

1978

## "Imbalance of Power, Shifting U.S.-Soviet Military Strength," and "American and Soviet Military Trends—Since the Cuban Missile Crisis"

D. G. Clark  
*U.S. Navy*

John M. Collins

Anthony H. Cordesman

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Clark, D. G.; Collins, John M.; and Cordesman, Anthony H. (1978) ""Imbalance of Power, Shifting U.S.-Soviet Military Strength," and "American and Soviet Military Trends—Since the Cuban Missile Crisis'," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 31 : No. 1 , Article 16.  
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol31/iss1/16>

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](mailto:repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu).

The author asserts that Israel is the only force standing in the way of Soviet domination of the Middle East; yet her position, her vital role, is not appreciated by the United States. Churba demands that the United States tie itself completely to Israel who is fighting our fight for us. She is "a priceless strategic stronghold, a reliable anti-Communist bastion, an essential contingency base and a crucial link in the NATO defense posture." At any cost, Israel is a "national security bargain for America."

Why does the United States not fully appreciate the Israeli effort and her dilemma, Churba asks. Why has our policy been so muddled? The author claims that State Department, the Pentagon, and the Intelligence community are Arab oriented and anti-Israeli. He offers nothing more than his own word to substantiate these neo-McCarthyite charges. He even claims that he was dismissed as a Pentagon analyst for challenging rampant anti-Israeli bias.

The book is a compendium of assertions proclaimed as fact. One final example must suffice. Rejecting any legitimate Palestinian grievance, Churba avers that the peoples of the area have never suffered any form of injustice by Israel. Any problems are entirely their own making: "The fact that some Arabs may have suffered during the period of reestablishment of Jewish sovereignty over a part of Palestine is the direct result of a stubborn refusal to reconcile themselves to its existence."

Though myopic, Churba's book is not worthless. It affords a good example of the Zionist perspective. It is interesting reading, vibrant and committed. More importantly, it raises questions worthy of serious debate and more sophisticated analysis than the author offers.

JOSEPH P. DUNN  
Converse College

Collins, John M. and Cordesman, Anthony H., *Imbalance of Power, Shifting U.S.-Soviet Military Strength*. San Rafael, Calif.: Presidio Press, 1978. 316pp.

Collins, John M. *American and Soviet Military Trends--Since the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Washington: The Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, 1978. 496pp.

The Spring 1977 issue of this publication reviewed *United States/Soviet Military Balance: A Frame of Reference for Congress*, commending the pamphlet "for its breadth, its detail, and its brevity." Its author, John M. Collins, a Senior Specialist in National Defense at the Congressional Research Service (CRS), has now followed that 1976 effort with two more extensive studies. Only brevity has suffered. His format has evolved from handbook, to almanac, to single-volume encyclopedia. However, his style has remained that of a dispassionate observer providing facts and asking questions of his readership—the Defense and Congressional decision-makers in Washington, it is hoped. Through page after page of tables, graphs, histograms and charts, complemented perfectly by concise explanatory prose and notes, he portrays the results of years of implicit policy decisions made by explicit budgetary incisions.

*Imbalance of Power* contains data through 1976 and provides "Net Assessment Appraisals" in each section by Anthony H. Cordesman, former assistant to the Deputy Secretary of Defense and Secretary of the Defense Intelligence Board. Of the two books, it can be read the most easily and leaves the survivor with some sense of understanding. *Trends* has picked up 1977 data, lacks the "assessment" sections, and adds substantial portions covering U.S. and Soviet defense organizations and functions, along with annexes

## 108 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

stating roles and missions per Title 10 U.S. Code, SALT, Warsaw and NATO Treaties and Protocols and a most valuable index for reference work.

Senator Howard Baker introduces *Imbalance* as providing "a unique service in making available to the public the information necessary for an informed and open debate on the defense needs of this nation and its allies." Congressman John Breckenridge introduces *Trends* thus: "To permit the adverse trends of the past ten to fifteen years to continue would be tantamount to a conscious decision by the American people to allow their national independence and free institutions increasingly to be hostage to decisions made in Moscow by Soviet Communist Party leaders."

There are more similarities between these two books than one would expect, even considering the common authorship and subject matter. Paragraphs, sections and figures appear in both; yet neither acknowledges the other. In some cases, minor cosmetic editing has been done while the preponderance of the words, the paragraphing and even the titles are the same. Copyrights aside, perhaps the tale should be "told twice," once for reading and once for reference.

The curriculum at the Naval War College is built around an ideal model: that military force serves national security as the result of a linear genesis in which policy begets strategy, begets budget, begets force level, begets tactics to meet a threat. Hence forces on scene are assumed to reflect some explicit national policy and strategy. We attribute such characteristics to other nations. If the *Trends* and *Imbalance* portrayed in these two books are actually a reflection of this nation's will and its perception of the world situation, then, perhaps, the Solzhenitsyn assessment at Harvard has more substance than it has been given by its sanguine detractors. If, rather, the situation is the result of a series of ad hoc budget

changes on the margin that have reduced strength and set policy by making many strategies infeasible, then these books cannot but assist in, at best, turning the situation around and, at least, in showing the public and Congressional and Executive Branch decisionmakers the cumulative results of isolated actions.

*Imbalance of Power* is recommended reading as the best unclassified net assessment available. *Trends* is a splendid reference text that capably and creditably meets its author's stated "fourfold purpose; to

- Furnish fact,
- Outline opinions,
- Sharpen issues, and
- Stimulate debate."

Collins, with the help of CRS, has done his homework and compiled an enormous amount of data that can serve the decisionmaker very well. Furthermore, he has Socratically posed sufficient policy and strategy questions that decisionmakers can now focus on policy as an input to, rather than as a by-product of, their work.

D.G. CLARK  
Commander, U.S. Navy

Couhat, Jean Labayle, ed. *Combat Fleets of the World 1978/1979: Their Ships, Aircraft, and Armament*. Annapolis, Md.: Naval Institute Press, 1978. 652pp.

The English language edition of *Flottes de Combat*, at roughly half the price of its obvious competitor from across the channel, is a bargain. This is the second edition published here and is larger (by 77 pages) and classier than the first. The Naval Institute has a winner which should find its way to many wardrooms in many navies.

Several years ago as a young lieutenant junior grade I had the unique opportunity to live and work for 3 months aboard a French destroyer, *Du Chayla* (D 630). She was visiting the