BIGHOLLYWOOD BIGGOVERNMENT





HOME EXCLUSIVES CATEGORIES CONTRIBUTORS



The New Congress Should Include Military Spending in **Deficit Reduction**

Posted by Christopher A. Preble and Benjamin H. Friedman Nov 9th 2010 at 4:56 am in Congress, Economy, Strategy, Weapons | Comments (52)

The prospect of balancing the federal budget forces choice, threatening political truces that luxury bought. It makes us better accountants, scrutinizing investments, separating needs from wants. It sharpens debate, forcing government agencies and their backers to remind taxpayers what they are buying.



Thanks to the deficit, military spending cuts are more likely today than at any time in the past decade. The \$550 billion non-war DoD budget is obvious prey for deficit hawks. It is more than we spent at any time in the Cold War, even adjusting for inflation, though our wealth creation makes it a smaller slice of the economy. It is over a fifth of federal spending, more than half of the discretionary variety, and it roughly doubled in the past decade. With the tea party up in arms about spending and groping for a foreign policy, the right is reconsidering the pass it gives the Pentagon when it laments "big government." With the pressure on to find savings, the left is worried that entitlements will unduly suffer if military spending does not.

To get the target off his department's back, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates is trying to make it more efficient shifting \$10 billion a year in administrative costs into force structure—even as he asks for future budgets that grow faster than inflation. But even if the funds Gates hopes to squeeze out of administration went to deficit reduction instead of weapons, they would cover less than one percent of the deficit. And even that's a reach. According to the Congressional Research Service, the efficiencies Gates has identified will cover only a fraction of his savings goal.

We can save real money on defense by doing less, rather than doing the same thing better. Judged by the objective it is supposed to serve—the defense of Americans—much of the defense budget is wasted. Our forces defend rich allies, freeing them to spend more on social welfare. The misconception that we can use military occupations to build stable governments out of foreign chaos has swollen the ground forces.

By avoiding the occupation of failed states and reducing commitments to defend healthy ones, we could plan for far fewer wars, allowing cuts to force structure, manpower, procurement spending, and operational costs. The resulting force would be more elite, less strained, and far less expensive

A report we recently released, "Budgetary Savings from Military Restraint," is an initial attempt to outline this force. It lays out 19 cuts that would save \$1.2 trillion over ten years. For example, because our strategy makes both conventional and counterinsurgency warfare less likely, we call for a one third cut to the end-strength of the Army and Marine Corps, once the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan end. Advances in strike technology and fewer missions would also allow a reduction of six fighter wing equivalents from the Air Force. Comparable technological advances have greatly increased the effectiveness of naval platforms, and restraint requires fewer of them. That allows the elimination of four carrier battle groups, four expeditionary strike groups, and a commensurate number of ships from

Congressmen that want immediate cuts that require less strategic upheaval might find some of our other recommendations more attractive. Here are six such items that are ripe for reduction even under the current strategic posture. These recommendations would save \$441 billion over ten years:

1. Nuclear Weapons: We have far more nuclear weapons than deterrence of any adversary requires. We should reduce the number of deployed warheads to 500, eliminating 50 percent of delivery platforms, including the bomber leg of the triad. A total savings of \$66 billion in the DoD budget and \$21 billion from the DoE budget.



Chris Yogerst: Sign the Petition: To

Hollywoodland: Today's Open Thread

Appease the Clintons, Has ABC/Disney Blacklisted 'The Path to 9/11' Forever?



