

US Security Strategy and Iraq: Preemptive Attack, Democratization, and Exit Strategy

SATO Heigo

With the new Iraqi government in place in May 2005, bringing the cycle extending from regime change to nation building to an end, the debate on the policy implications of the Iraq war began, with argument about the utility of the policy measures related to the war: preemptive strike, democratization, and exit strategy. The essence of the debate is not about the future application of these measures in some other case, but how durable these claims, which justified this unpopular war, are in the domestic political landscape of the United States.

The most important issue to be considered within this context is the US's exit strategy, i.e., when, how, and under what rationale the Bush Administration would decide to withdraw US troops from Iraq. Certainly, the WMD controversy, which brought into question the reason for starting the Iraq war, has calmed politically, so that it longer causes a significant impact on the debate. In fact, since the general election in December 2005, the focus of the debate has shifted to the question of when the US, Iraq, and the international community can corroboratively establish democracy in Iraq, and how the Iraqi government can reclaim governance and free the Iraqi people from fear of intrusion by foreign terrorists. The US issued the National Strategy for the Victory in Iraq in November 2005 in order to address this question, revealing the three-tiered formula for peace and stability in Iraq of "clear, defend and rebuild."

Indeed, the US exit strategy from Iraq is influenced by the short- and long-term effects of domestic politics. As for the short-term effect, the Bush Administration is well aware that public confidence in the Administration is directly linked to its unyielding stance on the Iraq issue, and any compromise would shake its political foundation. The long-term effect has to do with the condition of the federal budget and international support. The US has been forced to spend a massive amount of federal funds on the recovery from the hurricane disaster in Louisiana. As a Republican administration, however, the Bush Administration is committed to tax cuts, and the increasing demand for federal spending is a challenge to its basic policy. Another factor is international support for the nation building of Iraq. The issue here is not the legitimacy of Iraqi reconstruction through a United Nations framework, or sharing the burden of expenses for Iraqi reconstruction. Rather, it is a question of the commitment of the international community to the recovery of Iraq, and whether it will follow the path set forth in the November 2005 document.

The United States has special responsibility in Iraqi reconstruction and democratization, and this view has the broad-ranging support of the public in the US. Therefore, the decision to withdraw from Iraq is affected by the balance between how much of the cost associated with Iraqi reconstruction the US can endure, and the extent of its sense of responsibility for the reconstruction and democratization of Iraq.

Between “Preemption” and “Prevention”:
National Security Strategy of the Bush Administration

OKAGAKI T. Tomoko

This article examines the nature of “preemption” as a new US security strategy that has been developed into a formal doctrine under the Bush Administration, and assesses its effectiveness for the future of US security policy. Since the 9/11 terrorist attacks in 2001, the international community has become increasingly aware of the conceptual change in what constitutes security in today’s world, where threats can come anytime, anywhere, from anyone. In meeting threats posed by terrorists and rogue states possessing weapons of mass destruction (WMD), President Bush announced in the National Security Strategy of September 2002 that the “US must adapt the concept of imminent threat to the capabilities and objectives of today’s adversaries.” Since this represented a diminished distinction between “preemption” and “prevention,” the Administration’s usage of the term has invited critical repercussions from many different circles.

This article begins by distinguishing “preemption” from “prevention” as a strategic concept. “Preemption” has long been justified by international law as a means to defend one’s country when a threat posed by an enemy is “imminent and certain,” whereas “prevention” has been prohibited by international law. These conceptual discussions are followed by an overview of how preemption has been developed into a formal doctrine under the current Bush Administration. The article then examines several sets of criticisms against the recent US tendency to blur the distinction between preemption and prevention.

The article argues that overall US security policy will not be defined by the incidents of 9/11 and the characteristics of the Bush Administration alone. Preemption with a preventive connotation, therefore, is not likely to continue to be a dominant US strategy in the future. This is particularly clear when considering the following points: First, preemption by nature is difficult for a superpower to adopt as a strategy, given that a superpower’s national interests tend to have too global a reach to keep what is to be defended to a minimum degree, which is a prerequisite for preemption to be legitimate. Second, the overall outcome of US security strategy reflects many other aspects of today’s security environment that transcend WMD and terrorism, including regional institutional networks and the spread of norms of multilateral cooperation among states that might undercut and constrain the unilateral behavior of an individual state. Scholarship, in fact, has already started moving toward locating the Bush “revolution” in a broader historical context in an attempt to articulate the continuity in US security policy.

Civilian Human Resource Management in the US Army:
Transformation in the SES and Transition to the NSPS

KOZUKA Ikuya

Civilians have been an integral and important component of the Army, and are utilized to accomplish today's multiple, complex missions. Department of Army civilians include both Appropriated Fund and Nonappropriated Fund employees. These civilians are employed in over 550 different occupations such as logistics, research and development, and base operations functions.

The systems for recruiting, utilizing, developing, and sustaining DA civilians are decentralized, very unlike the centralized management of military personnel.

The US Office of Personnel Management (OPM) is the personnel agency of the executive branch charged with the mission to administer laws and executive orders with regard to all aspects of civilian personnel management. OPM develops standards of job classifications such as compensation systems, job titles, job series, job grades and so on, and merit is the primary principle guiding the OPM.

The Senior Executive Service (SES) was established in 1979, and represents a separate system for top civilian executives. The SES was designed to ensure professional civilian executive management of the government, but it actually has some problems related to its politicization. For this reason, the SES system was transformed by the Bush Administration in the fiscal 2004 Defense Authorization Act. There are five executive core qualifications and 27 leadership competences that all potential SES members must possess.

NSPS is a pay-for-performance system that provides the US Department of Defense with tools which are critical to the DoD's overall transformation to a results-oriented, performance-based culture. NSPS emphasizes the following key concepts that are core to the system. First is "Accountability"—the notion that employees are responsible for their careers and performance. Employee performance and contributions will pay off through salary increases and bonuses. Second is "Flexibility"—the understanding that NSPS is a simplified, adaptable management system that places the right people in the right jobs at the right time. Third is "Results" which means that employee performance and contributions are linked to achieving organizational goals and the critical missions of the DoD.

The Personnel Evaluation Systems of the Imperial Japanese Army and Navy

ISHIDA Keigo and HAMADA Hide

Research on the personnel evaluation systems of the Imperial Japanese Army and Navy affairs is limited compared with research on other areas of Japanese military history, because many administrative documents were deliberately incinerated on order immediately before the end of World War II. The rules for conducting personnel evaluations and the records of the results of such evaluations are among the documents that have been lost as a result of those orders. However, we can study the roots of the Imperial Army and Navy's personnel evaluation systems and the various revisions which were implemented to them by carefully analyzing certain other administrative documents which did survive, for example, the *Dainikkī*, *Kōbunbikō*, and *Seikiruishū* regulations and other documents and records in the possession of Japan's National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS). In addition, causal connections between personnel evaluations and actual personnel decisions may possibly be revealed by analyzing the memoirs and other recollections of former Army and Navy officers and men who were actually involved in personnel matters in the two services. This article therefore focuses on personnel evaluations, and on personnel records and promotions in particular, of the Army and Navy, and also refers to existing research and other secondary sources, in order to study the Imperial Army and Navy's personnel evaluation systems.

The following is a brief summary of the article. First of all, there was a personnel record table, called "*Kōka-hyō*," in the Army and Navy which was used to rate efficiency. However, strict quantifications were not necessarily done in the evaluations which used this table. Immediate and visible performance on the job was also not reflected at once in the evaluations. Rather, the *Kōka-hyō* is thought to have functioned more as a ledger of diversified person evaluations.

Next, the characteristic of the Imperial Japanese Army and Navy's promotions are investigated. The Army and Navy had established regulations governing promotions during war and peace. However, the speed of promotions in the Army and Navy differed. This difference was brought about by changes in the relative influence and power of the Army and Navy, which were caused by the disarmament of the Taisho Era and the military buildup of the Showa Era. Promotions in the Army from company grade officer to field grade officer were slow compared to the Navy, because the ratio of company grade to field grade officers was greater in the Army than in the Navy. Conversely, promotions were faster in the Navy because the number of junior officers and mid-level officers was roughly equal in the Navy. The Navy's structure was not as bottom-heavy as the Army's because, among other factors, the Navy could rely more upon its ships, planes and other equipment and was not as dependent upon sheer manpower. The speed of promotions of the Imperial Japanese Army and Navy was also greatly affected by legislation and policies such as regulations concerning replenishment, as well as national strategy and the National Defense Policy.

This research has made great strides in elucidating the personnel evaluation system of the Army and Navy, but much still needs to be done in future research. Personnel affairs have always been a major concern for individuals in any organization, and militaries are no exception. It is therefore expected that many findings which will have important implications for future personnel policies and decisions can be gleaned from the archival materials which will be used for this research, and therein lies the importance of its careful continuation.