

1986

Strategic Defense: "Star Wars" in Perspective

Stephen O. Fought
U.S. Air Force

Keith B. Payne

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

Recommended Citation

Fought, Stephen O. and Payne, Keith B. (1986) "Strategic Defense: "Star Wars" in Perspective," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 39 : No. 4, Article 17.
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol39/iss4/17>

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.

deployments be touted less as population protection and more as a means of mitigating the offensive threat to "strategic" forces. The former requires a nearly leak-proof defense that is subject to technical ridicule while the latter can readily be contrasted with arms control as an alternative to reducing the Soviet threat.

The book provides a framework for analysis of the SDI as presently constructed. It does not, however, offer alternatives to the popular conception that the SDI will eventually become a "shield" against ballistic missile attack. The authors clearly view this as a difficult, vastly expensive and dangerous task, whether protecting population or military forces. While "strategic" defenses may indeed be a black hole for the United States and the Soviets, an analysis of the effects of "imperfect" defenses would have been helpful. If a limited defense can cause a potential attacker to modify his attack plans so much that confidence of success in that attack is lost (and hence it cannot rationally be launched), is not that defense worthwhile?

As an aside, this very thought-provoking and helpful work is slightly marred by the technical inaccuracies of pages 14-15, i.e., the discussion of the workings and effects of the neutral particle beam weapon are incorrect. Nevertheless, the remainder of the work is a valuable addition to the debate on strategic defense.

ANTHONY C. DIRIENZO
Major, U.S. Army

Payne, Keith B. *Strategic Defense: "Star Wars" in Perspective*. Lanham, Md.: Hamilton Press, 1986. 268pp. \$20.95 paper \$9.95

Dr. Payne produces an easily read manuscript focusing on nearly all aspects of the current American debate over the Strategic Defense Initiative, "Star Wars." As he states early in the text, where a choice had to be made between clarity and detail, he clearly opted for clarity. Still, on most issues, there is sufficient detail to back up his arguments. Similarly, his use of summary sections on each chapter allows a casual reader to absorb rapidly the general concepts presented. Given this format and several point-counterpoint tables, the book should prove useful as a classroom text.

The early chapters offer an interesting and realistic crisis scenario; background in what might loosely be termed "deterrence theory," and a good history of nuclear strategies, concepts and the pace of the arms race. Dr. Payne rejects the long-standing concept of mutual vulnerability as the basis of "stability"—for which he offers a three-level definition—because this precept may only deter the United States. His conclusion that the Soviets already reject the mutual vulnerability concept is most intriguing.

By blending the oft-cited examples of Soviet civil defense, layered defense against airbreathing forces, and preparation to expand the only existing ABM network, he leaves the reader wondering how the Soviets could possibly object to ballistic

missile defense. Yet, the question goes unanswered. This reader would have appreciated Dr. Payne making a distinction between "Space Strike Weapons" (the Soviet terminology) and SDI (as explained by the Reagan Administration); according to Payne's arguments, Soviet objection to SDI represents a contradiction to their historical pursuit of homeland defense.

Dr. Payne also makes a strong point that the regime of arms control has ignored sophisticated technical developments in Soviet offensive weapons. Specifically, he suggests that Soviet heavy ICBMs (SS-18 onward) have so changed the strategic environment that any further attempts at arms control will be futile until these prompt counterforce weapons are eliminated. Through verbiage, not laborious exchange calculations, Payne drives home his point that these prompt counterforce offensive weapons have the same net effect on strategic balance as does a ballistic missile defense; arms control advocates have ignored this essential equivalence, to their and our detriment. Payne challenges them to rethink arms control in the context of the present strategic environment and to integrate the concept of strategic defense with other aspects of national strategy. While offering several possible negotiated paths to pursue strategic defense—most of which concern modification or abrogation of the ABM Treaty—the recurring themes are those which he establishes earlier; mutual vulnerability ill serves the

United States and mutual invulnerability *ought* to benefit both the Soviets and the United States.

But, Dr. Payne offers no panacea; in fact, his pessimism is reflected by the following, "Suggesting that nuclear disarmament is the solution to the nuclear threat is like suggesting that widespread wealth is the solution to poverty." Yet, he is clearly optimistic on SDI. Throughout the book his theme is that SDI is technically feasible, "militarily" reasonable and morally appropriate as an alternative to the present state of affairs. The book is readable, even for one not studied in such weighty strategic matters, yet possesses sufficient detail to be useful to those actively involved in the public debate.

STEPHEN O. FOUGHT
Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Air Force

Cohen, Eliot A. *Citizens and Soldiers: The Dilemmas of Military Service*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1985. 227pp. \$22.50

In his important study, *Citizens and Soldiers: The Dilemmas of Military Service*, Eliot Cohen explores why the United States alone, among the Great Powers of the 20th century, has failed to settle once and for all the kind of military service it will ask of its citizens during peacetime. Since World War II, the United States has either tried or seriously considered the following methods of meeting its manpower requirements: universal service (not limited to military ser-