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“The National Defense Strategy acknowledges an increasingly complex global security environment, characterized by...the re-emergence of long-term, strategic competition between nations. These changes require a clear-eyed appraisal of the threats we face, acknowledgement of the changing character of warfare, and a transformation of how the Department conducts business.”

2018 National Defense Strategy
NDS: Sharpening the U.S. military’s *competitive edge*

- Articulates how DoD contributes to the National Security Strategy
  - Contributes to each pillar of NSS
  - Amplifies Pillar 3-*Peace Thru Strength*
- Provides Secretary’s preeminent strategy guidance
  - Per NDAA 2016, it provides priorities for threats, missions, and capability investments
- Aims to *Compete, Deter, and Win* alongside allies & partners

- Build a more lethal force
- Strengthen alliances and attract new partners
- Reform the Department for greater performance & affordability

“This strategy is fit for our time—providing the American people with the military required to protect our way of life, stand with our allies, and live up to our responsibility to pass intact to the next generation those freedoms we enjoy today.”

James N. Mattis
The Challenge

• Great power competition with rivals who have organized themselves well to that end. We have not.

• Our policies - many and disconnected. We need a coherent strategy to organize ourselves to succeed in this competition.

• Strategy requires new conversations between government and industry.

• “Maintaining the Department’s technological advantage will require changes to industry culture, investment sources, and protection across the National Security Innovation Base.”

Frame a National Security Strategy for:

- Secure Innovation Base
- More Viable Industrial Base
- Properly Scaled, so...

Should Deterrence Fail, we able to Fight and WIN!
Great Power Competition?

• Classic Patterns - GPC Elements
  • Multipolar structure...powerful enemies...shuffling alliances
  • Disregard for rule-based constraints
  • Economic, social, cultural exist...secondary to large scale warfare

• Emerging Era
  • Unipolarity...post-Cold War...US military dominance
  • Bipolarity...US/China “first among equals”...shaping world politics
  • Globalization of trade...stability & prosperity...embedded, not imposed
  • Security problems not from mutually suspicious powers...handful of states unsatisfied with their status in the international system
  • Nuclear revolution...classic political-military forms of competition waning

Source: Mazarr, “This is Not a Great Power Competition, Foreign Affairs, 29 May 2019
Other Competitive Areas
- Economic
- Geopolitical
- Informational
- Talent

POP QUIZ #1:
What does “RD&T” stand for?
Research Development and THEFT!
Pop Quiz #2 – What is this?
### Emerging technological competitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Cloud computing</td>
<td>• Quantum computing</td>
<td>• Precision position, navigation and timing</td>
<td>• Robotics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Big data analytics</td>
<td>• Autonomy</td>
<td>• Directed energy</td>
<td>• Additive manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Artificial intelligence</td>
<td>• Novel / Smart / Bio-Materials</td>
<td>• Electro-magnetic weapons</td>
<td>• 4D printing / Smart materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cyber capabilities</td>
<td>• Meta-technologies</td>
<td>• Cyber capabilities</td>
<td>• Synthetic biology manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Virtual and augmented reality</td>
<td>• Composites for aerospace</td>
<td>• Unmanned systems</td>
<td>• Virtual and augmented reality / Simulation and training / Computer aided design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Robotics / Unmanned systems</td>
<td>• Internet of things</td>
<td>• Hypersonics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advanced sensors</td>
<td>• Energy capture and storage</td>
<td>• Optical satellite links</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Internet of things</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Visible light communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Countries’ perception of international technology competition and how they compete

- Competition not fully realized
- Competing based on innovation policy; raising their game
- Playing to win, but usually playing by the rules
- Often subvert rules when to their advantage
- Anything to win; including lowering others’ game

Laissez-faire
Aggregate intervention
Targeted intervention
National security intervention

Adapted from Atkinson and Ezell (2012) and Friedberg (2017)
PREPARING FOR CONFLICT - MOBILIZATION

• Future of warfare – fast, intensive, deadly
• Classic lines of battle overtaken by Cyberwarfare
• Attack infrastructure and national economies rather than troops
• Effective deterrence in a Great Powers Competition requires full use of our national capabilities
• WW II Mobilization Scale Infeasible
History of the Military-Industrial Complex

• Revolutionary War
  - Civilian Militia /American Privateers
  - Merchant shipping requirements for war material
  - Civilian ground logistics/transportation system

• World War I
  - US Industrial capability / 3X as much steel as Germany and Austria
  - Army takeover of industry segments deemed failure
  - Became a global power in 19 months

• World War II
  - Fully committed civilian population
  - Incentivized industry shifted from peacetime to wartime footing
  - Increased dependence on technology meant an increased reliance on manufacturers to provide updated systems rapidly to the warfighter
  - US total industrial might/capacity out-produced Axis Powers

• Cold War
  - Innovation – driven by private commercial industry
  - Vastly out produced our rival /cratered their economy

• GWOT
  - Contractors heavily supplemented the military due to the budget cliff
  - Contingency contracting allowed for greater flexibility
  - Contractor : Military support has exceeded 1:1
Pop Quiz #3  Who am I?

- FINANCIER
- PRESIDENTIAL ADVISOR
- PHILANTHROPIST
- STATESMAN
- WAR INDUSTRIES BOARD CHAIR – WW I
- ADVOCATED FOR THE ARMY INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE 1922
- OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION – WW II

I AM BERNARD M. BARUCH!
Mission:

Prepare selected military officers and civilians for strategic leadership and success in developing national security strategy and in evaluating, marshaling, and managing resources in the execution of that strategy.

“Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.”

Vision:

Internationally-recognized, accredited, graduate-degree granting, joint Professional Military Education institution uniquely focused on the integration of resources and strategy.
The Eisenhower School Private Sector Fellows Program

- Unique DoD program authorized by Congress
- 20 private sector fellows from organizations relevant to national security
- Master of Science – National Resource Strategy
- Develops strategic leaders with critical thinking skills
- Prepares leaders who develop successful national security strategy
- Focuses on evaluating, marshaling, and managing national-level resources
- Enhances industry and government relationships

134 Fellows
35 Companies
Past & Present Participants