

UNCLASSIFIED

AU/AF FELLOW/NNN/2004-00

AIR FORCE FELLOWS (SDE)

AIR UNIVERSITY

THE UNITED STATES: PREDATOR OR PROTECTOR

by

Gina M. Grosso, Colonel, United States Air Force

A Research Report Submitted to Air Force Fellows, CADRE/AR

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: Title First M. Last AU Advisor: _____

Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama

April 2004

UNCLASSIFIED

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US government or the Department of Defense. In accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the United States government.

Contents

DISCLAIMER.....ii

PREFACE.....iv

ABSTRACT.....v

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION.....1

CHAPTER 2 - 2002 NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY.....3

CHAPTER 2 - PREEMPTION AND INTERNATIONAL LAW.....11

CHAPTER 3 - THE JUST WAR THEORY.....18

CHAPTER 4 - ADEQUACY OF THE STRATEGY.....26

CHAPTER 6 - CONCLUSION.....41

APPENDIX A.....44

APPENDIX B..... 49

APPENDIX C.....50

APPENDIX D.....53

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....55

Preface

It is just now that I am beginning to understand how profoundly I was impacted by the events of 11 September 2001. I was in the Pentagon when it was hit, but my evacuation was totally uneventful. What was not uneventful was working at the Family Assistance Center trying to help the families of people killed both on the airplane itself and in the Pentagon. Observing the sorrow experienced by the family members and friends of innocent civilians killed in the attack sparked an unbelievable rage in me, which has sparked a keen interest in the United States efforts to combat terrorism. This in turn sparked a desire to understand the new National Security Strategy published approximately one year after the attack and to gain a better understanding of the controversy surrounding its “preemptive defense” policy.

As both a citizen of the United States and a member of the profession of arms, it is important to me to understand and assess the adequacy of United States plans to address the threats it is currently facing. The research reflected in this paper was an attempt to do just that. Perhaps in trying to understand my own thoughts on this issue, I can shed some light for others too.

I would like to thank Donald Halstead, the Writing and Research Advisor for the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs Fellows Program, Harvard University, for his assistance, encouragement, feedback, and support. His time and effort significantly improved my arguments and the way they are presented. I would also like to thank my research assistant, Leah Littman, who responded with light speed to all my requests, which allowed me to focus my efforts on absorbing and analyzing the information she provided.

AU/HARVARD/WCFIA/2004-04

Abstract

The United States developed a new National Security Strategy (NSS) in September 2002, which articulates the United State intent to act preemptively to prevent terrorist or rogue states from using weapons of mass destruction against the United States, and its friends and allies. This strategic tool has received a lot of attention and led many of these same friends and allies to voice concern over what many consider the United States illegitimate use of force. This paper examines the NSS and evaluates its concepts in legal and moral terms, and assesses whether the strategy is appropriate for the current security environment.

My research predominantly consisted of reviewing the voluminous literature on grand strategy, international law and the Just War theory. In addition, to expand my intellectual base I attended many seminars offered in the greater Boston academic community on the role of the United States in the world today.

My research found that the NSS does add a preemption option to the toolbox, along with the more traditional and still important tools of deterrence and containment. However, until the concept of “imminence” is redefined in the international community, the preemptive use of force will most likely not be in compliance with international law. Policy-makers will therefore have to legitimize the use of force through moral arguments, and I argue that the Just War theory serves as a useful compass in assessing and crafting those arguments.

UNCLASSIFIED

After assessing the NSS, I found that it does adequately address the gravest threat to United States security—a terrorist using weapons of mass destruction against the United States, its allies and friends. However, the lack of any prioritization among the many goals articulated in the strategy is a concern and will make it harder to successfully execute the strategy.

Chapter 1

Introduction

We will defend the peace by fighting terrorists and tyrants. We will preserve the peace by building good relations among the great powers. We will extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent.

—President George W. Bush

On 17 September 2002, a year after the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington, the United States announced a new National Security Strategy (NSS). John Lewis Gaddis argues that this strategy reflects a redefinition, for only the third time in American history, of what it will take to protect the United States from a surprise attack.¹ The strategy is not without controversy. It openly states that the United States intends to act preemptively to prevent terrorists and rogue states from threatening the United States, its allies, and friends. As the most powerful nation in the world, this intent has caused great concern around the world, which was exponentially magnified as a result of the United States leadership of the intervention in Iraq.

This paper therefore seeks to understand how the 2002 NSS addresses the post-September 11 security environment. It begins with a basic analysis of what is in the strategy and then examines whether it is consistent with international law and the Just War theory. Article 51 of the United Nations charter allows for a preemptive attack only if a threat is imminent. But does the NSS comply with Article 51? This should be a

UNCLASSIFIED

concern for the United States, because as the sole remaining superpower, the legitimate use of force is vital to successfully addressing all of its national security interests.

When political leaders consider using force to achieve a political objective, they justify that use of force in moral not legal terms. And whether they know it or not, they use concepts developed in the Just War theory to articulate their argument. The moral concepts in the Just War theory were first formulated almost 2,000 years ago by St. Augustine, and later expanded by St. Thomas Aquinas and Francisco de Vitoria. These remarkable Christian theologians gave us a concise Just War theory, but is this theory still relevant today when attempting to make a moral argument for the use of force? This paper attempts to persuade the reader that in the absence of legal authority from the Security Council, adhering to the tenets of the Just War theory will allow policy-makers to legitimize the use of force in moral terms that have stood the test of time.

Finally this paper assesses the adequacy of the NSS by comparing it to recent works on the current security environment by Robert J. Art, from Brandeis University, and Joseph S. Nye Jr., from Harvard University. This assessment looks at the major national interests of the United States, the greatest threats to those interests, and determines whether the NSS adequately addresses these interests and threats.

Chapter 2

The 2002 National Security Strategy of the United States

We cannot defend America and our friends by hoping for the best. History will judge harshly those who saw this coming danger but failed to act.

—President George W. Bush

National security has been defined as “the right to live our lives without fearing for our lives.”² It therefore follows that the United States National Security Strategy (NSS) should provide a path for United States policy-makers to pursue so that its citizens can live without fear from attack. The 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks radically altered the United States security environment and forced policy-makers to address a new source of insecurity for the United States. Gaddis eloquently describes the 11 September legacy as putting:

Americans back to a level of personal insecurity unknown since our ancestors were staking out a society along an advancing frontier, with the protections afforded by government trailing along behind them. There was once more, as there had been early in our history, a homeland security deficit, unlike anything we’d experienced in either of the world wars or the cold war. It was not just the Twin Towers that collapsed on the morning of September 11, 2001: so too did some of our most fundamental assumptions about international, national and personal security.”³

This radical change in the security environment cannot be overstated, and it is in light of this change that the 2002 NSS was produced. Any assessment of the strategy

UNCLASSIFIED

must consider this fundamental change in the security environment in which America finds itself, for its strength, it is not immune from catastrophic attacks.

There are three overarching goals the 2002 NSS articulates:

- (1) To defend the peace by fighting terrorists and tyrants;
- (2) To preserve the peace by building good relations among the great powers;
- (3) To extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent.

These tasks are fundamentally different than the tasks articulated in the previous (October 1998) National Security Strategy:

- (1) To enhance America's security;
- (2) To bolster America's economic prosperity;
- (3) To promote democracy and human rights.

These differences reflect the radical change in the security environment and the need to redefine how the United States views national security. Rather than pursuing more passive means to achieve its national security objectives—enhancing, bolstering, and promoting—the new NSS articulates more proactive means to achieve its objectives—defending, preserving, and extending.

The NSS can be described as a values-based strategy rather than an interest-based strategy. A values-based strategy is one that defines United National Security issues in terms of protecting and defending values that are important to the United States rather than interests that are important that the United States. This difference is reflected in the way the strategy is written. The NSS is not written in the more traditional terms of vital interests, highly important interests, and important interests. Instead, the NSS defines goals on the path to progress, “political and economic freedom, peaceful relations with other states, and respect for human dignity”⁴ and then lays out eight actionable items to achieve these goals dedicating a chapter to each.

UNCLASSIFIED

Even a quick examination of the eight action items makes it clear that the NSS has far more to say about national security than acting preemptively, though it is this point that has garnered the most attention in the press and around the world. The next several paragraphs summarize the action items for the reader and highlight some of the key concepts contained in the strategy.

The first action item is to “champion aspirations for human dignity.”⁵ While the action items are not numbered, it is highly improbable that this is the first action item by chance. The strategy states that this action item is important because, “in pursuit of our goals, our first imperative is to clarify what we stand for.”⁶

The next action item is to “strengthen alliance to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks against us and our friends.”⁷ It is also highly unlikely that this is the second action item by chance. The NSS was published a year after the terrorist attacks in the United States, and it clearly states that the United States is “fighting a war against terrorists of global reach.”⁸ Not only is there specific language in the NSS on this issue, but there are also two additional national strategies that address the issue in great detail: The National Strategy for Homeland Security (published 16 July 2002) and the National Strategy for Combating Terrorism (published in February 2003). The homeland security strategy focuses on preventing terrorist attacks within the United States; reducing United States vulnerability to terrorism; and minimizing the damage of a terrorist attack on the United States, while the Combating Terrorism strategy focuses on identifying and defusing threats before they reach United States borders. All three strategies work in concert to address national security issues. The latter two are simply more narrowly focused and provide much greater detail on homeland security and terrorism.

UNCLASSIFIED

It is in this second action item that the concept of preemption is first introduced:

We will disrupt and destroy terrorist organizations by: Defending the United States, the American people, and our interests at home and abroad by identifying and destroying the threat before it reaches our borders. While the United States will constantly strive to enlist the support of the international community, we will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defense by acting preemptively against such terrorists, to prevent them from doing harm against our people and our country.⁹

There is one other action item (the fourth) in the strategy that expands on the preemptive use of force, which I discuss below.

The third action item is “work with others to defuse regional conflicts.”¹⁰ Some might find it surprising that the strategy explicitly states that the “United States should invest time and resources into building international relationships and institutions that can help manage local crises when they emerge.”¹¹ Despite the perception of some that the United States prefers to act unilaterally, without the support of the United Nations or the international community, the NSS explicitly states a desire to foster international relationships and institutions that can effectively deal with crises.

The fourth action item is to “prevent our enemies from threatening us, our allies, and our friends, with weapons of mass destruction.”¹² This action item discusses in great detail the threat of terrorists acquiring and using weapons of mass destruction (WMD). An additional National Security Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction, which was published in December 2002, supplements the NSS. The NSS states, “The gravest danger to freedom lies at the crossroads of radicalism and technology.”¹³ To deal with this threat, the NSS states:

The United States has long maintained the option of preemptive actions to counter a sufficient threat to our national security. The greater the threat, the greater the risk of inaction—and the more

UNCLASSIFIED

compelling the case for taking anticipatory action to defend ourselves, even if uncertainty remains as to the time and place of the enemy's attack. To forestall or prevent such hostile acts by our adversaries, the United States will, if necessary, act preemptively.¹⁴

To more fully understand the concept of preempting a terrorist attack, it is helpful to review a few paragraphs from the graduation speech President Bush gave at West Point in May 2002 where he clearly articulated his thoughts on preemptive defense:

For much of the last century, America's defense relied on the Cold War doctrines of deterrence and containment. In some cases, those strategies still apply. But new threats also require new thinking. Deterrence—the promise of massive retaliation against nations—means nothing against shadowy terrorist networks with no nation or citizens to defend. Containment is not possible when unbalanced dictators with weapons of mass destruction can deliver those weapons or missiles or secretly provide them to terrorist allies.

We cannot defend America and our friends by hoping for the best. We cannot put our faith in the word of tyrants, who solemnly sign non-proliferation treaties, and then systematically break them. If we wait for threats to materialize, we will have waited too long.

The war on terror will not be won on the defensive. We must take the battle to the enemy, disrupt his plans, and confront the worst threats before they emerge. In the world we have entered, the only path to safety is the path of action. And this nation will act.

It is important to note that the preemptive use of force is strictly limited to dealing with the threat of terrorism and, in particular, terrorists or rogue states who seek to use weapons of mass destruction against the United States. Preemption is not discussed in any other chapters of the strategy and is not the only tool used to deal with threats to United States national security. In fact, the NSS states that, “the United States will not use force in all cases to preempt emerging threats, nor should nations use preemption as a pretext for aggression.”¹⁵

UNCLASSIFIED

The fifth action item in the strategy is to “ignite a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade.”¹⁶ This is important for the United States because a “strong world economy enhances our national security by advancing prosperity and freedom in the rest of the world.”¹⁷ This section contains several steps to promote free trade, as well as specific language on reducing America’s greenhouse gas emissions, despite the fact that the United States did not sign the Kyoto treaty.¹⁸ This indicates that the issue of global warming is at least on the scope of senior policy-makers in the current administration, despite some of its recent actions regarding environmental issues.

The sixth action item is to “expand the circle of development by opening societies and building the infrastructure of democracy.”¹⁹ The strategy says this action is important because “including all the world’s poor in an expanding circle of development—and opportunity—is a moral imperative and one of the top priorities of U. S. international policy.”²⁰ The strategy lists eight broad tasks to accomplish this objective among them are providing resources to air countries that have met the challenge of national reform, insisting upon measurable results to ensure that development assistance is actually making a difference in the lives of the world’s poor; securing public health in poor countries, emphasizing education programs in Africa. These kinds of actions give further evidence that the strategy is values-based rather than interest-based. Accomplishing these kinds of tasks is important to our value system but most likely will not have a direct impact on our national security.

The seventh action item is to “develop agendas for cooperative action with other main centers of global power.”²¹ The strategy further states that, “We have our best chance since the rise of the nation-state in the 17th century to build a world where the

UNCLASSIFIED

great powers compete in peace instead of prepare for war.”²² The NSS explicitly states that there is little “the United States can accomplish in the world without the sustained cooperation of its allies and friends in Canada and Europe.”²³ While the current perception is that the United States is not concerned with what its friends and allies think, the strategy explicitly acknowledges the importance of these relationships to United States national security.

The final action item is to “transform America’s national security institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the 21st Century.”²⁴ This section explicitly states that the United States intends to “maintain our defenses beyond challenge.”²⁵ It is surprising to me that this language did not garner as much attention as the language on preemption. Those concerned with United States hegemony need only to point to this declaration to prove their point. Military power is a key component for hegemony, and the United States clearly intends to stay well ahead of the pack in terms on military power. This section is completely consistent with the Quadrennial Defense Review published a year earlier, which goes into much greater detail on the need to transform the Armed Forces so that they can defend the post-cold war security threats. It is also interesting to note that this section contains all the elements one would expect from a military perspective, but also includes a diplomacy section that is just as comprehensive. From a strategic perspective the United States diplomatic capabilities and use is given equal thought and discussion as the capabilities and use of military force.

Thus, while the NSS has received a lot of attention for its language on preemption, in reality it is an all-encompassing values-based strategy. The NSS expresses the overall desire to defend, preserve and extend the peace through eight

UNCLASSIFIED

different action items that have within them more than fifty subtasks. This NSS has been supplemented by four additional national strategies (see Appendix A for details). A quick review of the action items in the NSS informs the reader that international relationships and institutions are important to United States; acknowledges that there is little in the world the United States can accomplish without its allies in Europe and Canada; sets specific goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions; reducing poverty through development around the world is important for United States security; seeks to prevent terrorist attacks against the United States and its allies and friends; and that the United States will outward for possibilities to expand liberty and justice for all.

Despite the broad nature of the NSS, the controversy surrounding the preemptive language has eclipsed all the other actions it articulates. The main reasons for this are that many believe it violates international law, and because when such a powerful country uses this language it makes the rest of the international community very uncomfortable. This concern will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Chapter 3

Preemption and International Law

As far as the legality of war is concerned, there has arisen in the 20th century a general consensus among states, expressed in several international treaties, that resort to armed force, except in certain circumstances, such as self-defense, is illegal.

—Joseph Frankel

If the NSS is values based, and our allies and friends generally share our values, why would the strategy cause such controversy? One of the answers to this question lies in understanding how international law considers a preemptive strike. However, to begin this discussion, its important first to consider what in fact is international law, where is it codified, and who governs it. *Encyclopedia Britannica* describes international law as follows:

There exists an international society of states that accepts the binding force of some norms of international behavior. These norms are referred to as international law, although they differ fundamentally from municipal law because no sovereign exists who can enforce them. Most international lawyers realistically accept that international law is, consequently, among rather than above states. It is, according to legal doctrine, binding on states, but unenforceable.

International law is therefore comprised of international agreements that are entered into by willing states. The most relevant law pertaining to the use of force is the United Nations Charter, which is a surprisingly straightforward document that clearly

UNCLASSIFIED

states how the international community will handle threats to peace and further stipulates when a state can use force legally. In fact, the charter's first sentence voices the desire for "collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace."

Chapter 1, Article 1: The purpose of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take *effective collective measures* for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

Per Chapter V, Article 24 of the charter, the primary responsibility for dealing with international peace and security issues is vested in the Security Council:

In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on its behalf.

The Security Council consists of 15 UN-member states: China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States are permanent members and the General Assembly elects the other 10 members who serve 2-year terms. Each member of the Security Council is allowed one representative, and each representative has one vote. Decisions by the Security Council on all matters that are not procedural require concurrence from nine members of the council in addition to the concurrence of the five permanent members. With only one exception, which I discuss below, the only body that can authorize the legal use of force against a nation is the Security Council. So, at any given point in time nine members of the Security Council must agree to the use of force and the five permanent members must concur with that decision.

UNCLASSIFIED

The one exception to this rule is a sovereign state's right to self-defense, which is dealt with in Chapter VII, Article 51 of the Charter. This article is very important for this discussion because it only allows for self-defense "if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations:"

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

If taken literally, this article does not allow for a preemptive attack without the consent of the Security Council. However, many have stretched this article to allow states to attack first if they perceive that an attack upon them is "imminent." For instance, many cite the Israeli attack on the Egyptian Air Force during the 1967 war as an example of a legal preemptive attack, because the Egyptian army was very clearly massed on the border, and there was no question that an attack upon Israel was imminent.

Therefore, for any preemptive strike to be "legitimate" under international law, the state must prove that an attack upon it is imminent—"about to occur at any moment." The problem in applying the concept of preemptive strikes to terrorist threats is waiting until an attack is "imminent" to be considered legal without prior United Nations Security Council approval. The NSS appreciates this dilemma because the strategy references the international law norm "that nations need not suffer an attack before they can lawfully take action to defend themselves against forces that present an imminent danger of

UNCLASSIFIED

attack” and further states that “we must adapt the concept of imminent threat to the capabilities and objectives of today’s adversaries.”²⁶

Richard Perle persuasively argues for a new way for the international community to think about “imminence” in a post 11 September world:

What I want to suggest is that the concept of imminence is a subtle one. It’s not just, is there going to be a war tomorrow if you don’t act today? Will you be attacked on Wednesday if you don’t attack on Monday? The reactor that the Israeli’s destroyed would not have produced a weapon for three, four, or five years. But a critical threshold was about to be crossed once it was fueled. So, I think we need to look at measurable threats once they evolve, and case by case as to when a point might be crossed at which point you can no longer prevent or have a reasonable prospect of preventing a terrible attack with a weapon of mass destruction . . . and others in countries that he might choose to attack. It’s always a question of balance. It’s always a question of the consequences of one course versus the consequences of another course and it is all too easy to look only at tragedies like the civilian deaths yesterday and forget what must be measured in the balance of risks.²⁷

So implementing a preemptive defense strategy against terrorist threats poses a dilemma from an international law perspective. Most would argue that strikes against suspected terrorists will be more preventive in nature, rather than preemptive.

“Preventive” in the sense that the United States knows that terrorists have targeted the United States but most likely does not know exactly when a specific attack is about to take place. Again, a preventive strike is only legal if the Security Council sanctions the action, but it has proven difficult over the history of the Security Council to gain approval for any use of force. The genocide in Rwanda stands out as the most striking example. Despite timely and compelling evidence of genocide on an unimaginable scale taking place in Rwanda, the Security Council was unable to take action to prevent the murder of between 500,000 and 800,000 Tutsi and Hutu moderates.

UNCLASSIFIED

To many people around the world, the only way to legitimize the use of force is to gain the approval of the United Nations Security Council, but how effective has the United Nations been since its inception at “saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war.”²⁸ The short answer is, not very. Since 1945, Chapter 1, Article 2 (“all members shall settle their disputes by peaceful means”) has been violated more than 200 times.²⁹

Human rights activists are the most eloquent at discussing the dilemma posed by the failure of international law to get nations to intervene when gross human rights violations are taking place. The Security Council has proven to be incapable of using its authority to stop these violations, the recent conflicts in Kosovo and Rwanda being two recent examples of this dilemma. Michael Glennon argues the reason for this lack of adherence to the charter by its signatories is that there is no consensus in the international community on whom, when, and how intervention to prevent conflict should take place, and it is impossible to regulate behavior when there is no consensus on what a violation is, how violations should be enforced and by whom.³⁰ A further example of this lack of international consensus can be found in the International Criminal Court treaty. Aggression is one of four crimes that can be prosecuted by the court, but it is not defined. So how can one be prosecuted for a crime that has no legal definition? The United Nations inability to deal with either intra- or inter-state aggression is a serious problem since it is seen as the legitimizing world body.

People from many different political factions, including Kofi Annan, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, agree that the UN needs to be reformed to deal with twenty-first century threats, which look very different than twentieth century threats.

UNCLASSIFIED

In a recent address to the General Assembly Kofi Annan called for United Nations reform:

Article 51 of the UN Charter prescribes that all states, if attacked, retain the inherent right of self-defense. But until now, it has been understood that when states go beyond that, and decide to use force to deal with broader threats to international peace and security, they need the unique legitimacy provided by the United Nations. My concern is that, if it were adopted, it could set precedents that resulted in a proliferation of the unilateral and lawless use of force, with or without credible justification. But it is not enough to denounce unilateralism, unless we face up squarely to the concerns that make some states feel uniquely vulnerable, and thus drives them to take unilateral action. We must show that those concerns can, and will, be addressed effectively through collective action. In my recent report on the implementation of the Millennium Declaration, I drew attention to the urgent need for the Council to regain the confidence of states, and of world public opinion--both by demonstrating its ability to deal effectively with the most difficult issues, and by becoming more broadly representative of the international community as a whole, as well as the geopolitical realities of today.

Not surprisingly, Richard Perle and David Frumm also have some thoughts on United Nations reform:

The UN must commit itself to the proposition that harboring, supporting, or financing terrorists in itself constitutes an Article 51 act of aggression against the country those terrorists target. This can be done by amending the UN Charter—or, alternatively, through an interpretive resolution of the Security Council or by some other means altogether. Whatever the method, the UN must endorse our “inherent” right to defend ourselves against new threats just as forcefully as we are entitled to defend ourselves against old threats. If not, we should formally reject the UN’s authority over our war on terror.³¹

Granted, the United Nations is the legitimizing institution looked to by the international community, but does this really make sense? Just because the fifteen nations who happen to be on the Security Council at any given time approve an action, does that make that aggressive action right morally? The simple response is emphatically

UNCLASSIFIED

“no.” And just because the same fifteen members fail to approve a course of action, does that make the action morally wrong? The simple response is again an emphatically “no.” While it is certainly fair to say Security Council approval makes an aggressive act “legal,” this does not get to the heart of the issue of whether it is morally acceptable. Therefore, given the difficulties the United Nations has experienced in responding to aggression since its inception, how else might a nation gain legitimacy if the United Nations Security Council is unable or unwilling to respond?

When individuals and state actors consider the use of force in a given crisis, the language used to evaluate a particular course of action is moral not legal: the use of force will be judged good or bad based on peoples’ analysis of the crisis, perceptions of which side is right and wrong, and the potential loss of life that may result from the use of force. These considerations are not legal ideas but moral ideas. In the absence of United Nations approval, I suggest we look to the second definition of legitimacy—being in accordance with accepted patterns and standards—and examine the Just War theory for “accepted patterns and standards.” The next chapter will show that the moral arguments articulated in the Just War theory will serve policy-makers well when considering the use of force and in justifying its to the rest of the world.

Chapter 4

The Just War Theory

If the distinction between nonviolence and violence is morally significant and if nonviolence has moral priority over violence, it is important to examine the criteria by which the transition from nonviolence to violence and from peace to war might be justified.

—James F. Childress

Why is the Just War Theory a useful tool in determining whether the use of force is legitimate? Before making the argument that the Just War theory is particularly relevant today, I will first describe what the Just War theory is and how it was developed. In fact, its evolution is one of the primary reasons why it is still relevant today.

The Just War Theory is attributed primarily to three Christian theologians: St Augustine, St Thomas Aquinas, and Francisco de Vitoria. Each theologian witnessed conflict during his life, and in response to ever increasing egregious acts of violence, created a set of rules that placed moral limits on the use of force. St. Augustine is considered the father of the Just War Theory, while St. Thomas Aquinas and Francisco de Vitoria expanded and refined his work.

St. Augustine was born in AD 354, in what is now Souk Ahras, Algeria. His parents were of the respectable class of Roman society and were able to provide Augustine with a first-class education. Augustine eventually became a teacher and taught rhetoric in Carthage. He was also a philosopher, and prior to his conversion to

UNCLASSIFIED

Christianity, Plato and Cicero informed many of his ideas. During his lifetime (AD 354 - 430), Christianity was adopted as the official state religion of the Roman Empire,³² and St. Augustine converted in 386 AD. In 396 AD St. Augustine became the Bishop of Hippo (modern-day Annaba, Algeria) and served as the bishop until his death in 430 AD.

St. Augustine's contribution to the Just War theory lies in his synthesis of classical Roman and Greek views with those of Christianity. Where the Greek and Roman traditions advocated equality just for citizens, St. Augustine sought to extend it to all mankind.³³ He reasoned that the law of love obliges Christians to come to the aid of others and so justifies the use of force that inflicts harm on malefactors.³⁴ It is this synthesis that St. Thomas Aquinas would pick-up almost a thousand years later (the thirteenth century) and further develop.

The period between the work of St. Augustine (430 AD) and that of St. Thomas Aquinas (1223 AD) saw a transition from the stability of the Roman Empire to the continuous feudal conflicts of the Early Middle Ages. Whereas Plato and Cicero had informed St. Augustine, it was Aristotle and Augustine who would primarily inspire St. Thomas Aquinas, who was born in the Kingdom of Sicily in 1224 AD. His parents put him in a nearby monastery when he was 6 years old, where he spent 9 years studying and living the spiritual life. He was then sent to the University of Naples, where he began a lifelong devotion to university life, studying and teaching in Paris, Rome and Naples.

It was Aquinas who summarized the key elements of Augustine's work and reduced them to abstract rules grounded in clearly stated principles. The clarity of the first three tenets of the Just War Theory as we know it today are attributed to St. Thomas Aquinas:

UNCLASSIFIED

- (1) A legitimate authority must initiate war; this concept is important because in requiring a legitimate authority to declare intent towards hostility invites the second party to the pending hostilities to offer redress in lieu of war.
- (2) War should be waged for a just cause.
- (3) Statesmen should resort to war with the right intention.

The sixteenth century theologian-philosopher Francisco de Vitoria was the next individual to expand the tenets of the theory. De Vitoria studied philosophy at the College Saint-Jacques in Paris. After receiving his doctorate he returned to his native Spain and won the most important chair of theology at the University of Salamanca, which he held until his death in 1546. At Salamanca, de Vitoria revived the works of Aquinas and lectured widely on limiting the horror of contemporary warfare, the catalyst for which was the Spanish conquistadors horrendous treatment of Native Americans.³⁵

His contributions to the theory were three additional conditions:

- (4) The evils of war, especially the loss of human life, should be proportionate to the injustice to be prevented or remedied by war;
- (5) Peaceful means to prevent or remedy injustice should be exhausted;
- (6) An otherwise just war should have a reasonable hope of success.

A summary of Just War theory standards as we think of them today follows. They fall into two categories: *jus ad bellum* (justice on the way to war,) and *jus in bello*, (justice in the midst of war.)

Jus ad Bellum criteria

1. **Legitimate Authority:** Only a legitimate authority can initiate the use of force, and the use of force must be declared ahead of time to the adversary.
2. **Just Cause:** There are three traditional reasons cited as a just use of force. To protect the innocent from unjust attack, to restore rights wrongfully denied, and to re-establish a just order.
3. **Right Intention:** the central objective of the just war is a just peace. All efforts related to the use of force must be judged accordingly.
4. **Last Resort:** Before force may be used, all reasonable attempts at peaceful resolution of conflict—negotiation, mediation, nonviolent and less violent means (deterrence)—must be exhausted. However, this does not mean that all possible

measure have to be attempted and exhausted if there is no reasonable expectation that they will be successful.

5. **Reasonable hope of success:** There should be good grounds for believing that use of force will in fact achieve the desired outcome. This discourages a “wasteful” use of force in terms of loss of human life, suffering and destruction.
6. **General proportionality:** All things being considered, the benefits of the use of force must outweigh the costs.

Jus in Bello:

1. Do not kill or injure any particular person, but to incapacitate or restrain him/her.
2. It is not legitimate to attack certain noncombatants.
3. Do not inflict unnecessary suffering; thus, cruelty and wanton destruction are wrong.
4. Even the indirect or incidental effects of force on civilians must be justified by the principle of proportionality.

One of the factors that makes the Just War theory particularly relevant today is that it can serve as a simple tool for policy-makers to use when considering the use of force, especially when the Security Council is unable or unwilling to act. It becomes an even more powerful tool when one considers Michael Walzer’s argument that the “decision to intervene is going to be made roughly the way the Kosovo decision was made—by political and moral debates in one or more sovereign states,” not by whether the Security Council approves or disapproves.³⁶ In essence, politicians are already framing the issue in moral terms to seek legitimacy, and the Just War theory construct allows a simple and clear way to think about and to legitimize intervention, and provides a moral framework for policy-makers to follow.

Another persuasive argument for the relevancy of the Just War theory is that it served as the foundation for modern international law. Hugo Grotius, a Dutch lawyer born in 1583, is attributed with attempting to transform the tradition of just war as a matter of moral principles into positive international law. Following in the formidable footsteps of Augustine, Aquinas, and Vitoria, Grotius was the next great thinker to revise

the Just War theory. Like Aquinas, Grotius was gifted at synthesizing the ideas of older writers and thinkers. His chief innovation was his insistence that nations are bound by natural law, which he considered to be independent of God and based on man's own nature. Thus he secularized the theological concepts of the Just War theory, and in doing so he is now regarded as the father of international law.

It may be obvious to many, but why does the use of force, particularly by the United States, need to be legitimized? Stephen Walt argues that legitimacy matters to the United States because even though we live in a unipolar era, there are strategies that smaller states can adopt to counter United States influence. He breaks these strategies into two categories—strategies of accommodation and strategies of resistance. Strategies of accommodation include: band wagoning, regional balancing, ingratiation, and penetration. Strategies of resistance include: balancing, asymmetric response, blackmail, passive resistance, and delegitimization (see Appendix B for a more thorough explanation of these strategies). The point here is that even though the United States is the most powerful nation in the world, its power can be checked by smaller states, and the degree to which United States is perceived by the world to use its power illegitimately will make it proportionately harder for the United States to satisfy other national interests that require cooperation from other nations.

It can also be argued that because the United States is so powerful, it needs to legitimize the use of its power more than ever. So much power in the hands of a single actor makes other nation states nervous. Walt proposes three reasons for this:

1. Other states fear and resent United States power; unchecked power makes other states nervous because they don't know what the United States is going to do with it.

2. Even countries that are not worried about being attacked are worried about the potential negative effects for them of an aggressive act on another nation.
3. Hypocrisy: we impose standards on others that we do not enforce on ourselves.³⁷

So the unilateral use of power by the United States will receive a great deal more scrutiny than an aggressive act by a less powerful nation. And this scrutiny and garnering of ill will may make it harder for the United States to accomplish what it wants in the world arena. Successfully dealing with threats like terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and reducing global poverty all require cooperation from the international community. If United States actions are perceived as aggressive and self-serving then none of these goals will be successfully addressed.

Nye frames this concern about legitimacy in a slightly different way. He voices concern about the precedent the United States sets if it appears to act illegitimately, just because it has the power to do whatever it wants. At a Brown University forum, Nye stated:

If you are going to stretch the concept of imminence to include preventive war then it is essential that it be multilateral not unilateral, because when we stretch it unilaterally, we set ourselves up as executioner, judge, and jury and we create a tremendous precedent, an unfortunate precedent, which essentially gives away the gains of what we learned in the first half of the twentieth century. What would happen then when Russia decides to invade Georgia? Or India decides to invade Pakistan? Or others in seeing that unilateral preventive war is now accepted?"³⁸

Another reason legitimacy is important has to do with the structure of the United States military. When people assess the military power of the United States, they tend to focus on the amount of money it spends on defense. However, a better metric to measure United States military power is to look at the people who comprise its military. The United States military is as capable as it is, not because of the weapons it has, but because

UNCLASSIFIED

of the people it has deploying those weapons. These people all enter the military voluntarily, and each year the Department of Defense recruits approximately 230,000 men and women. If the United States gets involved in conflicts that are seen as illegitimate in the domestic or international arena, the ability to continue to staff the military force with volunteers may be put in serious jeopardy, which would also jeopardize what the military can accomplish.

Another reason why legitimacy is important is also related to the United States Military, and has to do with those people serving in the military charged with using violence against other human beings when called upon to do so by the president. It has been said that as soon as a military member uses force, the force transforms the person that used it.³⁹ The moral authority or legitimacy of the conflict is what allows the soldier/sailor/airmen/marine to use force without being destroyed by its use.

One final thought on why it is important to legitimize the use of force. As Nye states, "Post-industrial societies are focused on welfare rather than glory, and they loathe high casualties except when survival is at stake. But the absence of a warrior ethic in modern democracies means the use of force requires an elaborate moral justification to ensure popular support (except where survival is at stake)."⁴⁰

When one examines the recent use of force in response to terrorist attacks in both the Clinton and Bush administrations, the principles of the Just War theory are very relevant. In recent testimony to the 11 September commission, Richard Clark, the former counter-terrorism director in the White House, discussed an incident during the Clinton presidency involving Osama Bin Ladin. There was some intelligence that Bin Ladin was at what appeared to be a hunting camp in Afghanistan. The decision was made not to

UNCLASSIFIED

bomb the lodge because too many innocent civilians would be killed.⁴¹ Had the United States had no concern for moral authority, it would have bombed the camp without a second thought. This in fact is a practical application of Just War concepts, and one can only hope that these concepts will be used as the United States continues the war on terrorism.

The Just War theory may be more relevant today than it was when originally conceived some 2,000 years ago. Its evolution in response to ever increasing acts of human violence resulting from conflict has created a potent moral compass for policy-makers to use when considering and justifying the use of force. Because the use of force is considered in moral terms rather than legal terms, the compass may in fact be more relevant than the legal sanctioning by the United Nations Security Council. This compass is even more potent when one considers that the Just War theory served as the foundation for modern international law. For the United States in particular, adhering to the tenets spelled out in the Just War theory can assist policy-makers in legitimizing the use of force if the United Nations Security Council is unable or unwilling to act.

Chapter 5

Adequacy of the Strategy

Strategy is a system of ad hoc expedients; it is more than knowledge, it is the application of knowledge to practical life, the development of an original idea in accordance with continually changing circumstances. It is the art of action under the pressure of the most difficult conditions.

—Helmuth Von Moltke

While the preemptive use of force articulated in the NSS poses risks from a legitimacy perspective, we have discussed a way to reduce that risk with the application of the Just War theory. But is this the preemptive use of force the right strategy for today's security environment? This section attempts to persuade the reader that this is in fact the right strategy to deal with terrorism; however, as we shall see, this does not mean the NSS is without flaws.

The NSS defines the grand strategy of the United States. It articulates how the United States intends to deal with threats to United States interests. However, as highlighted earlier in the paper, the United States does not have just one security strategy; it has in fact five, given in order of publication:

- ?? Quadrennial Defense Review – Sept 30, 2001
- ?? National Strategy for Homeland Security – July 16, 2002
- ?? National Security Strategy – Sept 17, 2002
- ?? National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction – December 2002
- ?? National Strategy for Combating Terrorism – February 2003

UNCLASSIFIED

The Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) predates the NSS and was the first strategy document published under the Bush administration. The QDR serves as the Department of Defense's overall strategic planning document, as required by Public Law 103-62. The National Strategy for Homeland Security also predates the National Security Strategy. The National Strategy for Homeland Security is the first of its kind and its purpose is to "mobilize and organize our Nation to secure the U.S. homeland from terrorist attack."⁴² Interestingly, this strategy was published before Congress established the Department of Homeland Security. Soon after 11 September the President established the Office of Homeland Security within the White House and it is this office that produced the National Strategy for Homeland Security. Congressional approval to create the Department of Homeland Security came soon after the homeland security strategy was published.

The NSS was published soon thereafter, and was quickly followed by the National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction (NSCWMD), which expands upon programs outlined in the NSS and the National Strategy for Homeland Security. While the NSCWMD is quite detailed, it does not assign responsibility for implementing the strategy to one agency but across several agencies. This will likely make its implementation harder to follow through on.

The final national level strategy published by the administration was the National Strategy for Combating Terrorism, which explicitly states that it supports the NSS of the United States:

This combating terrorism strategy further elaborates on Section III of the National Security Strategy by expounding on our need to destroy terrorist organizations, win the 'war of ideas,' and strengthen America's security at home and abroad. While the

UNCLASSIFIED

National Strategy for Homeland Security focuses on preventing terrorist attacks within the United States, the National Strategy for Combating Terrorism focuses on identifying and defusing threats before they reach our borders.⁴³

What is important to note is that all the strategies are in fact complimentary, a result that should not be assumed given the size and bureaucracy of the United States government. The NSS serves as the overarching guidance, or the grand strategy, and the other four strategies further amplify strategic guidance introduced in the NSS.

Grand Strategy

What is grand strategy anyway, and how can one evaluate its effectiveness?

Robert Art describes it as follows:

a grand strategy tells a nation's leaders what goals they should aim for and how best they can use their country's military power to attain these goals. Grand strategy, like foreign policy, deals with the momentous choices that a nation makes in foreign affairs, but it differs from foreign policy in one fundamental respect. To define a nation's foreign policy is to lay out the full range of goals that a state should seek in the world and then determine how all of the instruments of statecraft—political power, military power, economic power, ideological power—should be integrated and employed with one another to achieve these goals. Grand strategy, too, deals with the full range of goals that a state should seek, but it concentrates primarily on how the military instrument should be employed to achieve them. It prescribes how a nation should wield its military instrument to realize its foreign policy goals.⁴⁴

Strategies are usually described in broad terms. Common descriptions of strategy are Dominion or Primacy, Cooperative Security, Collective Security, Selective Engagement, Containment, and Isolationism. For a brief description of each see Appendix C. Many describe the current American strategy as primacy or dominance and I would have to agree.

To evaluate a grand strategy for the United States, one must first determine the country's interests in the world and then identify specific threats to those interests.

Robert Art states, "The most fundamental task in devising a grand strategy is to determine a state's national interests."⁴⁵ However, it is difficult to assess this task in the NSS because it is not written in the traditional language of interests and threats to those interests. If there were some sense of priority of actions in the strategy, then the reader would be able to deduce what the United States national interests were.

American Interests

What does the National Security Strategy say about United States interests in the world today? In the introduction to the strategy, President Bush does say that, "defending our Nation against its enemies is the first and fundamental commitment of The Federal Government." One may therefore assume that any resources required or actions related to this endeavor would take precedence.

Two other sections in the strategy also use language that sounds like it is describing American interests. In the section on global economic growth and free trade it reads, "A strong world economy enhances our national security by advancing prosperity and freedom in the rest of the world,"; it further states, "we will promote economic growth and economic freedom beyond America's shores."⁴⁶ Finally in the section on development, the strategy states that, "including all the world's poor in an expanding circle of development—and opportunity—is a moral imperative and one of the top priorities of the U.S. international policy."⁴⁷ Therefore, as far as setting priorities based on interests, the best that can be deduced from the strategy is that defending the nation is

the #1 priority and promoting economic growth and freedom and helping poor parts of the world develop are “top priorities.”

When one compares this strategy with the previous two National Security Strategies, the #1 priority of defending the homeland is the same, which should not be surprising. The real issues are what are the other priorities, how important are they, and how many resources should be devoted to them. The NSS provides no clear answers to these questions.

Threats to American Interests

The coverage of threats to American interests in the NSS is a little less vague, but it does not contain a comprehensive list. It would appear that the only threat to American interests is terrorism—more specifically, terrorists or rogue states who seek to use weapons of mass destructions in the United States or against its allies and friends. In the introduction to the strategy President Bush states that, “The gravest danger our Nation faces lies at the crossroads of radicalism and technology.” This is further expounded on in the body of the document:

When the spread of chemical and biological and nuclear weapons, along with ballistic missile technology—when that occurs, even weak states and small groups could attain a catastrophic power to strike great nations. Our enemies have declared this very intention, and have been caught seeking these terrible weapons. They want the capability to blackmail us, or to harm us, or to harm our friends—and we will oppose them with all our power.’⁴⁸

In essence, the spread of weapons of mass destruction to rogue states or non-state actors who would not otherwise pose a threat to the United States is now a real threat to national security.

UNCLASSIFIED

There is only one other section which contains language that may describe a threat to national security: “In an increasingly interconnected world, regional crisis can strain our alliances, rekindle rivalries among the major powers, and create horrifying affronts to human dignity.”⁴⁹ Perhaps because there was no clear discussion of interests, there could be no clear discussion of threats. Even though the strategy focuses on values, explicit mention of potential threats to the values the United States espouses would strengthen the document.

Another way to evaluate the NSS is to do a comparative analysis of contemporary grand strategies. For this comparison, I chose recent works by Robert Art and Joseph Nye on grand strategy.

Robert J. Art: U.S. Interests

Art views national interests in a more traditional way; in terms of those that are vital, highly important, or important. A “vital interest” is one that is essential and that, if not achieved, will bring costs that are catastrophic or nearly so. He cites only one vital interest to the United States, preventing an attack on the homeland.⁵⁰ This is consistent with the 2002 NSS, which states that, “Defending our nation against its enemies is the first and fundamental commitment of the federal government.”⁵¹ So the strategy hits the mark at least for what Art considers the most important interest for the United States.

Art describes highly important interests as ones that, if achieved, bring great benefits to a state, but, if denied carry costs that are severe but not catastrophic. He believes the United States has two highly important interests: (1) preventing great-power Eurasian wars and, if possible, the intense security competitions that make them more likely; and (2) preserving access to a reasonably priced supply of oil.⁵² The National

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Strategy has a stated goal of “defusing regional conflicts” and discusses several regions in depth: the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, South Asia, Indonesia, the Western Hemisphere, Latin America, Colombia, and Africa. So while the NSS does not specify its desire to defuse regional conflict to Eurasia, it does have a stated goal of dealing with regional conflicts.

The strategy also addresses the interest of preserving access to a reasonably priced supply of oil. Under the section on enhancing energy security the NSS states: “we will strengthen our own energy security and the shared prosperity of the global economy by working with our allies, trading partners, and energy producers to expand the sources and types of global energy supplied, especially in the Western Hemisphere, Africa, Central Asia, and the Caspian region.”⁵³

Art describes “important interests” as ones that increase a nation’s economic well-being and perhaps its security, and that contribute more generally to making the international environment more congenial to its interests, but whose potential value or loss is moderate. He believes the United States has three important interests: (1) preserve an open international economic order; (2) foster the spread of democracy and respect for human rights abroad, and prevent genocide or mass murder in civil wars; and (3) protect the global environment, especially from the adverse affects of global warming and severe climate change.⁵⁴

Again the NSS has a stated goal of igniting a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade, and discusses in great detail how the United States will go about this. Furthermore, the first goal it lists is to champion aspirations for human dignity. While there is no specific mention of preventing genocide, the strategy

states that the United States “will champion the cause of human dignity and oppose those who resist it.”⁵⁵

As for protecting the global environment, the NSS addresses this issue in several ways. It states, “We will also continue to work with our partners to develop cleaner and more energy efficient technologies.”⁵⁶ It further states “our overall objective is to reduce America’s greenhouse gas emissions relative to the size of the economy, cutting such emissions per unit of economic activity by 18% over the next 10 years, by the year 2012.”⁵⁷ It also lists specific actions for achieving this goal. So comparing the NSS with United States interests as expressed by Robert Art we can conclude that the strategy addresses most of the interests, but does so with little sense of priority.

Joseph S. Nye Jr: U.S. Interests

Joseph Nye, who has also written recently on United States grand strategy, argues for a broader view of national interests. While he agrees that national strategic interests are vital and deserve priority (e.g. survival), he makes clear that survival is not the only objective of foreign policy. He argues persuasively that other values such as human rights are equally important. In his book the *Paradox of American Power*, he suggests that U.S. strategy “must first ensure our survival, but then it must focus on providing global public goods. We gain doubly from such a strategy: from the public goods themselves, and from the way they legitimize our power in the eyes of others.”⁵⁸

However this is only two-thirds of the interest equation. The third element is human rights and democracy. Nye argues that furthering human rights and democracy around the world are important endeavors for the United States but also need to be pursued with great care. He offers six rules of prudence for humanitarian intervention

that can guide for policy-makers.⁵⁹ One of his rules reinforces this document's discussion on the relevance of the Just War theory in that Nye cautions policy-makers to "determine that there is a just cause and probable success"⁶⁰ when considering humanitarian intervention.

The goals of the NSS stack up pretty well against Professor Nye's criteria. We have already established that the strategy covers the survival of the United States. It also has several goals which address global public goods: igniting a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade; working with others to defuse regional conflicts; strengthening alliances to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks against us and our friends; and developing agendas for cooperative action with other main centers for global power. The strategy also has two goals specifically addressing human rights issues: champion aspirations for human dignity, and expanding the circle of development by opening societies and building the infrastructure of democracy. The challenge for both Nye's vision and the NSS is to find a way to prioritize all these interests, and as we have seen, the NSS does not indicate how these should be ranked

Robert J. Art: Threats to U.S. Interests

Lets now turn our comparison to how Art and Nye inform our thinking on the key threats to American interests. Art's threats are linked directly to his interests and he is unequivocal about the greatest threats to American survival. "The two greatest threats to the security of America's homeland today are grand terror attacks, especially NBC [nuclear, biological, and chemical] ones, and the acquisition of NBC weapons by state actors who are hard to deter."⁶¹ These threats are clearly addressed in the NSS: "The

UNCLASSIFIED

United States of America is fighting a war against terrorists of global reach;”⁶² and “We must be prepared to stop rogue states and their terrorist clients before they are able to threaten or use weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies and friends.”⁶³

Art believes the “greatest threat to Eurasian great-power peace comes from any aggressor state that seeks to dominate either eastern or western Eurasia or both, or from intense great-power security competitions that could escalate to war.”⁶⁴ However, the NSS deals with this threat only in vague terms: “Concerned nations must remain actively engaged in critical regional disputes to avoid explosive escalation and minimize human suffering.”⁶⁵ It follows this declaration with a short discussion about several key regions, covering more geographical areas than just Eurasia.

Art describes “the severest threat to American and global prosperity lies in the disruption of oil supplies from the Persian Gulf.” The NSS does not explicitly recognize this threat either but, as discussed in the interest section, it does contain language with regards to “enhancing energy security.”

Art states that, “the most serious threat to international openness come from economic nationalism, fears that economic openness could be militarily disadvantageous, or from a Eurasian great-power war.” Again these threats are vaguely described in the NSS. We have already discussed the strategy’s handling of conflict with Eurasia. As far as addressing economic openness, the NSS says the United States “will use our economic engagement with other countries to underscore the benefits and policies that generate higher productivity and sustained economic growth including . . . free trade that provides

UNCLASSIFIED

new avenues for growth and fosters the diffusion of technologies and ideas that increase productivity and opportunity.”

The next threat addressed by Art is in regards to democracy and human rights. “The greatest threat to the spread of democracy and to human rights come from ruthless dictators, thug leaders, or civil wars where one or both parties resort to mass murder of non-combatants.” As stated earlier, the first listed goal of the NSS is to “champion aspirations for human dignity.” The NSS does not deal with this issue in the terms of threats to the United States, but more in terms of spreading values that are important to the United States. One can argue that you will get the same outcome, regardless.

The final threat addressed by Art deals with the environment: “the worst threat to the global environment comes from the unbridled use of fossil fuels that continue to pump carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere.” As discussed under the interest section in this document, the NSS addresses this issue not so much as a threat but as an economic issue. Although it does have a fairly detailed plan on how to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, how important this goal is in relation to all the other goals in the strategy and why it is important are not addressed in the strategy.

Joseph S. Nye, Jr: Threats to U.S. Interests

What can Professor Nye add to this analysis of threats to the United States? He first examines the issue from a traditional balance of power perspective, and two of his conclusions are particularly interesting.

First, due to Russia’s “residual nuclear strength, its proximity to Europe, and the potential of alliance with China or India, Russia can choose to cooperate or to cause problems for the United States but not be a global challenger.”

UNCLASSIFIED

Second, the “closest thing to an equal that the United States faces at the beginning of the twenty-first century is the European Union.”⁶⁶ However, he does not see Europe threatening “the vital or important interests” of the United States nor vice versa.⁶⁷

Nye therefore concludes that from a traditional power perspective, the United States is the undisputed leader (see Appendix D for details). But he offers a new construct to understand the distribution of power in a globalized world:

Power today is distributed among countries in a pattern that resembles a complex three-dimensional chess game. On the top chessboard, military power is largely unipolar. As we have seen, the United States is the only country with both intercontinental nuclear weapons and large, state-of-the-art air, naval, and ground forces capable of global deployment. But on the middle of the chessboard, economic power is multipolar, with the United States, Europe, and Japan representing two-thirds of world product, and with China’s dramatic growth likely to make it a major player early in the century. As we have seen, on this economic board, the United States is not a hegemon and often must bargain as an equal with Europe. This has led some observers to call it a hybrid uni–multipolar world. But the situation is even more complicated and difficult for the traditional terminology of the balance of power among states to capture. The bottom chessboard is the realm of transnational relations that cross borders outside of government control. This realm includes non-state actors as diverse as bankers electronically transferring sums larger than most national budgets, at one extreme, and terrorists carrying out attacks and hackers disrupting Internet operations, at the other end. On this bottom board, power is widely dispersed, and it makes no sense to speak of unipolarity, multipolarity, or hegemony. Those who recommend a hegemonic American foreign policy based on such traditional descriptions of American power are relying on woefully inadequate analysis. When you are in a three-dimensional game, you will lose if you focus only on the interstate military board and fail to notice the other boards and the vertical connections among them.⁶⁸

Nye’s description of the distribution of power in the world today as a three-dimensional chess game gives a completely different construct than Art to apply, and it also takes into account at least one view of how to think about security strategy in the information age rather than the industrial age. It points to how much more complex a globalized world is, and illustrates that dominance in the military realm is not enough to allow the United

States to accomplish many of the goals in the strategy. To successfully deal with issues arising from the middle layer and the bottom layer requires cooperation from other nations. In addition, actions dealing with issues in one realm will ripple through the board, and the consequences must therefore be viewed in terms of all three dimensions of power.

There are several places in the NSS that acknowledge the United State's need to work and cooperate with other nations. In the section on terrorism, the strategy states, "While our focus is protecting America, we know that to defeat terrorism in today's globalized world we need support from our allies and friends."⁶⁹ One specific goal of the strategy is to "develop agendas for cooperative action with the other main centers of global power."⁷⁰ However, this analysis of power should also be at the heart of thinking about how the United States executes its strategy and could also serve as a useful tool to help prioritize limited resources to meet the many goals in the strategy.

We have compared the interests and threats identified by two leading thinkers on the subject to the NSS and found that all of the interests and threats to those interests are included in the strategy, even if they are not specifically stated as interests and threats. But being included or addressed is not enough. Does the strategy adequately address the threats?

The Threat of Grand Terror

There does not seem to be much dispute that the greatest threat to the United States and the Western world is terrorist groups acquiring and using weapons of mass destruction. What is the best way to address this threat? While entire volumes have been written on this issue, I would like to discuss the issue in general terms.

UNCLASSIFIED

Art persuasively argues “detering terrorists becomes nearly impossible if they are bent only on revenge, if they do not identify themselves, and if they engage in suicide attacks.”⁷¹ Therefore, if it is impossible to deter terrorists or rogue states, then a preventive or preemptive strategy is appropriate. And the strategy is very clear that this is the approach the United States has taken. However, Art also says that the “best way to forestall NBC attacks against the American homeland or American troops abroad is to take a strong stance against NBC spread.”⁷² Not only does the NSS have specific language on this issue, but three of the five current strategies deal solely with this issue: The National Strategy for Homeland Security, The National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction, and the National Strategy for Combating Terrorism.

John Lewis Gaddis describes the “Bush doctrine” in the following way: “the United States will identify and eliminate terrorists wherever they are, together with the regimes that sustain them.”⁷³ To meet this challenge the NSS added preemption to the toolbox, which already contains deterrence and containment.

Preemption is not a new tool, but was used in the nineteenth century to ensure security along the United State’s expanding borders. For example, in 1818 the Monroe administration invaded the territory of Spanish Florida after a series of attacks across the border by Creeks, Seminoles, and escaped slaves. To justify this act of aggression the Monroe administration asserted that it had the right to act preemptively to prevent future incursions.⁷⁴ To doctrine of preemption was then used to justify expansion west to deal with the concern of states that might fail. Texas was annexed in 1845 because of James K. Polk’s concern that the territory might not be able to retain the independence it has won from the Mexicans nine years earlier.⁷⁵

UNCLASSIFIED

To effectively use this tactic, the United States must have the capacity to act wherever it needs to without significant resistance from rival states—this is better known as hegemony. Gaddis goes on to characterize “the final innovation in the Bush strategy . . . is to spread democracy everywhere,” to address the issue of removing the causes of terrorism and tyranny altogether.⁷⁶

On the other hand, Robert Art describes the NSS in the following way:

In 2001-2002, a fourth appearance of dominion-like behavior became manifest under President George W. Bush. It was marked by tough rhetoric toward adversaries, a huge increase in American defense spending (only part of which could be accounted for by September 11), and unvarnished pursuit of American self-interest, a penchant for unilateralism that worried America’s potential enemies and aggravated its allies, a reaffirmation of the 1992 DPG declaration of intent to maintain military power sufficient “to dissuade future military competition”, and a strategic doctrine that stressed preempting threats rather than deterring or containing them. Part of this was a Republican Party correction to what it had perceived as a soft, overly multilateralist, and inconsistent Clinton foreign policy. Part was due to legitimate concerns about the spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons to states that both Republican and Democratic administrations would prefer not have them. Part, however, was due to an arrogance born of the knowledge that American power, especially its military power, bought the United States a lot of freedom of political maneuver.⁷⁷

Thus it is clear that the same words have evoked very different responses in two respected academics, and this reaction is also reflected in many other critiques of the strategy. I believe the truth lies somewhere between the two. I am reassured by the fact that the NSS does aggressively address the gravest threat to the United States, dealing with terrorists’ potentially acquiring and using weapons of mass destruction against the United States. And it addresses this threat in many different ways, not just with the preemptive use of force. While preemption is not without risk, there is no other way to deal with a threat that cannot be contained or deterred. This is not to say that the United

UNCLASSIFIED

States should not focus much energy and resources on addressing the underlying causes of terrorism but these cannot be fixed quickly if at all, and in the meantime, my preference is for a proactive approach rather than a reactive approach. I do not think the strategy articulates “arrogance” as Art describes; nevertheless statements made by senior officials in the administration can certainly convey this image. This is not helpful in achieving United States national security.

However, the threat of terrorism is not the only threat to the United States, and although the strategy addresses many of them, it does not do so in any organized way with any assigned priority. The NSS fails to clearly articulate any sense of priority among the many actions articulated in the strategy. This lack of prioritization is an even greater concern, given that the strategy is values based. Without any stated priorities one could argue that all actions in the strategy are equally important and that all should be pursued with the same level of intensity. It is doubtful that the United States has enough resources to accomplish all of the actions articulated in the strategy so some sense of priority is vital to successfully executing the strategy.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

Our Nation's cause has always been larger than our Nation's defense. We fight, as we always fight, for a just peace—a peace that favors liberty.

—George W. Bush

In September 2002, President Bush published a new National Security Strategy to address a radically altered security environment. Not since the burning of the White House and the Capitol in 1814 had the United States felt vulnerable to a surprise catastrophic attack. While the NSS is best known for its stated intent to act preemptively to prevent terrorists from using weapons of mass destruction against the United States and its friends and allies, the strategy actually articulates much more than this. In fact, it is a values-based strategy which acknowledges the responsibility of the United States to be a force for peace, prosperity and liberty in the world, and only advocates a preemptive approach regarding terrorism and the use of weapons of mass destruction.⁷⁸ The strategy also acknowledges the importance of adhering to international law and fostering strong relationships with Canada and Europe.

However, the “illegality” of the preemptive use of force from an international law perspective is a very serious problem for the United States. As the sole superpower, the United States has to be even more concerned about legitimizing its use of force, while the ineffectiveness of the international community to acknowledge and deal with new kinds

UNCLASSIFIED

of threats weakens the United States ability to adequately deal with them. The United States should therefore be leading the way on United Nations reform and in pressing for new international norms on what an “imminent” threat to world peace is and how it should be addressed. Without United States leadership on this issue, any use of force by the United States, no matter how morally justified, will be more difficult.

In the meantime, the principles outlined in the Just War theory will serve policy-makers well when determining when it is or is not appropriate to use force. It is not hard to argue that if a state had perfect knowledge that a terrorist was going to detonate a nuclear bomb at X time in Y location, then the world should do whatever it takes to interrupt the event from occurring. However, there is no such thing as absolute “certainty,” so the Just War theory can help policy-makers think about tradeoffs in an uncertain world.

As a United States citizen and military officer, I am comfortable with the strategy’s plan to deal with the gravest threats to national security. However, I do not think it adequately addresses threats that do not rise to this level, like global warming, and would strongly recommend that threats other than terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction be given a second look in the next draft.

A final thought. Strategy only gets you so far; it is how the strategy is executed that ultimately matters. It is too soon to tell whether the United States is effectively executing its strategy, but acting preemptively comes with great risk. Our leadership needs to recognize this and act prudently when exercising the unilateral use of military force. This force should only be used to preempt the gravest threats to the world—the

UNCLASSIFIED

threat of terrorists or rogue states using weapons of mass destruction against the United States and its allies and friends.

Appendix A

National Strategy Summary

<p>2001 (September) Quadrennial Defense Review (71 Pages)</p>	<p>2002 (July) National Strategy for Homeland Security (55 pages)</p>	<p>2002 (September) National Security Strategy for the United States (31 pages)</p>	<p>2002 (December) National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction (6 pages)</p>	<p>2003 (February) National Strategy for Combating Terrorism (30 pages)</p>
	<p>Strategic Objectives: ?? Prevent terrorist attacks within the United States; ?? Reduce America’s vulnerability to terrorism; ?? Minimize the damage and recover from attacks that do occur.</p>	<p>Goals: ?? We will preserve the peace by fighting terrorists and tyrants. ?? We will preserve the peace by building good relations among great powers. ?? We will extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent.</p>	<p>We will not permit the world’s most dangerous regimes and terrorists to threaten us with the world’s most destructive weapons.</p>	<p>?? No group or nation should mistake America’s intentions: We will not rest until terrorist groups of global reach have been found, have been stopped, and have been defeated. ?? While the National Strategy for Homeland Security focuses on preventing terrorist attacks within the United States, the National Strategy for Combating Terrorism focuses on identifying and defusing threats before they reach our borders.</p>

<p>?? Ensuring U.S. security and freedom of action, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o U.S. sovereignty, territorial integrity, and freedom o Safety of U.S. citizens at home and abroad o Protection of critical U.S. infrastructure <p>?? Honoring international commitments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Security and well-being of allies and friends o Precluding hostile domination of critical areas, particularly Europe, Northeast Asia, the East Asian littoral, and the Middle East and Southwest Asia o Peace and stability in the Western Hemisphere <p>?? Contributing to economic well-being, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Vitality and productivity of the global economy o Security of international sea, air, and space, and information lines of communication o Access to key markets and strategic resources. 	<p>?? The U. S. government has no more important mission than protecting the homeland from future terrorist attacks.</p>	<p>No specific mention of interest, so I gleaned these from the text:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Defending our Nation against its enemies is the first and fundamental commitment of the Federal Government. 2. A strong world economy enhances our national security by advancing prosperity and freedom in the rest of the world. (17) . . . We will promote economic growth and economic freedom beyond America’s shores. 3. Including all of the world’s poor in an expanding circle of development—and opportunity—is a moral imperative and one of the top priorities of the U.S. international policy. (21) 	<p>?? We must accord the highest priority to the protection of the United States, our forces, and our friends and allies from the existing and growing WMD threat.</p>	<p>?? Combating terrorism and securing the U.S. homeland from future attacks are our top priority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o But they will no be our only priorities. This strategy supports the National Security Strategy of the United States o As the National Security Strategy highlights, we live in an age with tremendous opportunities to foster a world consistent with interests and values embraced by the United States and freedom-loving people around the world. o And we will seize these opportunity.
--	---	---	--	--

<p>?? Diminishing protection afforded by geographic distance . . . it is clear that over time an increasing number of states will acquire ballistic missiles with steadily increasing effective ranges.</p> <p>?? Regional security developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Although the United States will not face a peer competitor in the near future, the potential exists for regional powers to develop sufficient capabilities to threaten stability in regions critical to U.S. interest. ○ Maintaining a stable balance in Asia will be a complex task. The possibility exists that a military competitor with a formidable resource base will emerge in the region. ○ The United States and its allies and friends will continue to depend on the energy resources of the Middle East, a region in which several states pose conventional military challenges and many seek to acquire—or have acquired—chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and enhanced high explosives (CBRNE) weapons. ○ An opportunity for cooperation exists with Russia. Yet, at the same time, Russia pursues a number of policy objectives contrary to U.S. interests. <p>?? Increasing challenges and threats emanating from the territories of weak and failing states. The absence of capable or responsible governments in many countries in wide areas of Asia, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere creates a fertile ground for non-state actors engaging in drug trafficking, terrorism, and other activities that spread across borders.</p> <p>?? Diffusion of power and military capabilities to non-state actors. The attacks against the U.S. homeland in September 2001 demonstrate that terrorist groups possess both the motivations and capabilities to conduct devastating attacks on U.S. territory, citizens, and infrastructure.</p> <p>?? Developing and sustaining regional security arrangements: U.S. alliances, as well as its wide range of</p>	<p>?? Unless we act to prevent it, a new wave of terrorism, potentially involving the world’s most destructive weapons, looms in America’s future.</p>	<p>Threats: (no specific list of threats, so these were gleaned from the text).</p> <p>?? The gravest our Nation faces lies at the crossroads of radicalism and technology. When the spread of chemical and biological and nuclear weapons, along with ballistic missile technology—when that occurs even weak states and small groups could attain a catastrophic power to strike great nations. Our enemies have declared this very intention, and have been caught seeking these terrible weapons. They want the capability to blackmail us, or to harm us, or to harm our friends—and we will oppose them with all our power. (13)</p> <p>?? America is threatened less by conquering states than by failing ones. (1)</p> <p>?? We are menaced less by fleets and armies than by catastrophic technologies in the hands of the embittered few. (1)</p> <p>?? In an increasingly interconnected world, regional crisis can strain our alliances, rekindle rivalries among the major powers, and create horrifying affronts to human dignity. (9)</p>	<p>?? Weapons of Mass destruction—nuclear, biological, and chemical—in the possession of hostile states and terrorists represent one of the greatest security challenges facing the United States</p>	<p>?? The threat of terrorists acquiring and using WMD is a clear and present danger.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A central goal must be to prevent terrorists from acquiring or manufacturing the WMD that would enable them to act on their worst ambitions.
--	---	---	--	--

<p>Operational Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Protecting critical bases of operations (U.S homeland, forces abroad, allies, and friends) and defeating chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and enhanced high explosives weapons and their delivery means; ?? Assuring information systems in the face of attack and conducting effective information operations; ?? Projecting and sustaining U.S. forces in distant anti-access or area-denial environments and defeating anti-access and area-denial threats; ?? Denying enemies sanctuary by providing persistent surveillance, tracking and rapid engagement with high-volume precision strike, through a combination of complementary air and ground capabilities, against critical mobile and fixed targets at various ranges and in all weather and terrains; ?? Enhancing the capability and survivability of space systems and supporting infrastructure; and ?? Leveraging information technology and innovative concepts to develop an interoperable, joint C4ISR architecture and capability that includes a tailorable joint operational picture. (page 30) 	<p>Critical Mission Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Intelligence and warning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Enhanced the analytic capabilities of the FBI o Build new capabilities through the information analysis and infrastructure protection division of the proposed Department of Homeland Security o Implement the Homeland Security Advisory System o Utilize dual-use analysis to prevent attacks; and o Employ “red team” techniques ?? Border and transportation security <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ensure accountability in border and transportation security; o Create “smart borders”; o Increase the scrutiny of international shipping containers; o Implement the Aviation and Transportation Security Act of 2001; o Recapitalize the U.S. Coast Guard; and o Reform immigration services. ?? Domestic Counterterrorism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Improve intergovernmental law enforcement coordination o Facilitate apprehension of potential terrorists; o Continue ongoing investigations and prosecutions; o Complete FBI restructuring to emphasize prevention of terrorist attacks; o Target and attack terrorist financing; and o Track foreign terrorists and bring them to justice ?? Protecting critical infrastructure and key assets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unify America’s infrastructure protection effort in the Department of Homeland Security; o Build and maintain a complete and accurate assessment of America’s critical infrastructure and key assets; o Enable effective partnership with state and local governments and the private sector; o Develop a national infrastructure protection plan; o Secure cyberspace; o Harness the best analytic and modeling tools to develop effective protective solutions; o Guard America’s critical infrastructure and key assets against “inside” threats; and o Partner with the international community to protect our transnational infrastructure. ?? Defending against catastrophic threats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Prevent terrorist use of nuclear weapons through better sensors and procedures; o Detect chemical and biological materials and 	<p>Actions: (to achieve these goals)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Champion aspirations for human dignity ?? Strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks against us and our friends ?? Work with others to defuse regional conflicts ?? Prevent our enemies from threatening us, our allies, our friends, with weapons of mass destruction ?? Ignite a new global economic growth free markets and free trade ?? Expand the circle of development by opening societies and building the infrastructure of democracy ?? Develop agenda for cooperative action with other main centers for global power ?? Transform America’s national security institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century. 	<p>Three principal pillars:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Counterproliferation to combat WMD use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Interdiction o Deterrence o Defense and mitigation ?? Strengthened Nonproliferation to Combat WMD Proliferation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Active nonproliferation diplomacy o Multilateral Regimes o Nonproliferation and Threat Reduction Cooperation o Controls on Nuclear Materials o U.S. export controls o Nonproliferation sanctions ?? Consequence management to respond to WMD use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The National Strategy for Homeland Security discusses U.S. government programs to deal with the consequences of the use of a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear weapon in the United States. 	<p>To accomplish these tasks we will simultaneously act on four fronts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?? Defeat terrorists and their organizations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Identify terrorists and terrorist organizations o Locate terrorists and their organizations o Destroy terrorists and their organizations ?? Deny sponsorship, support, and sanctuary to terrorists <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o End the state sponsorship of terrorism o Establish and maintain an international standard of accountability with regard to combating terrorism. o Strengthen and sustain the international effort to fight terrorism. o Interdict and disrupt material support for terrorists. ?? Diminish the underlying conditions that terrorists seek to exploit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Partner with the international community to strengthen weak states and prevent the re-emergence of terrorism o Win the war of ideas ?? Defend US. Citizens and interests at home and abroad. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Implement the National Strategy for Homeland Security o Attain domain awareness o Enhance measures to ensure the integrity, reliability, and availability of critical physical and information-based infrastructure at home and abroad. o Integrate measure to protect U.S. citizens abroad. o Ensure an integrated incident management capability.
---	--	---	---	---

UNCLASSIFIED

	<p>attacks;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">o Improve chemical sensors and decontamination techniques;o Develop broad spectrum vaccines, antimicrobials, and antidotes;o Harness the scientific knowledge and tools to counter terrorism; ando Implement the Select Agent Program <p>?? Emergency preparedness and response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">o Integrate separate federal response plans into a single all-discipline incident management plan;o Create a national incident management system;o Improve tactical counterterrorist capabilities;o Enable seamless communication among all responders;o Prepare health care providers for catastrophic terrorism;o Augment America's pharmaceutical and vaccine stockpiles;o Prepare for chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear decontamination;o Plan for military support for civil authorities;o Build the Citizen Corps;o Implement the First Responder Initiative of the Fiscal Year 2003 budget;o Build a national training and evaluation system; ando Enhance the victim support system.			
--	--	--	--	--

Appendix B

Strategies to Counter United States Power⁷⁹

Strategies of Accommodation:

Band Wagoning: Deflect United States power through appeasement; do what the United States wants so that the state will not be a victim of United States power.

Regional Balancing: Use United States power to oppose local challengers.

Ingratiation: Align with the United States in order to shape United States policy and gain concessions or influence United States aid.

Penetration: Manipulate United States political system in order to influence United States foreign policy.

Strategies of Resistance:

Balancing: Collaborate with others in order to resist the United States more effectively.

Asymmetric Responses: Look for areas of United States vulnerability; avoid direct tests of strength unless conditions are favorable (i.e. Al Qaeda).

Blackmail: Threaten unwanted actions in order to extract concessions (i.e. North Korea).

Passive Resistance: Do not resist openly; just say no (i.e. Russia's refusal to stop supporting Iran's nuclear energy/weapons program).

Delegitimization: Portray United States actions as illegitimate, self serving, hypocritical.

Appendix C

Grand Strategy⁸⁰

	<u>Neo Isolationism</u> To stay out of most wars and to keep a free hand for the U.S.	<u>Off Shore Balancing</u> Same as isolationism, and to cut down any emerging Eurasian hegemon Note: Isolationism and offshore balancing can be treated as one, absent the imminent emergence of a Eurasian hegemon.	<u>Selective Engagement</u> To do a selected number of critical tasks	<u>Collective Security</u> To keep the peace everywhere	<u>Cooperative Security</u> To reduce the occurrence of war by limiting the offensive military capability of states	<u>Primacy or Dominion</u> Aim is to rule the world	<u>2002 National Security Strategy</u>
Analytical Anchor	Minimal, defensive realism	Minimal, defensive realism	Traditional Balance of Power Realism		Liberalism	Maximal realism/unilateralism	
Prime Goal(s)	Keep freedom of action; stay out of most wars	Stay out of most wars; cut down on emerging Eurasian hegemon	Prevent spread of NBC; maintain great power peace; preserve energy security	Prevent war	Prevent war	World dominance; refashion world in America's image	We do not use our strength to press for unilateral advantage. We seek instead to create a balance of power that favors human freedom. The aim of this strategy is to help make the world not just safer but better. Political and economic, peaceful relations with other states, and respect for human dignity.
Major Problem of International Politics	Avoiding entanglement in the affairs of others	Avoiding entanglement in the affairs of others	Peace among the major powers	The indivisibility of peace	The indivisibility of peace	The rise of a peer competitor	Shadowy networks of individuals can bring great chaos and suffering to our shores for less than it costs to purchase a single tank.
Preferred World Order	Distant Balance of Power	Balance of Power	Balance of Power	Interdependence	Interdependence	Hegemonic	We seek instead to create a balance of power that favors human freedom: conditions in which all nations and societies can choose for themselves the rewards and challenges of political and economic liberty.
Nuclear Dynamics	Supports Status Quo	Supports Status Quo	Supports status quo	Supports aggression	Supports aggression	Supports aggression	
Conception of National Interests	Narrow	Narrow	Restricted	Transnational	Transnational	Broad	Broad
Regional Priorities	North America	Industrial Eurasia	Industrial Eurasia	Global	Global	Industrial Eurasia and the home of any peer competitor.	Israeli-Palestinian conflict is critical because of its toll on human suffering, because of America's close relationship with the state of Israel and key Arab states, and because of that regions importance to other global priorities of the United States. South Asia (India/Pakistan) Indonesia

UNCLASSIFIED

							Western hemisphere: Mexico, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia Africa: threatens both a core value — preserving dignity — and our strategic priority — combating global terror
Nuclear Proliferation	Not our problem	Not our problem	Discriminate prevention	Indiscriminate prevention	Indiscriminant prevention	Indiscriminant prevention	We must accord the highest to the protection of the United States, our forces, and our friends and allies from the existing and growing WMD threat. Indiscriminate prevention using all means available.
NATO	Withdraw	Withdraw	Maintain	Maintain	Transform and expand	Expand	Expand
Regional Conflict	Abstain	Abstain	Contain; discriminate intervention	Intervene	Intervene	Contain; discriminate intervention	No doctrine can anticipate every circumstance in which U. S. action, direct or indirect, is warranted. We have finite political, economic, and military resources to meet our global priorities. The United States will approach each case with these strategic principles in mind: The United States should invest time and resources into building international relationships and institutions that can help manage local crises when they emerge. The United States should be realistic about its ability to help those who are unwilling or unready to help themselves. Where and when people are ready to do their part, we will be willing to move decisively.
Ethnic Conflict	Abstain	Abstain	Contain	Intervene	Nearly indiscriminant intervention	Contain	See above.
Humanitarian Intervention	Abstain	Abstain	Discriminate intervention	Intervene	Nearly indiscriminant intervention	Discriminate intervention	See above.
Use of Force	Self-defense	Discriminate	Discriminate	Frequent	Frequent	At will	We must build and maintain our forces beyond challenge. Our military's highest priority is to defend the United States. To do so effectively, our military must: Assure our allies and friends; dissuade future military competition; deter threats against U.S. interests, allies, and friends; and decisively defeat any adversary if deterrence fails.
Force Posture	Minimal Self-defense	Slightly more robust than isolationism, especially a larger Navy	Two-MRC force		Reconnaissance strike complex for multilateral action	A two-power-standard force	

Appendix D

Power Resources⁸¹

	United States	Japan	Germany	France	Britain	Russia	China	India
Basic								
Territory in thousands of km ²	9,269	378	357	547	245	17,075	9,597	3,288
Population in millions (1999)	276	127	83	59	60	146	1,262	1,014
Literacy rate	97	99	99	99	99	98	81.5	52
Military								
Nuclear Warheads (1999)	12070	0	0	450	192	22,500	>40	85-90
Budget in billions of dollars (1999)	288.8	41.1	24.7	29.5	34.6	31	12.6	10.7
Personnel	1,371,500	236,300	332,800	317,300	212,400	1,004,100	2,480,000	1,173,000
Economic								
GDP in billions of dollars in purchasing power parity (1999)	9,255	2,950	1,864	1,373	1,290	620	4,800	1,805
Per capita GDP, in purchasing power parity (1999)	33,900	23,400	22,700	23,300	21,800	4,200	3,800	1,800
Manufacturing value added, in billions of dollars (1996)	1,344	1,117	556	290	214	NA	309	63
High-tech exports, in billions of dollars (1997)	637	420	112	69	96	87	183	32
Number of personal computers per thousand population	570.5	286.9	297	221.8	302.5	37.4	12.2	3.3

Bibliography

- A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement, The White House, February 1995.
- A National Security Strategy for a New Century, The White House, October 1998.
- Annan, Kofi, Secretary General, United Nations. Address. General Assembly
- Art, Robert J. *A Grand Strategy for America*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2003.
- Belcher, Emmy Lou. *A Reflection on "Just War" in Theory and Practice*. Ohio River Group, 1991.
- Blair, Bruce G. "The Logic of Intelligence Hype and Blindness." Bruce Blair's Nuclear Column, 11 December 2003. Available from <http://www.cdi.org/blair/intelligence.cfm>.
- Bush, George W. Address. Graduation Speech at West Point, United States Military Academy West Point, New York, 1 June 2002.
- Childress, James F. *Moral Responsibility in Conflicts: Essays in Nonviolence, War, and Conscience* (Louisiana State University, 1982), chapter 3.
- Chomsky, Noam. *Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2003.
- Christopher, Paul P. "Just War Theory: An Historical and Philosophical Analysis," Dissertation Thesis, University of Massachusetts, 1990.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. *Just War Theory*. Washington Square, New York: New York University Press, 1992.
- Glennon, Michael. "Drop the Great Pretence: The World Must Recognise that the Rules Which Govern the Use of Force by States Have Failed." *The Financial Times*, Monday London Edition 1, 6 May 2002, p. 17.
- Glennon, Michael J. "Why the Security Council Failed." *Foreign Affairs*: May/June 2003.

UNCLASSIFIED

Kennedy, Paul, Richard Perle, and Joseph S. Nye, Jr. "The Reluctant Empire: In a Time of Great Consequence." In a moderated discussion that was a segment of a weeklong public affairs conference hosted by Brown University and the Providence Journal on 1 April 2003. An abridged transcript published in the Brown Journal of World Affairs, Summer/Fall 2003, Volume X, Issue 1, pp 11 – 31.

National Strategy for Combating Terrorism. The White House. February 2003. Available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/02/counter_terrorism_strategy.pdf.

National Strategy for Homeland Security. Office of Homeland Security, The White House. July 2002. Available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/index.html>.

National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction. The White House. December 2002. Available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/12/wmdstrategy.pdf>.

Nye, Joseph S. Jr. *The Paradox of American Power*. Oxford University Press, 2002.

Posen, Barry R. and Andrew L. Ross. "Competing Visions for U. S. Grand Strategy," *International Security* (Vol. 21 No. 3), Winter 1996/7, pages 5 – 53.

Perle, Richard. and David Frumm. *An End to Evil*. New York: Random House, 2003.

Quadrennial Defense Review Report. United States Department of Defense, September 2001. Available at <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/qdr2001.pdf>.

Regan, Richard J. *Just War Principles and Cases*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996.

Rumsfeld, Donald H. "Press Conference after NATO Meeting." United States Department of Defense News Transcript, 7 June 2001. Available from http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jun2001/t06082001_t0607sda.html.

Rumsfeld, Donald H. and Richard Myers. "DoD News Briefing." United States Department of Defense News Transcript, 17 June 2002. Available from http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jun2002/t06172002_t0617sd.html.

Russell, Richard L. "War and the Iraq Dilemma: Facing Harsh Realities." *Parameters*, Autumn 2002, pp. 46 – 61.

The United Nations Charter

UNCLASSIFIED

The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, The White House, September, 2002. Available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.pdf>.

Walzer, Michael. *Just and Unjust Wars*. New York, NY: Basic Books, 1977.

Wolfowitz, Paul. "Interview with New England Cable News." United States Department of Defense News Transcript, 23 March 2003. Available from http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Mar2003/t03242003_t0323nec.html.

Yoder, John Howard. *When War is Unjust*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984.

¹ John Lewis Gaddis, *Surprise, Security and the American Experience* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England: Harvard University Press, 2004), p. 85.

² Gaddis, p. 73.

³ Gaddis, p. 80.

⁴ United States National Security Strategy, (White House, 2002), p. 1.

⁵ *Ibid*, p. 3.

⁶ *Ibid*, p. 3.

⁷ *Ibid*, p. 5.

⁸ *Ibid*.

⁹ *Ibid*, p. 6.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, p. 9.

¹¹ *Ibid*.

¹² *Ibid*, p. 13.

¹³ *Ibid*.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, p. 15.

¹⁵ *Ibid*.

¹⁶ *Ibid*, p. 17.

¹⁷ *Ibid*.

¹⁸ *Ibid*, p. 20.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, p. 21.

²⁰ *Ibid*.

²¹ *Ibid*, p. 25.

²² *Ibid*.

²³ *Ibid*.

²⁴ *Ibid*, p. 29.

²⁵ *Ibid*.

²⁶ National Security Strategy, page 15.

²⁷ Richard Perle "The Reluctant Empire: In a Time of Great Consequence," A moderated discussion between three men who forge and evaluate U.S. foreign policy was a segment of a weeklong Public Affairs Conference hosted by Brown University and the Providence Journal. *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, Summer/Fall 2003, Volume X, Issue 1, page 17.

²⁸ United Nations Charter, Preamble.

²⁹ Glennon, Lecture at Tufts, 27 Feb 2004.

³⁰ *Ibid*.

³¹ Richard Perle and David Frumm, *An End to Evil*, page 271.

³² Paul P. Christopher, "Just War Theory: An Historical and Philosophical Analysis," (Doctoral Thesis, University of Massachusetts, 1990), p. 107.

³³ *Ibid*, p 134.

-
- ³⁴ Regan, p 17.
- ³⁵ Christopher, p 153.
- ³⁶ Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust War*, page xiv.
- ³⁷ Stephen Walt, lecture at Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, 27 February 2004.
- ³⁸ Joseph S. Nye, Jr. "The Reluctant Empire: In a Time of Great Consequence," A moderated discussion between three men who forge and evaluate U.S. foreign policy was a segment of a weeklong Public Affairs Conference hosted by Brown University and the Providence Journal. *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, Summer/Fall 2003, Volume X, Issue 1, page 23.
- ³⁹ Prin, Tufts, 27 Feb 04.
- ⁴⁰ Joseph S. Nye, Jr. *The Paradox of American Power* (Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 6.
- ⁴¹ Transcript: 24 March 2004 9/11 Commission Hearings, FDCH E-Media, p. 31.
- ⁴² National Strategy for Homeland Security, p. VII.
- ⁴³ National Strategy for Combating Terrorism, p. 2.
- ⁴⁴ Robert J. Art, *A Grand Strategy for America* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2003), p. 2.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid*, p. 45.
- ⁴⁶ National Security Strategy, p. 17.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid*, p. 21.
- ⁴⁸ National Security Strategy, p. 13
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid*, p. 9.
- ⁵⁰ Art, p. 46.
- ⁵¹ National Security Strategy, third paragraph of President Bush's opening statement.
- ⁵² Art, p. 46.
- ⁵³ National Security Strategy, p. 20.
- ⁵⁴ Art, p. 46.
- ⁵⁵ National Security Strategy, p. 4.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid*, p. 20.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid*.
- ⁵⁸ Nye, *Paradox of American Power*, p. 147.
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid*, p. 152.
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid*.
- ⁶¹ Art, p. 47.
- ⁶² National Security Strategy, p. 5.
- ⁶³ *Ibid*, p. 14.
- ⁶⁴ Art, p. 8.
- ⁶⁵ National Security Strategy, p. 9.
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid*, p. 29.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid*, p. 35.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid*, p. 39.
- ⁶⁹ National Security Strategy, p. 7.
- ⁷⁰ *Ibid*, p. 25.
- ⁷¹ Art, p. 52.
- ⁷² *Ibid*.
- ⁷³ Gaddis, p. 86.
- ⁷⁴ *Ibid*, p. 17.
- ⁷⁵ *Ibid*, p. 18.
- ⁷⁶ *Ibid*, p. 89.
- ⁷⁷ Art, p. 89.
- ⁷⁸ National Security Strategy, p. 1.
- ⁷⁹ Stephen Walt, lecture at Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, 27 February 2004.
- ⁸⁰ Posen, Barry R. and Andrew L. Ross. "Competing Visions for U. S. Grand Strategy," *International Security* (Vol. 21 No. 3), Winter 1996/7, p. 6.
- ⁸¹ Nye, *Paradox of American Power*, p. 37.