

1987

American Defense Annual, 1985-1986

Paul R. Schratz

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

Recommended Citation

Schratz, Paul R. (1987) "American Defense Annual, 1985-1986," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 40 : No. 1 , Article 15.
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol40/iss1/15>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu.

the Third World may require multiple carrier employments because geography or political conditions may necessitate independent U.S. actions without access to forces based in allied nations. Would a 12-carrier program still be sufficient to meet such contingencies while simultaneously retaining enough forces to protect the sealanes against the Soviet Navy?

The climate for defense spending has changed significantly from a few years ago. These monographs should help readers see the nature of these changes and help stimulate thinking about how much is enough. While Kaufmann and Epstein cannot be said to provide the definitive analysis of the defense budget, they do further the debate on the best level and composition of the defense budget.

JOHNA. WALGREEN
Wheaton College
Norton, Massachusetts

Hudson, George E. and Kruzell, Joseph, eds. *American Defense Annual, 1985-1986*. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1985. 277pp. \$23, paper \$13.95

Kruzell, Joseph, ed. *American Defense Annual, 1986-1987*. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1986. 239pp. paper \$13.95

Believing that much of the public debate about defense issues is preoccupied with cost rather than policy, associates of the Mershon Center, Ohio State University, commenced

producing the *American Defense Annual* last year, the second issue appearing this spring. The goal is an authoritative annual assessment of American defense policy, a service provided by no other publication. *Military Balance* and *Strategic Survey*, published annually by the International Institute for Strategic Studies, London, do not examine U.S. policies in detail, nor does the *International Security Yearbook* published by the Georgetown University Center for Strategic and International Studies, which is worldwide in scope. The annual Brookings Institution critique of the defense budget is limited to cost trends and projections.

Since defense issues do not change dramatically each year, another objective is to find authors who will cover different phases of an issue or divergent policy views on the subject. Success under these circumstances critically depends on the contributors. In both *Annals* to date, the formula has worked well.

The 1985-1986 *Annual* offered a liberal-conservative debate on "U.S. Defense Strategy—A Debate" by Earl Ravenal and William R. Van Cleave which set the stage for much of what followed. The reviewer found the debate marred somewhat by misplaced acerbity; others may find this a useful device in order to highlight divergencies. Such diversity appears in treatment of "Strategic Forces" by Walter Slocombe in the first edition and Colin Gray in the second edition; in "The Defense Budget" by Leonard Sullivan and Lawrence Korb; in "Manpower" by

Martin Binkin; and "Personnel" by David Segal. In the 1986-1987 *Annual*, views on "U.S. Defense Strategy" by Robert Komer on the one hand, and "Seapower and Projection Forces" by Admiral Harry D. Train II on the other, are quite enlightening.

Both editions offer a wealth of information, jargon-free, backed by ample charted data and illustrations which both the professional and the amateur will find helpful. Can the editors continue to find the level of outstanding contributors necessary to provide stimulating and comprehensive views each year within an essentially rigid format? To aid in this respect, a distinguished panel of defense authorities has been added as the *Annual's* editorial board to assist in finding new issues and potential contributors. The start, to date, has been auspicious.

PAUL R. SCHRATZ
Arnold, Maryland

Valenta, Jiri and Potter, William, eds. *Soviet Decisionmaking for National Security*. Winchester, Mass.: George Allen & Unwin, 1984. 319pp. \$40, paper \$18.50

Valenta and Potter edited and contributed to a series of papers presented at a conference at the Naval Postgraduate School in 1980 which have been updated for publication. Despite the fact that the Soviet Union is a country where even the simplest things are classified, and security matters even more so, the

authors are able to make perceptive analyses of the Soviet process for arriving at national security decisions. The studies range from conceptual bureaucratic models to case studies; e.g., Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan. There are no definitive answers here, nor could there be, given the nature of the Soviet system. Nevertheless, the book marks, as the editors note, "the beginnings of wisdom." This is worthwhile reading for the serious student of Soviet affairs.

ARTHUR BEGELMAN
Arlington, Virginia

Sloss, Leon and Davis, Scott M., eds.

A Game for High Stakes: Lessons Learned in Negotiating with the Soviet Union. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1985. 180pp. \$24.95

According to Richard Pipes: "The emotionalism that surrounds the whole issue of these [nuclear] weapons transforms the process of nuclear-arms negotiation from what it ought to be—namely, matter-of-fact bargaining—into a quasi-religious ritual whose success is measured not by the results obtained but by the 'sincerity' with which it is approached." Although he did not write those words in review and criticism of the compilation of papers by Sloss and Davis, he well might have, for they accurately describe the general mindset of the contributors. The book does not offer, nor does it purport to offer, a comprehensive review of U.S.-Soviet negotiations, but sets forth