

The League of Women Voters of Seattle

The U.S. National Security Strategy November 2003



WRITING COMMITTEE

Carol Goldenberg, Chair

Elizabeth Davis

Vicki Downs

Betsy Greene

Nora Leech

Bert Metzger

Don Whitmore

READING COMMITTEE

Martha Jordan, Chair

Paula Polet

Diana Henderson

Introduction

by Carol Goldenberg, Chair, International Relations Committee, LWVSeattle

When the League of Women Voters of the United States updated its position on the United Nations in the spring of 2002 none of us anticipated that just months later preemptive strikes would become a declared policy of the U.S. government. Two documents issued by the White House, “The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2002” and the “National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction, December 2002,” have inspired intense controversy here and abroad. Watch for the 2003 White House National Security Strategy of the United States that is due by the end of this year.

The readings in this packet are designed to help League members understand what appears to be a profound shift in U.S. security policy. The first two documents are summaries of the above publications that lay out the administration’s policy. We urge you to take advantage of the websites listed at the end of the summaries to see the entire documents. The other readings in this packet provide background and commentary. We hope they will inspire questions and lead to creative thinking about how to deal with threats to national security.

Glossary

Pax Americana – peace dominated or imposed by the United States

Hegemony – leadership or predominant influence exercised by one state over another

Mercantilism – the system of political and economic policy evolving with the modern nation state and seeking to secure a nation’s political and economic supremacy in its rivalry with other states. According to this system money was regarded as a store of wealth and the goal of a state was the accumulation of precious metals by exporting the largest possible quantity of its products and importing as little as possible, thus establishing a favorable balance of trade.

Contents

1. “National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2002” and the “U.S. National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction, December 2002,” summaries of the White House publications.
2. “Current and Projected National Security Threats,” a summary of the testimony by the Defense Intelligence Agency to the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, February 2003.
3. “LWVUS Positions on Security.”
4. “The Underpinnings of the Bush Doctrine,” a summary of the article by Thomas Donnelly, resident Fellow of the American Enterprise Institute, defending the current national security strategy of the U.S.
5. “Humpty Dumpty’ Security, A Critique of U.S. National Security Strategy” by Donald C. Whitmore.
6. “U.S. National Security Policy: Past and Present” by Nora Leech.
7. “Other Views on National Security.”
8. Bibliography, Resources and Websites.

1. The National Security of the United States of America

The White House, September 2002

A synopsis prepared by Donald C. Whitmore and Bert Metzger

The great struggles of the twentieth century ended with a single sustainable model for national success: freedom, democracy and free enterprise. The values of freedom are to be able to: speak freely, choose who will govern them, worship as they please, educate their children male and female, own property and enjoy the benefits of their labor. These values are right and true for every person, in every society and the duty of protecting these values is the common calling of freedom-loving people everywhere and always.

Overview. We are now threatened by catastrophic technologies in the hands of the embittered few. The U.S. national security strategy will be based on a distinctly American internationalism to help make the world not just safer, but better. To achieve our goals we adopt the following policies:

Champion Human Dignity. We must stand firmly for the rule of law; limits on the absolute power of the state; free speech; freedom of worship; equal justice; respect for women; religious and ethnic tolerance; and respect for private property. We will use international institutions and foreign aid to promote freedom; press governments that deny human rights; and promote freedom of religion and conscience.

Strengthen Alliances to Defeat Global Terrorism and Prevent Attacks. Our responsibility is to rid the world of evil. Our priority will be disrupting and destroying terrorist organizations. 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. We will also wage a war of ideas against international terrorism, using the full influence of the United States; diminishing the underlying conditions that spawn terrorism; and use diplomacy to promote the free flow of information and ideas. We need support from our allies and friends, relying, wherever possible, on regional organizations and state powers. We will continue to work with international organizations, such as the United Nations.

Defuse Regional Conflicts. Concerned nations must engage in regional disputes to avoid explosive escalation

and minimize human suffering. The United States will work with friends to alleviate suffering and restore stability. We should invest time and resources into building international relationships and institutions that can help manage local crises. We stand committed to an independent and democratic Palestine; strong relations with India and Pakistan; and coalitions with countries that share our priorities. Coordination with European allies and international institutions is essential.

Prevent Our Enemies from Threatening with Weapons of Mass Destruction. We must stop rogue states and their terrorist clients before they are able to threaten or use WMD against the United States and our allies and friends. Our comprehensive strategy to combat WMD includes proactive counterproliferation; strengthened nonproliferation; and effective consequence management. We must adapt the concept of imminent threat to the capabilities and objectives of today's adversaries. We will, if necessary, act preemptively. The reasons for our actions will be clear, the force measured, and the cause just.

Ignite Global Economic Growth through Free Markets and Trade. We will foster pro growth policies; rule of law and intolerance of corruption; strong financial systems; and investments in health and education. Our long-term objective should be all countries having investment-grade credit ratings. We will support economic growth in ways that provide a better life by incorporating labor and environmental concerns into U.S. trade negotiations. We will strengthen our energy security by working to expand the sources and types of global energy supplied. Greenhouse gas concentrations should be contained at a level that prevents dangerous human interference with the global climate. Our strategies for this include U.N. Framework Convention; improved standards; renewable energy promotion; increased spending on new conservation technologies; and assistance to developing countries.

Expand Development and Infrastructure of Democracy. Including the world's poor in an expanding circle of development – and opportunity – is a top priority of U.S. international policy. Our strategies to achieve this are to provide resources to countries that have achieved national reform; improve the effectiveness of the World

U.S. National Security Strategy 2003

Bank; insist upon measurable results; increase development assistance grants; free markets and trade; secure public health; education; and agricultural development.

Cooperative Action with Other Centers of Global Power. We will implement our strategies by organizing coalitions of states able and willing to promote a balance of power that favors freedom. NATO's core mission remains, but it must develop new structures and capabilities. To enhance our Asian alliances we will work with Japan, Australia and South Korea. The NATO-Russia Council can refocus our relationship on the global war on terrorism and facilitate Russia's entry into the World Trade Organization. Our interests require a strong relationship with India and we welcome a strong, peaceful and prosperous China. Democratic development of China is crucial. China is following an outdated path that will hamper its own pursuit of national greatness. We will cooperate where our interests overlap, including the current war on terrorism. Areas in which we have profound disagreements include our commitments to the self-defense of Taiwan and human rights.

Transform America's National Security Institutions. Our national security institutions must be transformed to build our defenses beyond challenge. To defend us effectively our military must: assure our friends; dissuade future military competition; deter threats; and decisively

defeat any adversary. By our willingness to use force in our own defense and in defense of others, we demonstrate our resolve to maintain a balance of power that favors freedom. We must transform the Department of Defense, especially in financial management, recruitment and retention. Intelligence is our first line of defense and it must be integrated with our defense and law enforcement. We must also rely on diplomacy. The State Department must receive funding sufficient to ensure the success of our diplomacy. International cooperation must be backed by our readiness to play our part. We also need a different approach to public information efforts that can help people around the world learn about the U.S. In exercising our leadership, we will respect the values, judgment and interests of our friends and partners. Still, we will be prepared to act apart when our interests and unique responsibilities require.

Ultimately, the foundation of American strength is in the skills of our people, the dynamism of our economy and the resilience of our institutions. A diverse, modern society has inherent, ambitious entrepreneurial energy. Our strength comes from what we do with that energy. That is where our national security begins.

Note: The full 33 page text of the official strategy is available at: www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html

National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction The White House, December 2002

A synopsis prepared by Donald C. Whitmore and Bert Metzger

Introduction

Weapons of mass destruction (WMD) - nuclear, biological, and chemical - in the possession of hostile states and terrorists - represent one of the greatest security challenges facing the United States. We must take advantage of the application of new technologies, increased emphasis on intelligence collection and analysis, the strengthening of alliance relationships and the establishment of new partnerships with former adversaries. Some states, including several that have supported terrorism, already possess WMD and are seeking even greater capabilities. We must accord the highest priority to the protection of the U.S. and our friends from the WMD threat.

Pillars of Our National Strategy

Three principal pillars are:

1. **Counterproliferation.** To counter the threat and use of WMD against us and our friends we must possess the following operational capabilities:
 - Interdiction -- Prevent the movement of WMD materials, technology and expertise to hostile states and organizations.
 - Deterrence -- Employ a strong declaratory policy and effective military forces, along with the full range of political tools to persuade potential adversaries not to seek or use WMD. Overwhelming force - including resort to all of our options - (will

deter) the use of WMD against us and our friends. Defense and Mitigation -- Defend against WMD-armed adversaries, including preemptive measures, by detecting and destroying an adversary's WMD assets before they are used. Disrupt, disable or destroy WMD en route to their targets and include vigorous air defense and effective missile defenses. Mitigate the effects of a WMD attack against our forces.

2. **Nonproliferation.** Principal measures to prevent states and terrorists from acquiring WMD include: **ACTIVE DIPLOMACY.** Employ diplomatic approaches in bilateral and multilateral settings. Dissuade supplier states from cooperating with proliferant states and induce proliferant states to end their WMD and missile programs. Build coalitions to support our efforts.

Multilateral regimes. Support existing nonproliferation and arms control regimes currently in force and work to improve the effectiveness of, and compliance with, those regimes. Cultivate an international environment that is more conducive to nonproliferation. Our efforts will include:

- Nuclear nonproliferation.
- Chemical and biological prohibition.
- Missile technology control.

Nonproliferation and Threat Reduction Cooperation. Pursue programs to address the proliferation threat from the large quantities of Soviet-legacy WMD, missile expertise and materials. Work with other states to improve the security of their WMD materials.

Controls on Nuclear Materials. Continue to discourage the worldwide accumulation of separated plutonium and minimize the use of highly-enriched uranium.

U.S. Export Controls. Further our nonproliferation goals, while recognizing what American businesses face in the increasingly globalized marketplace.

Nonproliferation Sanctions. Develop a comprehensive sanctions policy and work with Congress to modify existing sanctions legislation.

3. **WMC Consequence Management.** Reduce the consequences of WMD attacks through integrated and comprehensive efforts needed to respond rapidly to a WMD event on our territory. The Office of Homeland Security will also work closely with state and local governments to ensure their planning, training, and equipment requirements are addressed.

Integrating the Three Pillars

Critical enabling functions serve to integrate the three pillars:

Improved Intelligence Collection and Analysis. A more accurate and complete understanding of the full range of WMD threats is a U.S. intelligence priority. Improving our ability to obtain timely and accurate knowledge of adversaries' offensive and defensive capabilities, plans, and intentions is key to developing effective counter- and nonproliferation policies and capabilities.

Research and Development. A critical need is for cutting-edge technology that can detect, analyze, facilitate interdiction of, defend against, defeat, and mitigate the consequences of WMD.

Strengthened International Cooperation. It is vital we work closely with like-minded countries on all elements of our comprehensive nonproliferation strategy.

Targeted Strategies Against Proliferants. Targeted strategies are brought to bear against supplier and recipient states, as well as against terrorist groups which seek to acquire WMD. We will pursue country-specific strategies that best enable us and our friends to prevent, deter, and defend against WMD and missile threats from each of them. One of the most difficult challenges is to prevent, deter, and defend against the acquisition and use of WMD by terrorist groups. The current and potential future linkages between terrorist groups and state sponsors of terrorism are particularly dangerous and require priority attention.

A full copy of the document can be found at www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.htm

2. League of Women Voters of the US Positions on Security

by Elizabeth Davis

From the LWVUS Impact on Issues 2002-2004, A Guide to Public Policy Positions.

League of Women Voters U.S. Principles

The League of Women Voters believes that cooperation with other nations is essential in the search for solutions to world problems and that development of international organization and international law is imperative in the promotion of world peace.

Of League's several positions under international relations, the word 'security' is found in these three sections:

- A. Military Policy and Defense Spending (1984, revised 1986)
- B. Arms Control (1983)
- C. United Nations (2002)

- A. Military Policy and Defense Spending - In summary, the League believes that national security has many dimensions and cannot be limited to military policy alone. It can be defined as ensuring domestic tranquility, providing for the common defense and promoting the general welfare. Key elements include the country's ability to implement social and environmental programs and to maintain cooperative relationships with other nations. Other important components are effective political leadership and a strong economy. Therefore, in decisions about the federal budget, political leaders should assess the impact of U.S. military spending on the nation's economy and on the government's ability to meet social and environmental needs.
- B. Arms Control - The League believes that arms control measures should be evaluated in terms of the following six factors: equity, verifiability, confidence building, widespread agreement, environmental protection, and continuity.
- C. United Nations - The League supports UN leadership in a comprehensive, multifaceted approach to promoting world peace and security that includes ongoing efforts to eliminate the underlying causes of conflict. The League supports UN efforts to 1) promote international peace and security, 2) advance the social and economic well-being of the world's people, 3) ensure respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, 4) foster trust and cooperation among nations by encouraging adherence to conventions, treaties and other international agreements, 5) protect the integrity of the world environment, 6) achieve the full and equal participation of women in all aspects of civil and political life

Report by Elizabeth Davis, member of LWVWA International Relations Committee from South Whidbey League.

A full copy of the League positions can be found at the following website www.lwv.org and will be available at the November Forum.

3. Current and Projected National Security Threats to the U.S.

Prepared by Nora Leech

The following is a summary of the testimony given to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Feb. 11, 2003, by Vice Admiral Lowell Jacoby, Director, Defense Intelligence Agency.

Near Term Priorities

Global Terrorism. A number of terrorist groups - including the FARC in Colombia, various Palestinian organizations, al-Qaida network and Lebanese Hizballah - have the capability to do us harm.

Iraq. Saddam Hussein appears determined to retain his WMD and missile programs, reassert his authority over all of Iraq, and become the dominant regional power.

North Korea. Pyongyang's open pursuit of additional nuclear weapons is the most serious challenge to U.S. regional interests in a generation.

Global Situational Awareness. We must assess global developments to provide strategic warning on a wide spectrum of potential threats and continue to generate the requisite intelligence to give our leaders the opportunity to preclude, dissuade, deter, or defeat emerging threats.

Enduring Global Realities

These conditions likely to emerge in the next decade are capable of creating a turbulent global environment.

Reactions to U.S. Dominance. Much of the world is increasingly apprehensive about U.S. power and influence. These perceptions, mixed with angst over perceived 'U.S. unilateralism' will give rise to significant anti-American behavior.

Globalization. The increasing global flow of money, goods, services, people, information, technology, and ideas remains an important influence. Countries unable to exploit these advantages can leave large numbers of people seemingly worse off, exacerbate local and regional tensions, increase the prospects and capabilities for conflict, and empower those who would do us harm.

Uneven Economic and Demographic Growth. The world will add another billion people over the next 10 to 15 years with 95 percent of that increase occurring in developing nations. Economic progress in many parts of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America will not keep pace with population increases. Lack of progress will marginalize large numbers of people, foster instability, spawn ethnic, religious, and cultural conflict, create lawless safe-havens, and increase the power of dangerous non-state entities. In some areas, particularly in the Middle East, rising unemployment among expanding

youth populations, stagnant or falling living standards, ineffective governments, and decaying infrastructures create environments conducive to extremist messages.

General Technology Proliferation. Advances in information processing, biotechnology, communications, materials, micro-manufacturing, and weapons development are having an impact on how people fight. New vulnerabilities, interdependencies, and capabilities are being created in both advanced and less developed states.

Weapons of Mass Destruction and Missile Proliferation. More and more countries seek to provide a hedge to deter or offset US military superiority developing WMD like ballistic and cruise missiles, nuclear weapons, chemical and biological weapons and proliferation.

States and terrorists seek WMD to provide a hedge to deter or offset U.S. military superiority. New alliances have formed, pooling resources for developing these capabilities, while technological advances and global economic conditions make it easier to transfer materiel and expertise.

Declining global defense spending. Global defense spending has dropped 50% during the past decade and, with the exception of some parts of Asia, is likely to remain limited. Less defense money, declining arms markets, and globalization are leading to a more competitive global armaments industry. In this environment, technology transfer restrictions and arms embargoes will be more difficult to maintain, monitor, and enforce.

International crime. Criminal groups in Western Europe, China, Colombia, Israel, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, and Russia are broadening their global activities and are increasingly involved in narcotics trafficking, alien smuggling, and illicit transfers of arms and other military technologies.

Increasing numbers of people in need. There are increasing numbers of people facing deepening economic stagnation, political instability, and cultural alienation. These conditions provide fertile ground for extremism. Their frustration is increasingly directed at the U.S. and the West.

U.S. National Security Strategy 2003

Other Regional Issues

Issues that have the potential to become serious challenges include Israeli-Palestinian violence; tension between India and Pakistan; pressures in the Muslim World. Other major regional actors of concern include Iran, Russia, and China.

Coping With U.S. Power

Our opponents understand they cannot match our political, economic and military power. Accordingly, they seek to avoid decisive engagements and act indirectly.

Threats to the Homeland. Many adversaries believe the best way to avoid, deter, or offset U.S. power is to develop a capability to threaten the U.S. homeland. In addition to the traditional threat from strategic nuclear missiles, our national infrastructure is vulnerable to physical and computer attack.

The Intelligence Threat. The open nature of our society, and the ease with which money, technology, information, and people move around the globe, make counterintelligence and security difficult. Sensitive business information and advanced technologies are increasingly at risk as both adversaries and allies conduct espionage against the private sector.

Information Operations. Physical attacks may be expected against key information nodes, and computer network attacks.

Counter transformational challenges.

Adversaries will continue to develop the following:

- **WMD and precision weapons delivery capabilities** that allow effective targeting of critical theater bases of operation, personnel concentrations, and key logistics facilities and nodes.
- **Counter-access capabilities** designed to deny access to key theaters, ports, bases, and facilities, and critical air, land, and sea approaches.
- **Counter-precision engagement capabilities** focused on defeating our precision intelligence and attack systems.

- **Space and space-denial capabilities.** Adversaries recognize the importance of space and will attempt to improve their access to space platforms, either indigenous or commercial. Worldwide, the availability of space products and services is accelerating, fueled by the proliferation of advanced satellite technologies and increased cooperation among states.

You can find the article in its entirety at the following website.

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2003_hr/021103jacoby.htm

4. The Underpinnings of the Bush Doctrine

by Thomas Donnelly, resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. Printed with permission from American Enterprise Institute

Synopsis prepared by Betsy Greene

The Bush Doctrine, articulated by the president in speeches and encapsulated in the new National Security Strategy, represents a return to the first principles of American security strategy and the realities of international politics in today's world. The combination of America's universal political principles and its unprecedented global power and influence make the doctrine a whole greater than the sum of its parts; it is likely to remain the basis for U.S. security strategy for decades.

Americans have always taken an expansive view of their security interests. Having faith in a set of political principles believed to have universal application, they have come to regard the exercise of their power as not only a force for national greatness but for human liberty.

Four realities argue for the continued and vigorous exercise of that power, including preemptive military action:

1. The U.S. possesses the means - economic, military, diplomatic - and the requisite political willpower to pursue its expansive geopolitical purposes. Now having determined to reform Middle East politics, it will be difficult and dangerous to stop with half measures.
2. There are potential future but no immediate great power threats. However, there is good reason for concern over states such as Iraq, North Korea and Iran. Perhaps for regime maintenance, aggrandizement or desires for regional hegemony as well as to counter U.S. power, these three nations are attracted to weapons of mass destruction and flirt with international terrorist organizations. Any comprehensive "threat assessment" would conclude that the normal balance of power constraints no longer inhibit the exercise of American might. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction devalues conventional military strength. Rogue states and violent, weak international movements are coming to have a disproportionate weight in global security calculations. The war on terrorism is principally against "Islamism," a political movement antagonistic to modernity and the West.

3. Opportunities to extend a "balance of power that favors freedom" really exist. The desired liberal, democratic order will probably be accepted as the norm in more parts of the world. Democracies rarely war on other democracies, a truth of social science. An "opportunities assessment" would conclude that weapons proliferation, nuclear weapons in particular, are deterrents in the prospects for an expanded, American-led liberal international order.
4. Primacy, rising threats and emerging opportunities combine to give the U.S. a "systemic" responsibility to preserve the viability and legitimacy of the liberal international order of nation-states.

Taken together, American principles, interests and systemic responsibilities argue strongly in favor of an active and expansive stance of strategic primacy and willingness to employ military force. Within that context, and considering the ways weapons of mass destruction can distort the normal calculation of international power relationships, there is compelling need for the U.S. to hold open the option of preemptive strike operations and it must take a wider view of the traditional doctrine of imminent danger.

The preservation of today's Pax Americana rests upon both actual military strength and the perception of strength. Convincing would-be great powers, rogue states and terrorists to accept the liberal democratic order requires not only an overwhelming response when the peace is broken, but a willingness to step in when the danger is imminent.

Source: A complete copy of the article can be found on the American Enterprise Institute website www.aei.org/publications/pubID.15845/pub_detail.asp

5. “Humpty Dumpty” Security

A Critique of U.S. National Security Strategy

by Donald C. Whitmore, President, Third Millennium Foundation

A blue-ribbon panel chaired by former Senator Warren B. Rudman recently concluded: “the United States remains dangerously ill-prepared” for catastrophic attacks. The Council on Foreign Relations report, released June 28, 2003, recommended adding \$100 billion over five years to “first responder” spending. The Department of Homeland Security retorted by calling that number “grossly inflated.” Yet, state and local agencies complain the feds have not supplied adequate support, and a recent Century Foundation study confirmed those concerns. This situation contrasts starkly with official national security strategy: “(we) must be fully prepared to respond to the consequences of WMD (weapons of mass destruction) use” ... “Our first responders must have the full-range of protective, medical, and remediation tools ...” (White House, Dec. 11, 2002).

Disconnects between the official strategy and actual implementation of that strategy are illustrated by the “Rudman” episode. Numerous disconnects can be cited. Port security is especially plagued by mismatches between declared policy and implemented policy. Official strategy asserts: “(we) will ... prevent our enemies from threatening us” ... We must be prepared to stop rogue states and their terrorist clients before they are able to threaten or use (WMD)” - White House, Sept. 20, 2002. Yet, the Coast Guard was denied funds for expanded port security in the administration’s FY2004 budget request. The grossly under funded “Container Security Initiative” inspects only 2%-3% of container freight and even some of the associated costs are passed on to foreign governments and private shippers.

When funding is denied for closing critical security gaps, the U.S. is clearly more vulnerable. Fragile national security is the result. Is this “Humpty Dumpty” security poised for a great fall?

Policy disconnects are not the only problem -- official strategy is also conceptually flawed. These flaws include utopian vision of democratized society patterned after American precepts; simplistic threat assessment; and dangerous ideas that actually damage national security.

First, the utopian vision overlooks harsh realities of a still-imperfect world. Current post-war realities in Iraq underscore the fallacy of such pollyanna notions.

Simplistic threat assessment is the second major flaw. Preoccupation with terrorist threats, especially with WMD, have narrowed both threat and security perspectives. Overlooked threats include nuclear arsenal improvements pursued by Russia and China; runaway WMD proliferation; and cruise missiles.

Third, the most dangerous idea in the official strategy is likely the preemptive attack strategy -- to be employed even if an “imminent threat” is not proven by reliable evidence. This preemptive strategy is already undercutting security goals. A prime example is soured relations with traditionally close allies, following failed consensus for the preemptive attack on Iraq. The official strategy states: “... to defeat terrorism in today’s globalized world, we need support from our allies” ... “our response must take account of strengthened alliances.” Perhaps worse, the preemptive attack has stirred Muslim passions and assisted Al Qaeda recruiting. Also notable is the reaction of North Korea. Rather than being deterred from pursuing nuclear weapons (by preemptive attack threats), North Korea now appears convinced those weapons are needed to deter preemptive attacks. The U.S. preemptive attack strategy, in this case, increases both the terrorist threat and the nuclear proliferation threat. Strong relations with allies, needed to combat those threats, are also compromised by the preemptive strategy.

Beyond policy disconnects and flawed concepts are other serious failings. Official strategy is long on lofty goals, but short on practical proposals. Success criteria are missing, as are timelines for measuring progress. Goals are not prioritized and resource requirements are ignored. A particularly grievous failing is “head-in-the-sand” disregard for real-world constraints, such as practical limitations on collecting good intelligence. Taken in sum, official U.S. strategy seems more harmful to national security than it is helpful. “Humpty Dumpty” security teeters on the wall. All the King’s

6. Can We Learn From the Past?

A Short History of U.S National Security Policy

by Nora Leech, former Program Director, World Affairs Council

Past

Isolationist Beginnings

The American Revolution emanated from a fear of abusive power and loss of liberty. In the early days of our nation, the fact that the U.S. was small with limited military and financial resources played a major role in shaping the nation's security strategies.

Competing Interests

Distinct differences between the northern industrial and the southern agrarian states regarding strategy for national security appeared from the very beginning. For the most part, the South was aligned with Thomas Jefferson's vision of a country of farmers, artisans and small businessmen free of oppressive government taxes and regulations. Since farm goods were primarily exported to Europe, southern states supported free trade policies and opposed U.S. tariffs that kept the European manufactured goods they needed from entering the country. Southerners, though in favor of protecting merchant shipping routes, were generally against increased military spending or ambitious foreign policy engagement because they feared a powerful centralized government. In general, the southern states supported a westward expansion for new land to farm. They were the Federalists, soon to become the Democrats.

The northern industrial states, on the other hand, were not as interested in the westward expansionist policies sought by the South. The opening of the West drained the labor force they needed for their growing industries, generating pressure to increase wages and improve working conditions. The northern states lobbied Congress for tariffs to protect their fledgling industries from foreign competition thereby allowing the local industries to raise prices. The industrialists and bankers supported a strong centralized government with a strong military. Alexander Hamilton expressed their views. They were the Whigs soon to become the Republicans.

Alignment

Given the country's small size and influence, the national security policies that the competing interest groups could firmly agree on were: first, the U.S. could best safeguard its security by preventing America's entanglement in "all the pernicious labyrinths of European politics and wars," second, the U.S. should limit Europe's influence in the Western Hemisphere, and third the country should grow.

These policies set a steady course for the first century.

Imperial Republic: Expansionist Policies and Open Trade

Despite territorial claims by France, Spain, Russia and Britain, the U.S. adopted the policy of "Manifest Destiny" aggressively expanding westward. With the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, the U.S. doubled its size. With the acquisition of Florida from Spain and the purchase of Alaska from Russia, the U.S. gained key strategic resources. With the war with Mexico in 1845, the U.S. annexed Texas and in the next three years added New Mexico, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, California, Colorado and Oregon, virtually doubling in size again. This rapid expansion gave the U.S. critical natural resources and regional control.

The Monroe Doctrine of 1823 not only cautioned European nations against standing in the way of American westward expansion but also warned Europe that the U.S. would consider efforts "to extend their political system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." While the U.S. did not have the military prowess necessary to repel Spain or Portugal, Great Britain was only too pleased to lend its support in order to gain access to the lucrative South American markets that it had been denied under mercantilism.¹ The U.S. used this time to strengthen its economic and military power.

The Civil War, 1861-1865, turned the nation's attention inward. It was a war about slavery, freedom and unity but it was also a war about trade, a centralized government and industrialization. The agricultural sector needed slaves and the north needed workers. At this point, the Confederate States supplied over 80% of the cotton for the British textile mills.

The devastation of the war (one million dead) was followed by a period of rapid economic expansion for the industrial sector. Steel mills, railroads, oil companies, meatpacking and high finance flourished. Tremendous personal wealth was accumulated by families like the Rockefellers, Vanderbuilts, Rothchilds and JP Morgan. The general level of import duties (tariffs) rose to 50% of the value of the goods purchased by consumers. This revenue swelled the U.S. government budget to over a billion dollars in 1890.² President Harrison used this windfall to expand the U.S. Navy from 17th to 7th in the world. By this time, the U.S. had adopted the gold standard along with Europe, greasing

U.S. National Security Strategy 2003

the skids for a large expansion of investment capital and international trade.

In 1893 the U.S. experienced a serious depression. When the P & R Railroad went belly up, European investors demanded to be repaid in gold. U.S. gold reserves dropped precipitously leading to bank failures. The depression drove down prices, millions of Americans lost their jobs and there was a glut of surplus goods in a depressed market. It became imperative to find new markets abroad.

Europe was engaged in rapid colonial expansion in the 19th century. Early indicators that U.S. economic interests lay beyond the Western hemisphere were evident with Admiral Perry's opening of Japan, the establishment of a protectorate over Samoa and the authorization of military incursions in Hawaii.

In 1898, the sinking of the U.S. battleship Maine in Cuba's Havana Harbor served as the catalyst for President McKinley to declare war with Spain. With Spain's defeat, the U.S. took control of the Spanish colonies of Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines and Guam.

At the same time, China was becoming a major trade focus for Japan, Britain, Russia and France. This prompted Roosevelt's Secretary of State John Hay to announce the Open Door policy. He warned Europe "not to interfere with the free use of the treaty ports within their spheres of influence in China." This policy indicated that the U.S. was not interested in obtaining colonial territories but would take action to ensure a world open to American business. With the Open Door policy, trade with East Asia flourished.

President Theodore Roosevelt announced the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine. In his words, "the United States was justified in exercising "international police power to put an end to chronic unrest or wrongdoing in the Western Hemisphere". The Roosevelt Corollary gave legitimacy for many U.S. military interventions in the Caribbean, Central and South America including Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Mexico and Columbia. With the U.S. support, a rebellion in Columbia established the state of Panama followed by the creation and control of the Panama Canal.

Roosevelt's mediation to end the Russo-Japanese war and his bold display of U.S. naval power, sending the "Great White Fleet" to ports around the globe announced that U.S. had come of age as a world power.

Both Roosevelt and Wilson campaigned to lower tariffs. This marked a significant shift and the beginning of

a struggle between the "free traders" and the U.S. industrialists wanting protective tariffs.

Global Wars

By 1914 the escalating war in Europe made the U.S. nervous. Europe was quickly withdrawing their financial investments in the U.S. to pay for their war depleting the gold reserves. Trade with Europe was suspended causing damage to US exporters particularly the South. Tariff revenues dropped precipitously resulting in large U.S. deficits. Europe asked the U.S. for loans for their military build up which were provided through the sale of bonds to the public. Staying true to their history, the American people were primarily against getting involved in the geopolitical struggles in Europe. The sinking of the Lusitania became the catalyst for the U.S. to do the unthinkable, become entangled in the "pernicious labyrinths of European politics and wars." Before WWI, 90% of the Federal revenue came from tariffs and excise taxes. In 1913, the US ratified the 16th amendment to the Constitution and introduced the individual income tax.³ It was the income tax that supplied much of the revenue for the war.

President Wilson had begun his term with the vision of global democracy, free markets and peace. At the end of the war, he lobbied America to become a part of the League of Nations. Republican Senator Cabot Lodge vociferously advocated for a more unilateral brand of internationalism. "America should protect its own security interest before worrying about the collective welfare of the international community." The Senate voted no three times. U.S. participation in an international institution for world peace was postponed.

After WWI, Americans soon felt secure with the rapidly expanding economy of the 20s. However, that quickly ended with the Great Depression of the 1930s. The depression was a financial crisis creating havoc around the globe. There was high unemployment in the U.S. and massive bank failures in Germany. Germany quickly moved to go to war. The American public was again reluctant to get involved. This time the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor catapulted the U.S. into war. Record numbers of soldiers were sent overseas to fight the world's bloodiest war.

After the devastation of WWII, the U.S. took the lead to create global institutions like the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, and GATT/ WTO. These institutions were designed to build a one-world economic system to foster commerce and to reduce global conflicts. Nations now came together to create global institutions that would provide for collective security and settlement of international disputes by

peaceful means. The vision was to build a rule-based international order.

Following WWII Stalin's Iron Curtain and the Truman Doctrine of Containment reflected the beginning of the Cold War. The fight against Communism consumed U.S. national security policy for over 40 years. National security was based on the "domino theory" that asserted if one country were taken over by Communists, neighbouring countries would fall like dominos. During this period, the U.S. acted to remove by unilateral force the communist or socialist government leaders in countries like Iran, Chile, Nicaragua and Cuba. It gave military support to many friendly but repressive undemocratic governments such as Guatemala, Dominican Republic, Paraguay, Spain, Taiwan and Saudi Arabia. China's fall to communism in 1949 influenced the U.S. decision to "declare war" in Korea and Vietnam. Although the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to declare war, Congress has not declared war since WWII. It is clear that war is no longer war but "military interventions."

Along with the fear of communism, Americans lived with the fear of a nuclear holocaust; the apogee was the 1961 Cuban missile crisis.

With the demise of the USSR in 1992, the U.S. became the sole superpower and liberal democratic capitalism became the dominant paradigm. Today, around 300,000 U.S. troops are presently deployed in over 140 nations. The U.S. annual military budget equals the defense spending of the next 14 highest countries combined. As Paul Kennedy, author of *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* states, "Nothing has ever existed like this disparity of power; nothing. I have returned to all of the statistics over the past 500 years...and no other nation comes close."

The power imbalance is driving the U.S. national security policy today.

Present

Competing Strategies

The over arching goal of U.S. national security policy continues to be, in the words of Paul Nitze in National Security Council-65 (1950), "to foster a world environment where the American system (liberal democratic capitalism) can survive and flourish." However, the strategies to reach this goal today vary greatly. Major fault lines can be seen between the U.S. Defense and State departments, industrialist and financial capitalists, Europe and the U.S., the rich and the poor. These fissures can be seen in the different strategies being promoted to achieve national

security. Strategy debates include hard power vs. soft power, American primacy or multi-polarity, unilateral vs. multilateral military action, internationalism vs. isolationism, deterrence vs. preemptive military strikes. Although the lines are blurred, the strategies and their advocates fall into broad groups.

Neoconservative. For the neoconservatives, the global aim is unilateral American dominance. They are willing to employ military force including the use of preemptive strikes where necessary to secure our strategic hegemony. They are critical of global institutions that might curtail the ability of the U.S. to move unilaterally. They see treaties as the Liliputians tying of Gulliver and do not support treaties like the Anti Ballistic Missiles, Comprehensive Test Ban and the Kyoto Accords. They are promoters of using hard power i.e., wealth and military strength to obtain cooperation. They support the international institutions that foster free trade. They actively seek to extend free market democracy around the globe with the goal to build nations sympathetic to liberal democratic capitalism. This strategy may require a significant military build up.

People aligned⁴ with all or parts of the neoconservatives' strategy include Vice President Dick Cheney, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Pearle (Defense Policy Board), William Kristol with the *Weekly Standard*, and Robert Kagan with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The think tank American Enterprise Institute⁵ produces much of the research. Columnist Charles Krauthammer frequently articulates the thinking behind this strategy.

Traditional conservative. This group primarily differs from the neoconservatives regarding military action. They support a military policy of active deterrence and containment and approve of military action only to protect U.S. vital interests. They were not enthusiastic about the current war with Iraq but did not oppose it. They generally question humanitarian missions unless they connect to U.S. vital interests or have little cost to the U.S. They support free trade and approve of global institutions like the IMF and WTO, but they see the UN playing a very limited role. They are concerned with loss of sovereignty and are generally suspicious of attempts to establish global government structures like the International Criminal Court. They are interested in working with coalitions of allies to maintain world peace, alliances such as NATO and support international treaties like the ABM. They worry that U.S. preemptive strikes will encourage other states to legitimize aggression leading to a volatile, destabilized global environment.

U.S. National Security Strategy 2003

People aligned with parts or all of these policies are the old guard foreign policy establishment, including former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, former Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, former National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft, and U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations Jean Kirkpatrick. Think tanks where these views are expressed include the Libertarian Cato Institute, Institute for International Economics and Hoover Institution. Their views are often found in *The Economist*. Writers include George Will and Clyde Prestowitz.

Liberal internationalists. People in this group see the world as a place with multi-polar centers of power as opposed to a world with the U.S. as the dominant power. For this reason, they advocate for global institutions to provide a rule of law. They share the Wilsonian vision of global democracy, free markets and peace. The goal is the expansion of free markets. “Just as our states formed a federation, a larger federation is being born with the goal of unrestricted international commerce.”⁶ Their strategy is to use soft power – an indirect way to exercise power through international trade regimes, law, and organizations such as the IMF, WTO, G-8 and United Nations. Although they feel that East Asia, Persian Gulf and Europe must be kept out of the hands of hostile powers and they support action to stop the development of weapons of mass destruction, they believe it is important to achieve these goals through multilateral institutions. They are not against using selective force to influence recalcitrant leaders but do not see wars with large casualties as an effective way to bring about security.

A subset of the liberal internationalists is a group of people whose strategy is to motivate countries to participate in liberal democratic capitalism with a vision of prosperity and a better life. They give strong support to the UN, humanitarian aid, and intervention in regions with violent civil strife. They believe the U.S. should work to spread democracy, protect the environment, attack global health issues, encourage economic development and be involved in nation building.

People supporting multilateralist views include Retired Army General Wesley Clark, Harvard professor Joseph Nye, former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, Nobel economist Joseph Stiglitz. Think tanks expressing these views include the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Council on Foreign Relations and Brookings Institute.

New Nationalism or America First strategy. This group adheres to the conservative principles of national

sovereignty, economic patriotism, limited government, and individual freedom. They are eager to protect U.S. manufacturing and local businesses, committed to a policy of full employment, fearful of overseas entanglements, leery of super governments, and adamant that American forces limit their mission to deterring nuclear attacks on U.S. homeland.⁷ They see NAFTA and the WTO as a threat to national sovereignty.

Spokesmen for this point of view include Patrick Buchanan, Ross Perot and Alan Tonelson. You will find their views expressed in the U.S. Business & Industrial Council Educational Foundation and the Economic Strategy Institute as well as the magazine *The American Conservative*.

The world is at an unprecedented point in time with one dominant economic and military power. Technological innovations including weapons of mass destruction and communications have dramatically changed the face of global conflict. The 21st century will need new thinking on ways to create collective security, global stability and prosperity without the violence of war. This thinking must acknowledge the challenges posed by the conflicting demands between rising nationalism, rapidly expanding globalization and the struggles for peace and justice. The question citizens in a democracy must ask is whether our national security policies will make our world more secure.

(Footnotes)

- ¹ <http://regentsprep.org/Regents/global/themes/imperialism/southamerica.cfm>
- ² *Great Tax Wars* by Steven Weisman
- ³ Ibid
- ⁴ People are complex and rarely monolithic. Values and beliefs change over time. Those listed in the article may believe in full or part with the associated strategies.
- ⁵ The think tanks listed in this article express a variety of views to further the debate on critical foreign affairs and national security issues.
- ⁶ *The End of the American Era* by Charles Kupchan
- ⁷ *The Shield of Achilles: War, Peace and the Course of History* by Philip Bobbitt p246

7. Other Views on National Security

by Carol Goldenberg, International Relations Committee Chair

There are many expert opinions on the current US policies. We've gathered a sampling for you to stimulate your discussions.

Clyde Prestowitz, a self-identified conservative, president of the Economic Strategy Institute of Washington, D.C., and a former high official in the Reagan administration, finds the current U.S. drift toward empire troubling. He agrees with Edmund Burke, the conservative philosopher, that empire is not conservatism but rather is radicalism, egotism and adventurism cloaked in the stirring rhetoric of traditional patriotism. Burke said of imperial Britain: "I dread our being too much dreaded."

Prestowitz notes that after the war America insisted on controlling Iraq's oil, severely restricted U.N. involvement in rebuilding the country and punished Canada, Mexico, Chile and ubervillain France for not supporting the war, adding to the perception abroad that America is a rogue nation that might find a pretext to turn on any country at any time. Prestowitz, "American Empire: Conservatives Ask: Is This Abuse of Power?" Seattle Times, June 29, 2003.

Etienne Davignon, a European elder statesman, recently said of the U.S. "After World War II you were all powerful, relatively more powerful than you are today. Yet you chose to make your power safe for the world by enmeshing it in multilateral institutions and defining your own national interest in terms of the interest of other nations."

Prestowitz, "American Empire: Conservatives Ask: Is This Abuse of Power?" Seattle Times, June 29, 2003.

Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Dean of Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, states "Power is the ability to obtain the outcomes one wants." As we have seen in Afghanistan and Iraq the hard power of the U.S. is not sufficient to get the administration what it wants. Nye sees world politics as a three dimensional chess game. On the top chessboard – the military realm - the U.S. is the only superpower and can claim unipolarity or hegemony.

On the second level of the board – the economic realm - power is multipolar. The U.S. cannot obtain what it wants on trade, antitrust or financial issues without the agreement of the European Union, Japan and others. It cannot claim hegemony.

The bottom level of the chess board is the realm of transnational relations that crosses borders outside of government control. This realm includes, at one extreme,

such non-state actors as diverse as bankers electronically transferring sums larger than most national budgets, and, at the other extreme, terrorists carrying out attacks and hackers disrupting Internet operations. In this realm to speak of a unipolar world or American empire makes no sense.

Nye notes: "As the U.S. National Security Strategy makes clear, this is precisely the set of issues intruding into the world of grand strategy." The new unilateralists who focus almost entirely on military power are one dimensional players in a three dimensional game.

Nye believes: "Soft power lies in the ability to attract and persuade rather than coerce. Hard power, the ability to coerce, grows out of a country's military and economic might. Soft power arises from the attractiveness of a country's culture, political ideals and policies." Inadequate attention to soft power can be limiting to the hard power the U.S. can bring to bear in such situations as Iraq. When U.S. policies appear legitimate in the eyes of others, American soft power is enhanced. When the policies seem illegitimate, the coalitions of the willing or opportunistic we are able to mount may continue to shrink.

Nye further notes: "The paradox of American power is that world politics is changing in ways that make it impossible for the strongest power in the world since Rome to achieve some its most critical goals alone. The U.S. lacks both the international and domestic capacity to resolve conflicts that are internal to other societies and to monitor and control transnational developments that threaten Americans at home. On many of today's key issues such as international financial stability, drug trafficking, the spread of diseases, and especially the new terrorism, military power alone simply cannot produce success; and its use can sometimes be counterproductive. Instead, the U.S. must mobilize international coalitions to address these shared threats and challenges. By devaluing soft power and institutions, the new unilateralist coalition is depriving Washington of some of its most important instruments for implementation of the Bush National Security Strategy. If the administration continues with this track, the U.S. could fail what Henry Kissinger called the historical test for this generation of American leaders: to use concurrent preponderant U.S. power to achieve international consensus behind widely accepted norms that will protect American values in a more uncertain future."

Nye, *The Paradox of Power - Why the World's Only Superpower Can't Go It Alone*.

U.S. National Security Strategy 2003

George F. Will, conservative political columnist with the Washington Post Writers Group, writes: “George W. Bush may be the most conservative person to serve as president since Calvin Coolidge. Yet his presidency is coinciding with, and is in some instances initiating or ratifying, developments disconcerting to four factions within conservatism. The faction that focuses on foreign policy has four core principles: Preserve U.S. sovereignty and freedom of action by marginalizing the United Nations. Reserve military interventions for reasons of U.S. national security, not altruism. Avoid peacekeeping operations that compromise the military’s war-fighting proficiencies. Beware of the political hubris inherent in the intensely unconservative project of ‘nation-building.’” “Today a conservative administration is close to asserting that whatever the facts turn out to be regarding Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, the enforcement of U.N. resolutions was a sufficient reason for war. If so, war was waged to strengthen the United Nations as author and enforcer of international norms of behavior. The administration also intimates that ending a tyranny was a sufficient justification for war. Foreign policy conservatism has become colored by triumphalism and crusading zeal. That may be one reason why consideration is being given to a quite optional intervention -- regime change, actually -- in Liberia.”

Will, “Conservative Label Doesn’t Fit Bush”, Seattle P.I., July 27, 2003.

Theresa Hitchens, vice president, Center for Defense Information, says: “The US National Security Strategy seeks to justify this new strategic posture by citing the recognized right under international law for a nation to defend itself by taking preemptive action against an ‘imminent threat.’ However, the strategy’s language clearly stretches the traditional definition of ‘imminent’ – seeming to include preventing a nation or non-state actor from obtaining even the capability to attack the United States....”

Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Jan/Feb 2003

The Economist says “Early on, the document [U.S. National Security Strategy] draws two clear lessons from the end of the cold war. America is now threatened less by conquering states than we are by failing ones and the cold-war doctrines of deterrence and containment no longer work effectively in a world of ‘shadowy’ terrorist networks. And since this is so, ‘to forestall or prevent...hostile acts...the United States will, if necessary, act preemptively.’” “Preemption is not new. America has acted preemptively before, notably in Central America. And though it now

becomes a core part of foreign policy, it sits uneasily beside the statement that ‘our military must deter threats against U.S. interests, allies and friends.’ Deterrence, clearly, is not dead.”

“A second tension is between the aims of defeating terror and promoting democracy. The document says that America aims to create ‘a balance of power that favors freedom’ and claims that ‘the world’s great powers find ourselves on the same side—united by common dangers.’ It moves to and fro as if these things were the same. They are not.”

“The first is about promoting values, the second about promoting order. It is simply not true that at the level of government all the world’s powers are on the same side in promoting democracy. And some of the steps you might take to defeat threats (cosying up to Saudi Arabia, for instance) conflict with the aim of promoting freedom.”

“Unprecedented Power, Colliding Ambitions,” *The Economist*, Sept. 26, 2003

George Perkovich writes “The Bush administration’s new ‘National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD),’ announced in December, is wise in some places, in need of small fixes in other places, and dangerously radical in still others. Most important, the strategy’s approach to nuclear issues seems destined to reduce international cooperation in enforcing nonproliferation commitments rather than enhance it. America’s willingness to use force against emergent WMD threats, as in Iraq, can stir the limbs of the international body politic to action. But a truly effective strategy to reduce nuclear dangers over the long term must bring along hearts and minds as well.”

“...Nuclear weapons... are temporarily legal in five countries, not illegal in three others, and forbidden essentially everywhere else -- a complex and inconsistent arrangement that presents a unique set of dilemmas.”

“This regime [nuclear non-proliferation] was established by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty ... Shaped largely by the two superpowers, the NPT posited that the world would be more secure if proliferation did not extend beyond the five states (the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France, and China) that at the time possessed nuclear weapons. It reflected the widely held judgment that the more nuclear weapons holders there were, the greater the risks would be that some weapons would go off, either accidentally or on purpose.”

“The vast majority of countries, however, felt that ‘total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against [their] use,’ and enshrined this

conviction in Article VI of the NPT. That is, nuclear weapons per se are a problem, even if they could serve as effective deterrents against certain threats. The United States and the other four nuclear powers accepted this proposition and in May 2000 reaffirmed their ‘unequivocal undertaking’ to eliminate their nuclear arsenals.”

“To persuade the rest of the world to give up its right to future acquisition of nuclear weapons, in other words, the nuclear weapon possessors had to promise to give up their own eventually. They had to offer other incentives as well: a pledge not to use their weapons to threaten non-possessors, help in acquiring and using civilian nuclear technology for states that renounced nuclear weapons and accepted international monitoring, and the enhanced security of knowing that the treaty would also help keep one’s neighbors from acquiring nuclear weapons. On this foundation, the United States and other countries have constructed over the years a nonproliferation regime of norms, laws, rules, institutions, sanctions, and, ultimately, un-backed coercion.”

“Since the NPT was agreed to in 1968, only five states have acquired nuclear weapons: Israel, India, Pakistan, South Africa, and perhaps North Korea. The first three never signed on to the treaty, and so their ongoing possession is morally, politically, and strategically (although not juridically) akin.”

“Bush’s Nuclear Revolution: A Regime Change in Nonproliferation,” *Foreign Affairs Quarterly*, March/April 2003, <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20030301facomment10334/george-perkovich/bush-s-nuclear-revolution-a-regime-change-in-nonproliferation.html>

George Tenet, CIA Director: “The domino theory of the 21st century may well be nuclear. With the assistance of proliferators, a potentially wider range of countries may be able to develop nuclear weapons...” Senate testimony, Select Committee on Intelligence, Feb. 12, 2003.

US National Security Policy Bibliography

1. "National Security Strategy of the United States," The White House, Sept. 17, 2002 www.whitehouse.gov
2. "National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction," The White House, Dec. 2002, www.whitehouse.gov
3. Clyde Prestowitz, "American Empire: Conservatives Ask, Is This Abuse of Power?" Seattle Times, June 29, 2003.
4. Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *The Paradox of American Power – Why the World's Only Superpower Can't Go It Alone*, 2002.
5. George F. Will, "Freedom Has Different Meanings," *Seattle P.I.*, Aug. 17, 2003; "Conservative Label Doesn't Fit Bush," Seattle P.I., July 27, 2003.
6. Krepon: "Dominators rule," Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Jan/Feb 2003
7. Weldon/Edwards: "The Post-Hussein Era: America, Russia, Terrorism, and Weapons of Mass Destruction" Arms Control Today
8. Thomas Donnelly, "The Underpinnings of the Bush Doctrine," Feb. 1, 2003, American Enterprise Institute online.
9. Vice Admiral Lowell E. Jacoby, USN, Director, Defense Intelligence Agency, Testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Feb. 11, 2003.
10. Brewster C. Denny, "Our Place in the World: We Must Follow Path of Diplomacy," *Seattle P.I.*, Sept. 5, 2003.
11. George Perkovich, "Bush's Nuclear Revolution: A Regime Change in Nonproliferation," *Foreign Affairs Quarterly*, March/April 2003.
12. Michael Ciarrocca, "Do As I Say, Not As I Do Nuclear Policy," *Foreign Policy In Focus*, May 27, 2003, www.fpiif.org.
13. Robert Kagan, "Power and Weakness," *Policy Review*, No. 113
14. Philip Bobbitt, *The Shield of Achilles: War, Peace and the Course of History*.
15. Ivo H. Daalder and James M. Lindsay, *America Unbound: The Bush Revolution in Foreign Policy*, Brookings Institute Press, coming in November 2003
16. Lawrence J. Korb, *A New National Strategy in the Age of Terrorists, Tyrants and Weapons of Mass Destruction*,
17. Niall Ferguson, *Empire: The Rise and Demise of the British World Order and the Lessons for Global Power*.
18. Andrew Bacevich, *American Empire: The Realities and Consequences of US Diplomacy*.
19. Clyde Prestowitz, *Rogue Nations: American Unilateralism and the Failure of Good Intentions*.
20. Jonathan Schell, *The Unconquerable World: Power, Nonviolence and the Will of the People*.
21. Robert Kupchan, *The End of the American Era*.
22. Steven R. Weisman, *The Great Tax Wars*

Websites

American Enterprise Institute www.aei.org

Arms Control Assoc. www.armscontrol.org

The Atlantic Council. www.acus.org

British-America Security Information Council www.basicint.org

Brookings Institute www.brook.edu

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace www.ceip.org

Cato Institute www.cato.org

Center for Defense Information www.cdi.org

Center for Strategic and International Studies www.csis.org

Council on Foreign Relations www.cfr.org

U.S. Department of State www.state.org

Henry L. Stimson Center www.stimson.org

Hoover Institution www.hoover.stanford.edu

Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies www.idds.org

Monterey Institute for International Studies (MIIS), Center for Nonproliferation Studies cns.miis.edu

National Academy of Sciences www.nationalacademies.org/nas/nashome.nsf

National Security Council www.whitehouse.gov/WH/E/OP/NSC/html/nschome.html

Rand Corporation www.rand.org

Office of Secretary of Defense www.defenselink.mil/pubs/almanac/osd.html

Third Millennium Foundation www.abolishnukes.com