

The View From (Army) Space ...

By COL James R. Pierson

Welcome back to the Army Space Journal. In this edition we've added a twist — a controversial Space professional topic (Does our nation need a separate Space Force?) — where both sides of the issue are discussed. What we anticipate doing is generating thought and discussion on this “lightning rod” topic and hopefully others as well. After all, if we're all thinking alike, then maybe we're not thinking hard enough.

Balance! Balance is critical in just about everything we do. The New England Patriots had a unique balance between very good offensive, defensive and special teams personnel that have thrust them into discussions of another football dynasty. Great basketball teams, like the Duke Blue Devils, also have a delicate balance between offensive and defensive excellence. Each one of us is fully aware of the need for maintaining that delicate balance between our professional military lives and our personal lives. Finally, our tremendous military has developed a superb balance between defensive and offensive capabilities — each being observable almost on a daily basis.

This concept of balance also carries over into a discussion about Space. Quite often, our focus is on increased collection at the expense of exploitation and dissemination. But an ever increasing collection capability without a corresponding increase in exploiting or disseminating the collected information (especially for that “last tactical mile”) does not produce the increase in warfighting capabilities that we need. Similarly, a warfighting dependency on Space capabilities mandates that these capabilities be pro-

tected to ensure their assuredness for the warfighter. As we continue to exploit emerging Space technologies and operational concepts, we must also be aware that our potential adversaries are keenly observing what we are doing and quite likely, developing strategies to counter our current and planned advantages. This quickly leads into a discussion between the necessary balance between force enhancement capabilities (e.g., comms, PVNT, weather, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, and missile warning) and Space control capabilities (e.g., protection, surveillance, prevention and negation).

Recent geo-political events have caused a shift in our focus from large scale wars to smaller scale conflicts and stability operations. The need for Space control at the lower end of the spectrum of conflict is much less than at the upper end where our nation may be expected to face a peer competitor. Will we be ready when the pendulum swings back toward being prepared for a near peer fight? Does the concept of “no more Task Force Smith's” apply to Space? Was the assertion of a potential “Space Pearl Harbor” in the 2001 Space Commission report outlandish or a wake-up call? The challenge we face as Space professionals is to understand how best to fully leverage current Space capabilities in support of today's priorities (the fight for freedom and democracy in Iraq and Afghanistan), being aware of “tipping points” that would cause the strategic landscape to radically change again and to achieve a “good enough” resource balance between the needs for today's Army and the future force.

As MG (Ret) Robert Scales, a noted military historian and former Commander of the Army War



Space Operations Officer Qualification Course 04-02

Back Row (left to right): MAJ Kurt Hoch, CPT Paul Sanders, LTC Kevin Janes, MAJ David Harriman, MAJ Scott Gensler, LTC Jorge Rangel, LTC Richard Wolfe, CPT Gary Blount, CPT Sang Lee, MAJ Robert Redding, MAJ Tod Pingrey. Front Row (left to right): COL Kurt Story – 1st Space Brigade Commander, MAJ Joseph Papenfus, CPT Rain Jones, SFC Robert Miller, CPT Gary Blount, MAJ Michael Pepe, CPT Travis Gilbert, MAJ Phillip Speth. (not pictured: MAJ Andrew Riter and MAJ Brian Soldon) *Photo by SFC Dennis Beebe*

College, states in an editorial titled “Studying the Art of War” (Feb. 17, 2005 Washington Times) our Army must also have a balance between the physical and the intellectual. Scales states that the Achilles’ heel of the British military system in the 19th and early 20th century was intellectual rather than physical. The demands of defending the British Empire created an army too busy to learn and thus hastened the demise of their Empire. He goes on to assert that there are striking and disturbing parallels between the British Army then and the American Army of today. Whether you agree with the General’s assertion or not, you would probably agree that the need to learn has never been greater. We must continually learn not just about new tactics (e.g., defense against improvised explosive devices) and technologies (e.g., directed energy, near Space) but also about foreign cultures (e.g., Islamic) and emerging organizations (e.g., Modularity Units of Employment, Joint Functional Component Commands and Standing Joint Task Forces).

So where am I going with this, you say? Do we have the proper balance between our commitment to executing today’s challenging tasks with an intellectual commitment to thinking about or studying the art of warfare (Space warfare in our case)? What should this balance look like? How can we achieve it? Achieving this balance requires an institutional as well as a personal commitment.

Right now, our Space education is good at the entry level — educating FA40s at the early field grade stage. However, we lack a continuing program of Space education and learning (read more about this in MAJ Bob Guerriero’s ASJ article titled “Improving Space Training” starting on page 28). We are taking steps in that direction. For almost a year, we have been integrating our Space education efforts with the Air Force at the National Security Space Institute (NSSI). In the near future, the NSSI will commence a Space 300 course

— what I liken to a Space Advanced Course. As the Space cadre continues to grow, the often overlooked element of Space education must also grow with the cadre. Additionally, as the concept of education shifts from formal (e.g., established schoolhouses) to informal learning (e.g., CompanyCommand.com), how do we leverage these shifts within the Space community? How can we share valuable lessons and insights from across the FA40 community on a continual basis? Certainly, the ground that is being plowed by LTC George Andary, and his Space Support Element embedded with 3rd Infantry Division, will reap tremendous insights for the FA40 community and the Army. What about the often unsung efforts of our FA40s on the Army staff, Soldiers like MAJ Jim Pruneski (DA/G8) and LTC (P) Bruce Smith (DA/G3)? Or the efforts by LTC Tom James (Directorate of Combat Development - Future Warfare Center) in developing next generation Space capabilities? There is a saying — Cooperate and Graduate. Maybe that needs to change to — Collaborate and Graduate! If the need for learning has never been greater, will collaboration across time zones and regions help us learn more effectively? How can we collaborate so we are continuously improving?

As MG (Ret) Scales says so eloquently, “War is a thinking man’s game and only those who take the time to study war are likely to fight it competently.” Are we, the Army’s Space professionals, taking the necessary time to think about and to study both the art, and the science, of warfare — air, land, sea and Space warfare?

If not, let’s move in that direction.

To read MG (Ret) Scales’ full editorial as seen in the Feb. 17, 2005 Early Bird, go to: <http://ebird.afis.osd.mil/ebfiles/e20050217352541.html>