

Foreign Policy In Focus / Center for Defense Information
www.fpif.org

www.cdi.org

Task Force on
**A Unified Security Budget
For the United States**

Task Force Co-Chairs

Marcus Corbin, Center for Defense Information
Miriam Pemberton, Foreign Policy In Focus

Task Force Members:

Carl Conetta, Project on Defense Alternatives
Christopher Hellman, Center on Arms Control and Nonproliferation
Lawrence Korb, Center for American Progress/ Center for Defense Information
Don Kraus, Citizens for Global Solutions
Col. Daniel Smith (ret.), Friends Committee on National Legislation
Cindy Williams, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
John Zavales, Cuny Center

Organizational affiliations for identification purposes only

March 2004

Foreign Policy In Focus
A Project of the Institute for Policy Studies
and the Interhemispheric Resource Center
733 15th Street NW Suite 1020
Washington, DC 20005
202-234-9382
www.fpif.org

Center for Defense Information
1779 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-332-0600
www.cdi.org

A Unified Security Budget for the United States

Executive Summary

Since September 11, 2001, the question of how to provide for our security has loomed large over our national life. Many of the Bush administration's answers to this question have come under intense challenge—from the doctrine of preventive war to the development of new designs for “usable” nuclear weapons to the choice of war with Iraq as the centerpiece of its war on terrorism. But until recently one aspect of the administration's strategy has gone virtually unchallenged, namely its military budgets and the spending priorities contained within them. From 2000 to 2004, these budgets have increased by more than 50%. Congress has approved each of these budgets, and virtually the entire menu of programs specified in them, with hardly a whisper of debate.

Ever-increasing budget deficit projections have finally begun to make security budget priorities a permissible topic of conversation among lawmakers. In mid-February the House Speaker declared all parts of the budget “on the table” for cuts, including the military, and soon thereafter the administration abruptly canceled the Army's long-running *Comanche* helicopter program.

The Task Force on *A Unified Security Budget for the United States*, drawing on the knowledge of analysts with expertise in different dimensions of the security challenge, welcomes the opening of this overdue debate, and offers this contribution to help point it in the right direction. Among its findings:

Key finding: Despite promises of a comprehensive approach to fighting terrorism, the Bush administration has concentrated its resources overwhelmingly on its military forces, at the expense of other security tools. **Bush's 2005 budget would spend seven times as much on the military as on homeland security and all other forms of non-military security programs combined.**

Key finding: The Bush military budget is being spent on a force structure that does not match today's security challenges, because it is designed for a cold-war-style large-scale conventional challenge that we no longer face.

Key finding: Fixing the problem will require a unified approach to security that integrates nonmilitary tools into our security strategy and rebalances military forces for today's security challenges.

This document provides a working model for how this could be done, without reducing overall spending levels on security, and without increasing the deficit. It shows how funding can be shifted within military accounts for an overall saving of \$51 billion. And

it outlines \$52 billion in spending on non-military measures that could enhance U.S. security substantially.

Key finding: The administration's decision to cut the Comanche program was a good start. The report identifies ten other programs, including the F-22 fighter and DDX destroyer, which could be safely cut or reconfigured to free up \$56 billion in resources for other neglected security priorities.

Key finding: \$5 billion should be added to military accounts to rectify military equipment shortfalls identified in Iraq, such as improved flak jackets, truck armor reinforcements and helicopter protection systems, and to restructure and retrain forces for small- and medium-scale peace and stability operations and counterterrorist missions.

Key finding: The report recommends reallocating \$6 billion to strengthen crucial nonmilitary dimensions of our security including diplomacy, nonproliferation programs, and support for international peace and stability operations.

Key finding: In a 2002 speech President Bush identified development assistance as a security tool, linking the desperate resort to terrorism with the hopelessness of persistent poverty. This unified security budget recommends a \$10 billion increase in US development assistance, and outlines key reforms in development policy.

Key finding: The remainder of the report's recommended savings are allocated to addressing key deficits in homeland security, including increased funding for "first responders" to a terrorist attack.

It's possible to rebalance our national security budget, filling in its missing military and nonmilitary pieces, without increasing its overall bottom line. The result would be military forces better prepared for actual deployments, nonmilitary tools better deployed to address the sources of threat, and a net gain in security for our nation.

Foreign Policy In Focus (FPIF) is a "think tank without walls" whose network of experts seeks to make the U.S. a more responsible global leader and global partner. FPIF is a collaborative project of the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) and the Interhemispheric Resource Center (IRC). www.fpif.org

Center for Defense Information, based in Washington, DC, is a non-partisan, non-profit security policy organization dedicated to strengthening security through international cooperation; reduced reliance on unilateral military power to resolve conflict; reduced reliance on nuclear weapons; a transformed and reformed military establishment; and prudent oversight of, and spending on, defense programs. To encourage the intellectual freedom of the staff, CDI does not hold organizational positions. The views expressed in CDI publications are those of the authors. www.cdi.org

Security Policy Working Group (SPWG) is comprised of leading defense and security policy researchers, analysts and non-governmental organizations that seek to reshape and expand the public and policy discourse on what constitutes true security in a post 9-11 world. Several of the report's endorsers are SPWG members. www.proteusfund.org/spwg

This report was funded with generous support from the Proteus Fund and the Ford, Arca, MacArthur, Town Creek and Rubin Foundations.

The members of the Task Force support this report as one positive proposal illustrating a way to rebalance the security budget, without necessarily endorsing each program proposal within it.