in the Post–Cold War Era" is the most complete and readable chapter on the subject that has recently appeared in print.

The book's weakness stems from its having been edited anonymously. While Bruce Berkowitz of the Aspen Strategy Group composed a useful introduction (indeed, the key to selecting other chapters to read), no editorial responsibility has been assigned. One result, among others, is that there are glaring inconsistencies across the chapters, even in such straightforward issues as agreement on terminology. For example, the essay by Richard Haass, "Military Intervention: A Taxonomy of Challenges and Responses," forces the reader to warp backward in time to when "peacemaking" meant imposing peace and the term "peace enforcement" did not exist. Haass maintains a death-grip on the old terminology, even though the military, most analysts, and other government departments have adopted the language introduced by Secretary General of the United Nations Boutros Boutros-Ghali in his 1992 pamphlet *An Agenda for Peace*. He even cites Boutros-Ghali and offers an analytical footnote explaining why he refuses to adopt Boutros-Ghali's terminology. An engaged editor would have resolved this problem of language, which will confuse those readers who are not versed in the fine points of the debate over "peacemaking" as a purely diplomatic activity and "peace enforcement" as the use of force to establish and maintain a state of peace.

Presumably an editor would also have established quality control over the material. Some articles are riddled with typographical errors, while others are proofed, parsed, and punctuated perfectly. Most of all, an editor would have appreciated the great contribution a bibliography would have made to the appeal of the book—it is not a difficult exercise.

Three essays at the end of the book provide contemporary insights about the British, French, and Russian perspectives on intervention. Of the three, Sergei Karaganov's "Military Force and International Relations in the Post–Cold War Environment: A View from Russia" is by far the most enlightening. It is also the only essay that remotely considers the conditions under which nuclear weapons might be used, which in itself is food for thought. However, one is left to puzzle why such essays were included, given the title and orientation of the book.

The United States and the Use of Force in the Post–Cold War Era offers a useful roundup and generally evenhanded discussion of the key aspects of intervention. However, to obtain a more detailed and less abstract grip on the central issues, one should read *U.S. Intervention Policy for the Post–Cold War World: New Challenges and New Responses*, edited by Arnold Kanter and Linton F. Brooks, published in 1994 by W.W. Norton & Co., New York.

ROGER W. BARNETT
Naval War College
Newport, Rhode Island

Denoon, David B.H. *Ballistic Missile Defense in the Post–Cold War Era*. New York: Westview, 1995. 230pp. $55

Dr. Denoon, a professor of politics and economics at New York University, discusses

the complex issues of U.S. ballistic missile defense policy, tracing its evolution from the beginning of the Cold War to the post–Cold War era. Denoon's past responsibilities as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense enable him to provide insight and perspective into issues that in other books are sometimes lacking. Readers seeking a comprehensive understanding of this subject will find this work helpful.

In the first part of the book, Denoon provides a convenient, terse synopsis of the early history of ballistic missile defense. He explains how the concept of deterrence based upon "mutually assured destruction" (MAD) precluded the maturation of ballistic missile defenses during the Cold War, by a confluence of interests among the defense contractors who were building U.S. strategic offensive systems, the Defense Department bureaucracy, and academic defense specialists committed to arms control.

In the second part of the book, the author reviews the ballistic missile threat to the United States and its interests. He discusses how the Persian Gulf War helped to renew interest in ballistic missile defense (which has waned in the mid-1990s) and goes on to address both theater missile and national missile defense. Denoon treats ballistic missile defense as insurance against catastrophe and suggests ways to determine whether its value as protector will outweigh the cost of procurement. He recognizes that deployment of substantial missile defenses by the United States will require changes in political, economic, arms control, and industrial policies as well as in military doctrine and strategy.

It surprised this reviewer that a contemporary book covering such breadth of material would be published without an index, limiting its value as a convenient reference. Also, the attention and space given to discussion of the Patriot performance in the Gulf war seem at odds with the policy focus of the rest of the book.

Readers familiar with the technical aspects of ballistic missile defense will find value in the book's perspective on the motivation and rationale of both the proponents and opponents of such defenses, while those interested in national security policy will appreciate its succinct and balanced summary of the issues and their evolution.

DALE K. PACE
The Johns Hopkins University
Applied Physics Laboratory

Sagan, Scott D. and Waltz, Kenneth N. *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1995. 136pp. $16.95

Should we welcome or fear the spread of nuclear weapons? This is the question posed by Waltz and Sagan in this book, organized as a debate on the probable consequences of nuclear proliferation. Kenneth Waltz is a "nuclear optimist," while Scott Sagan is the "nuclear pessimist." Each author presents his arguments about the meaning of nuclear proliferation for future world politics in two wide-ranging essays. Also included is a set of rebuttal essays in which Waltz and Sagan respond to each other's criticisms, identify areas of agreement, and discuss their disagreements.

Waltz uses neo-realist assumptions and concepts to support his conclusion that the spread of nuclear weapons will deter their use in the future. He believes that fear of a devastating nuclear reprisal will act as a major restraint on would-be aggressors. To support his position, Waltz discusses the increased deterrent value of small second-strike forces as new nuclear weapons states build and