

National Security Strategy 2013

Introduction & Guiding Principle

The United States will lead the international order as a nation first among equals to encourage stability, foster economic growth, promote democratic values, and protect global strategic interests.

Our nation is strongest when we adhere to the core values and interests of the citizenry. The principle above should inform every citizen and government official to understand our national priorities, policy positions, and decisions to be made during the next four years. The international order has changed significantly since the end of the Cold War, and will continue to do so. The United States must prepare for a multilateral world where, while retaining our military, economic, and cultural preeminence, we may be challenged by both allies and adversaries. Therefore, Americans must adopt the view from within and without that we are a nation “first among equals” to reflect the trends of demographics, global finance, and military power.

Strategically limiting American hard power to maximize our effectiveness while not constraining our ideals and aspirations of making the world safe for democracy will increase flexibility in assuring our national security. Our strength over the long term rests with the ability to persuade rather than coerce. The United States will maintain the most capable armed forces in the history of the world, in order to pursue our tradition of peace through strength. America will lead the international order through our ideals and cooperation, not just our military might, to solve geopolitical problems.

The security of the United States in today’s globalizing world order increasingly ties our interests with our allies and adversaries. Access to strategic resources and pathways for trade combined with our desire for foreign citizens to freely express themselves democratically will not always align. We must abide by democratic principles at home and pursue our national strategic interests while peacefully promoting democracy and human rights elsewhere.

This document details the international environment the United States faces moving forward and depicts how we can navigate a peaceful and stable order in the future by leading the global economy, protecting critical global strategic interests, and maximizing the disposition and strength of our military. Furthermore, the analysis of emerging and persistent national security issues – cyberspace, terrorism, and nuclear weapons – emphasizes the opportunity of American leadership.

Leading the International Order

Supporting an international system beneficial to U.S. interests, but neither dependent on nor hostile to, U.S. global predominance.

The world order is in continual flux¹; the close of the Cold War, September 11th, and the Arab Spring show how much the world can change in a generation. Consequently, United States' policy has changed to meet the new demands on our power and influence. We should expect this change that proves the pragmatism of our international policies. The main dynamic occurring in the international system today is the shift in geopolitical center of gravity from the Atlantic to the western Pacific. We are at an important inflection point in world affairs and we possess the ability to determine our national future and influence the international system to provide continued national security. Our government and society should not fear change, but embrace the dynamism of tomorrow to create global stability through American leadership and ideals.

Is this trend sustainable, or will geopolitics settle into a new multi-polar system similar to that of the early 20th century? Must we guard against an inevitable power struggle between major states?

The increased accessibility to information and global markets has made volatility the norm. Though impossible to predict, it is likely that this trend will continue, making uncertainty and change among a large number of states more likely than a sustained conflict between a few, or just two, major international powers. We should consider world power in changing degrees rather than a static first, second, and third.

World hegemony has historically been able to encourage relatively peaceful international systems. Since the end of the Second World War no major powers have fought directly. Instead, Europe was rebuilt and integrated, nuclear war was avoided, and global cooperation and integration pulled millions out of poverty through trade and development. The ideological schism between capitalism and communism did not prevent these accomplishments. The Arab Spring has come about in the face of another ideological schism, but one for which the extremists are losing capability and support. The empowerment of people, through education, access to information, and economic prosperity are the greatest weapons against extremist ideologies.

The United States is the strongest, most capable world power; rather than fighting a fluctuating system however, an opportunity exists to encourage a more stable international system, able to operate even as the world moves toward greater multi-polarity. Policing the system and acting, as a sort of 'security provider of last resort' is overly burdensome for the United States, has damaged our legitimacy abroad, and creates more geopolitical problems that it solves. It is unlikely our influence will go unchallenged in strategically important areas of the globe. States are now offered other models for development beyond what is perceived as our model of westernization.

¹ Hutchings 2003

A Shift from West to East and from States to Non-State Actors

The major trend inherent in this systemic flux reflects the rise of both China and India. Their rise results primarily from developmental catching-up inevitable in the globalizing world. As massive populations in both of these countries come out of poverty, both China and India continue to experience relatively strong economic growth, despite the global financial crisis. In addition to growth, these countries are advancing technologically and militarily. It is unavoidable then, assuming these trends persist, that our relative power will decrease and that global influence will shift from West to East. The United States will continue to have absolute advantage in critical areas of national power.

The changing international power dynamics could be seen as a threat, but should be embraced as an opportunity for regional stabilizers to relieve some of the burden from taxpayers. Our strategy encourages China to use its own influence in both Sudan and North Korea to promote greater stability and human rights. China is now our main partner and competitor in shaping the international system. After our own security, priority should be given to minimizing the insecurities where feasible of major powers like China and India. Neither a contained nor insecure China will be helpful in creating a stable international system. The key is to further convince countries like China that their prosperity is linked to global cooperation and trade.

China and India are not the only states on the rise. Other countries such as Brazil, Russia, and South Africa show degrees of potential in shaping their regional environments as well. Greater influence is not confined even to states however. Non-state actors such as international businesses, non-governmental organizations, regional organizations, and even digital communities are becoming more influential in shaping global affairs. Our strategy accepts a greater number of influential players and a changing center of geopolitical gravity. Historical power centers will not necessarily remain the only important ones, and though the state-system will remain, states will not necessarily be the only influential players tomorrow. Accepting greater uncertainty and the need to reform global institutions will prove challenging, but is in our national interest.

A Dispersion of Influence and Greater Uncertainty

This dispersion of influence results in increased uncertainty. The Arab Spring exemplifies this uncertainty in two ways. First, individuals are gaining new power to shape politics in authoritarian states, in large part due to the digital age. Second, as events in Syria, Bahrain, and Iran show, substantial protests may still fail to result in change as state leaders act in very different ways to maintain power. The digital domain is a medium that can be used by all sides in a conflict - whether this is to spread information, track information, or cut off information.

In addition to the Arab Spring, continued success of developing economies presents greater uncertainty as emerging economies gain greater influence. As trade flows grow and fluctuate, new centers (both for production and consumption) will gain influence internationally. Thus creative destruction of

markets will create further uncertainty - especially because scarce resources hold the potential for tempting greater hostility between competitors.

This growing uncertainty will reward perception and flexibility more than dogmatic policy commitments to foreign countries. Supporting greater human rights and democracy, while an ultimate aim nonetheless, must be balanced with how our action may lead to greater uncertainty. The United States suffered after the invasion of Iraq was followed by a general implosion of order, and had to react at high cost. In the future, especially concerning states like Iran and North Korea, our policy must adequately weigh the potential costs of uncertainty.

Global Institutions

The major threat in the next four years will likely come from actors that remain cut off from the global community. These actors are the primary source of terrorism in terms of funding, weapons, and safe haven. States such as Iran and North Korea are destabilizing as they pursue nuclear weapons and threaten common good resources such as sea-lanes and oil. Our policy must champion an emphasis on integrating these non-players into global institutions.

In some cases, however, this will not be possible in the short term. In these extreme cases, sanctions will likely remain necessary, but states like Russia and China must be discouraged from undercutting such multilateral actions because of how these strategies tend to harm populations in the end. These local populations must be considered as key opportunities. Especially in Iran, where strong reformist movements exist, United States policy should encourage rather than alienate these populations. As a consequence, policies that lead to a 'rallying around the flag' effect should be examined carefully. The operational goal of our strategy is not to limit our legitimate policy options in any geopolitical situation.

Our strategy invites new influential players into multilateral institutions, to both lessen our burden, and ensure long-term stability, prosperity, and the diffusion of democratic values. This makes these institutions legitimate, but may require politically difficult reforms in organizations like the United Nations, World Trade Organization, International Monetary Fund, etc. In the absence of progress at the WTO, regional trade agreements will continue to proliferate. Ultimately, increased trade and the regimes that integrate states regionally lessen overall economic uncertainty and strengthen international relationships. These agreements, even if regional, should be encouraged. However, it is important to limit these types of agreements if they induce exclusive trading blocs dominated by regional hegemons.

The United Nations Security Council is also a regime where further reform may encourage greater participation from rising powers. Rising powers that see opportunities for greater leadership within the United Nations may also take up greater responsibility for regional stability. One way to induce more cooperation within the Security Council is to encourage dialogue on changing the membership of the Council to reflect current international realities. The permanent members do not reflect current trends in global influence. There are policy opportunities for innovative ideas about membership and voting at the UN Security Council.

Multilateral institutions in general are difficult to change. Though the process of these institutions can be difficult, making meaningful change look unlikely, they remain important and capable. Positions of influence should not be taken for granted any longer. We are in a time where geopolitical changes mean new stakeholders take greater responsibility for the system in which they have succeeded.

Cybersecurity, Terrorism, & Nuclear Weapons

Cyber Security

The United States has the most innovative technology industry in the world, and we are committed to using the strength of our civilian and military innovation in the future. The continued strength of our innovation is a pillar in the future of our economy. We must recognize and address our cyber security vulnerabilities. Our reliance on cyber networks for maintaining critical infrastructure means that we must prepare to provide robust cyber security. Inadequate security leaves the United States exposed to attack our banking systems, power supplies, and communications networks.

Non-cooperative organizational structure created failures to share information between the various intelligence agencies prior to the September 11th attacks. The United States cannot suffer from similar failures again. The sharing of technology and information gained through technology can amplify the technological success of individual agencies and units in the military. The United States must develop standards for sharing cyber security information among government and military branches.

The success of the private cyber security industry highlights the success of our technology sector; the private sector provides the majority of cyber security in the United States. Our ability to protect the American public as best as possible rests on the cooperation between the private sector and the government. The United States government is committed to providing avenues through which private cyber security firms can share sensitive information with the government in order to prevent future attacks.

We cannot be caught by surprise if states or non-state actors choose to enter the game of cyber warfare. We must prepare for the future of defense through the development of both defensive and offensive cyber capabilities. The United States affirms the military has the responsibility, through the authority of the President, to engage in offensive cyberspace operations.

The United States retains the inherent right of self-defense in cyberspace. We define cyber attacks, which have the same destructive result as do traditional attacks, as constituting a use of force against the United States government and the American people. In the event of such an attack, the President has the authority to respond under the traditional doctrine of self-defense.

Recognizing the power of cyber operations will have a profound impact in the future of the United States military, and the United States is committed to expanding the recruitment, training, and development of cyber security specialists. The United States will maintain our sovereign cyberspace security by

responding to the cyber threats of the future through the development of professionals with unparalleled skills today.

Terrorism

In the decade after the devastating attacks of September 11th, 2001, the United States remains unwavering in our commitment to the security of all Americans and our allies against terrorism, to never allow terrorists safe haven, and to prevent the ability of terrorists from ever obtaining or using weapons of mass destruction.

The vast majority of the people in the world rejected the attempts of terrorists to create an atmosphere of fear in the hearts and minds of all people. The United States hopes the dedication of all peoples will eliminate terrorism as a viable political tool. We will always support those working to reclaim Islam from extremist ideologies. Through the determination of our people and the support of our allies, the soil of the United States is safer now than ever in the past. The maintenance of this safety is predicated on our continued commitment to fighting terrorism at home and abroad through all available means, including but not limited to unilateral military action.

As a testament to the strength of America's allies, countries around the world developed their own means of combatting terrorism on their own soil. In order to further support our allies' programs to fight terrorism in their own territories, the United States is committed to lending our skills and expertise in fighting terrorism. Because of this cooperation, the United States will need to intervene less in foreign conflicts. This will preserve our fiscal and military resources, while we can retain the knowledge that terrorists will not be allowed to prosper.

Moving forward in the fight against terrorism, the United States will rely on both experience from the past and the strength of our future. The United States is dedicated to further developing technology that can be used to detect and disrupt terrorist activity.

The development of drone technology allows the United States to fight terrorism while limiting the over-commitment of troops abroad. Pakistan is a unique case due to its proximity to our deployed forces in Afghanistan and the porous nature of their shared border. The intent of using satellite and drone capabilities is to debilitate terrorist networks. The use of drones provides the United States with new advantages and opportunities to pressure our adversaries on the truth of their intentions and capabilities.

We must work to gain international cooperation with the states where drones are used in the fight against terrorism. We propose an international convention dedicated to forming an international consensus on the use of drones, predicated on the idea that drones will be used when a state cannot or will not stop terrorists on their own territory.

Nuclear Weapons

The United States is committed to the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons, and fully supports the enforcement of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Over the past decade, the world has seen rogue states shirking their treaty

obligations and seeking to develop nuclear technology. The United States will stand in solidarity with the majority of the world in calling for these rogue states to cease the development of nuclear weapons technology and to dismantle existing technology.

The United States will not accept the possibility of non-state actors and terrorists obtaining nuclear technology. The interception of Abdul Qadeer Kahn's nuclear network highlights the risks of rogue individuals selling nuclear secrets to the highest bidder. The United States and our allies cannot tolerate secrets getting into the wrong hands, and we will secure a renewed commitment to uphold nuclear security from each nuclear state. North Korea presents a specific concern for the illegal proliferation of nuclear technology to rogue state and non-state actors. Collaborating with our allies in Asia and China, we can successfully restrict North Korea's ability to flout international agreements on non-proliferation.

The United States does not assume the nuclear security of all nuclear powers will always exist. The nuclear powers should enter an honest dialogue about the limits of safety in their own nuclear programs, and the ways in which states can address the safety concerns on their own. Along with our allies, we should commit to negotiating agreements with nuclear powers to provide safeguards for nuclear weapons in the case that a state's government cannot provide appropriate security for its weapons.

We will work to incentivize the development of nuclear technology that can only be used for nuclear energy. We will also work to open channels of communication with those states developing nuclear technology to ensure technology is not dual use. States have a real and legitimate right to the development of nuclear energy technology, but they cannot be permitted to develop this technology as a means to produce nuclear weapons. Through the development of nuclear safeguards and a new international understanding of coordinated security, the United States will maintain a safe world for future generations.

Strategic Resource Access & The Middle East

Global access to critical resources for worldwide economic prosperity.

America's dependence on foreign oil creates vulnerability to supply disruptions and price increases, and negatively impacts our flexibility to respond to these events. Our dependence also undermines our influence on oil-exporting countries' behavior, because they know we are reliant on them to continue supplying us with oil. Further, it has the potential to bring us into competition with other large oil importers, such as China and India, as world demand grows and reserves shrink.

While we should make every effort to strive for it, independence from foreign oil is not feasible in one or two presidential terms. With that in mind, we will focus on managing our dependence in the short term. This includes the recognition that for the foreseeable future we must defend critical waterways through which global oil supplies travel. Not only that, but we are also constrained by our allies' and adversaries' dependence on the global oil supply. We must be

prepared to act to defend strategic points that, while not directly vital to ensuring domestic supply, could have a severe impact on the worldwide supply of oil. Disruption of access to energy supply will negatively impact our domestic economy and constitute a threat to national security.

However, this shared dependence on foreign oil or oil revenues can be a useful area for consensus building among international efforts. Each party has an interest in protecting its energy infrastructure and shipping lanes from security threats, such as terrorism or piracy, for example.

We can also seek to lower our domestic consumption of oil, through measures such as a gas tax or “cap and trade” system. We must continue to incentivize research and development of new energy technologies, particularly in transportation and manufacturing. At the same time, we should encourage domestic production and exploration. This may not significantly increase the supply of domestic oil in the long term, but it will serve to bolster America’s credibility when inducing other countries to produce and explore more within their borders.

The Arab Spring & Iran

The lingering unrest in the Middle East and North Africa as a result of the Arab Spring is both a cause for concern and hope with respect to American national security. The concern is that continued instability benefits Iran, terrorist groups, and others looking to gain influence in the region, and that the US has lost long-standing partners in Hosni Mubarak and Zine al-Abidine Ben Ali. The risk remains that conservative Islamist parties, staunchly opposed to American policies in the region, could dominate post-revolution politics in Egypt and elsewhere.

Our interest for a stable and peaceful Middle East is our top priority in the region. The same opportunities for cooperation that existed under the deposed rulers, however, still exist. While uncertainty remains about who will ultimately assume leadership of Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, Syria, and Yemen, the new leaders will face the same concerns about counterterrorism, economic development, and security. They may be less receptive to direct US involvement, but under the auspices of international organizations, there will be opportunities for finding and capitalizing on common ground.

Iran’s situation is exceptional because they are attempting to revise existing security and economic arrangements within the region. The United States will not concede vital security, economic, or strategic arrangements to the Iranian government. Our military serves as the option of last resort; our priority is diplomacy. International politics and economic sanctions must be allowed to continue pressuring the regime in Iran to change course with its nuclear technology program.

The only acceptable path to peace with the Iranian people is for their government to abandon any attempt to create nuclear weapons by allowing full IAEA inspections, stop supporting terrorist organizations, and engage in honest and peaceful dialogue with its allies and adversaries. To this end, the United States will stand firm with the international community.

Interests and Values

In such a complex international environment, it is inevitable that our interests and values will conflict. How we act in those circumstances will serve as a lightning rod for criticism, or an opportunity to strengthen relationships with other actors on the world stage based on mutual interests.

We believe that the new international order discussed above, in concert with the other policies we outline, will work together to foster a US role in the world that gives us greater flexibility of action when our interests and values conflict. Rather than being hamstrung by unilateralism or an immediate imperative to act, we will be able to employ a variety of multilateral strategies against threats, hopefully mitigating the need to work at direct cross-purposes to either our interests or values. Our flexibility to respond to international circumstances creates the policy space necessary to conduct a rigorous assessment based on our fundamental principle.

Leading a Globalizing Economy

*Improve American competitiveness with an innovative economy
decreasing our vulnerabilities in a globalized age.*

For too long, economic policy developed in response to crisis and threats to economic prosperity instead of through active leadership of a stable economy. Without adequate leadership crisis will drive decision-making. The recent global financial crisis provides this administration an opportunity to lead the global economy towards stability; however, the administration must lead through courageous and bold leadership.

The current global financial crisis is not novel in our financial history; bubbles and subsequent crashes characterize the world economy throughout history. The global financial crisis depicted the world's vulnerability to an increasingly interconnected and computerized financial economy. By nature, financial markets reflect global economic realities; however, financial institutions are only regulated domestically. Financial markets will continue to globalize and push current thresholds. Creating wealth and economic growth, its by-products are instability and volatility. New regulation will support the globalization of financial markets and constrain the volatility. As the largest economy and possessing the largest financial center, it is our responsibility to create the rules of the road for global financial institutions. To support efficient and equitable markets, we need simple and enforceable rules for a robust system. A robust and fair financial system will allow for even economic growth, which provides the basis for much of our national security.

Competitive Advantages & Domestic Investments

Our competitive advantage is our unsurpassed environment for entrepreneurship. To sustain long-term economic growth, we must acknowledge, harness, and invest in this advantage. The ability to create, innovate, and design new companies and products for global consumers creates the foundation for our economic growth. Today, our products consist of patents, financial services, and innovative processes. These processes create a

natural, creative destruction and shift away from old technologies. Yet, we continue to invest in dying industries and outdated technologies, entrenching and protecting their interests. This is an inefficient allocation of capital that weakens our economy. We must also recognize the threats and challenges that a commitment to innovation creates for our economy.

Improvements in technology create economic growth, but also generate a scarcity of low-skill jobs. These improvements shift industries away from being labor intensive to capital-intensive. This decreases the demand for low-skill manufacturing in the United States, which results in a vanishing middle class and thus, inequality rises. This phenomenon will gain momentum in the short-term. A commitment to innovation increases the demand for highly skilled workers. The benefits of the knowledge-based economy accrue for those with strong skill sets with advanced backgrounds in the sciences, engineering, law, and financial services. Many positions remain unfilled because our workers cannot meet the qualifications demanded by these employers. To continue to support and meet the demands of a knowledge-based economy, we must invest in educating students to work in a technical and demanding economy.

We need to address this demand for skilled workers with short-term and long-term protocols. A short-term response includes revising immigration policies to fill gaps immediately with highly skilled workers. Foreign students graduating from domestic higher education institutions should be encouraged to work within the United States, driving economic growth. An effective long-term response relies on a significant investment to our education, which focuses on math and science to prepare students to participate in an innovative economy. Improving the skill level of workers within the domestic economy will sustain our competitiveness in a global environment and preserve our competitive advantage at innovation and entrepreneurship.

Global Trade, Multi-lateral Institutions, & Bilateral Agreements

The global financial crisis weakened our leadership and ideological pursuit of unfettered finance. Where developed economies struggled—emerging markets gained global market share. The increasing strength of emerging markets places tensions on multilateral institutions to concede greater control. As a result, institutions like the World Trade Organization struggle to bring about significant improvements in trade because they remain deadlocked negotiating the Doha Development round. The WTO intended for this round of negotiations to address development and market access issues for developing countries; however, as the negotiations continue into their 11th consecutive year, many fear that the negotiations will never close.

Emerging markets distrust the ability of the WTO to promote free and equitable trade as larger economies refuse to acknowledge their increased role in the global economy. Yet, both large and small economies desire greater international trade to support economic growth. States find it both easier and faster to negotiate regional agreements with fewer stakeholders involved. As such, regional trade agreements increase in popularity as the WTO struggles to find consensus in trade negotiations. The increase in regional trade agreements provides a strategic advantage for us. Trade agreements negotiated outside the WTO venue benefit the United States, as smaller economies afford larger

concessions in these agreements to gain open access to our large domestic economy.

Leading the Global Monetary Order - Stabilizing our National Debt

The U.S. dollar is a global currency as it is the primary choice for cross-border transactions and foreign country reserves. Although this places significant pressure on the dollar, it is also a source of strength providing Americans an important privilege within the global economy. To preserve the dominance of the dollar as the world's main reserve currency, we must maintain economic and fiscal health through economic growth and responsible government expenditures.

Our ability to repay current and future national debt outlays resides in how we use that capital. The construction of infrastructure for future generations to prosper is an American ideal. Renewing existing infrastructure serves the needs of today, but we must look forward and plan for future American economic dominance by developing new infrastructure. The education of our youth is the most cost effective long-term strategy in creating a dynamic workforce that adapts to an evolving international economy. Focusing on providing infrastructure renewal and education opportunities are long-term American successes waiting to be achieved.

Growth is essential to maintain our leverage in the global economy. Stagnation and the growing national debt increases the uncertainty among foreign holders of U.S. dollars. Our ability to borrow at cheap rates from the rest of the world is not a constant. This period will end and we must prepare for this by reducing our dependence on debt spending. While it is not realistic to significantly reduce the debt in the short-term, we can commit to stabilizing the debt burden. Setting the standard for reducing debt in the long-term.

Strengthening Our Military & Defending the Homeland

Defend the American Way of Life, encourage stability in the international system, and protect global access to strategic resources.

The United States has endured twelve years of war in Afghanistan and Iraq, and interceded on behalf of NATO's mission in Libya. With approximately 1.5 million men and women under arms, and another 1.5 million in reserve, the United States is fully capable of defending our citizens and territory. Our longstanding doctrine of being able to fight two simultaneous land wars was deemed outdated under the Obama administration. The wars and military actions most likely to occur in the near to medium term are low intensity conflicts and asymmetric warfare. Preparing for the years ahead, we must begin to reposition our worldwide force projection capabilities, defend critical strategic resources, and promote stability in the international system through unilateral strength and multilateral alliances.

The geopolitical balance of power is shifting from west to east, and the disposition of our armed forces should represent this reality. Asian security concerns coincide with China's economic rise and military aspirations. Our commitments in the Pacific region and in Southeast Asia are crucial to American

economic prosperity. Working closely with Taiwan, Japan, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Australia will insure regional security and cooperation to counter-balance China. This does not require China's exclusion from regional security agreements; rather their inclusion should be encouraged with proper consideration.

Our security in the Atlantic remains predicated on cooperation through NATO. The shift in the geopolitical center of gravity from West to East necessitates continued drawdowns of American personnel from Europe to reposition forces toward Asia and Africa. This does not translate into a dereliction of our responsibilities on the continent. However, Europe no longer serves as an effective geographic location for force projection to the Middle East, Sub-Saharan Africa, the Indian sub-continent, and Asia. Therefore, our commitment to NATO in men and materiel remains a pillar of American security, but must exist within a dynamic global security context of shifting regional concerns.

American forces stand ready to combat any action seeking to deny the world access to critical resources. Access to energy resources and refined products provides for the economic modernity developed nations enjoy and to which developing ones aspire. Free access to resources and markets is critical to stability in the international system. The United States must remain committed to keeping vital international supply chokepoints open and persuading countries not to use their resources to destabilize markets. The Navy is the most effective tool in denying pirates the freedom to harass international trade lanes, preventing the Straits of Hormuz or Malacca from being closed, and reducing the security costs of international shipping. In the past we bore the burden of protecting sea-lanes alone, but increasingly we will rely on international coalitions to keep peace on the high seas as a cost effective and cooperative security effort.

Building a Military for Tomorrow

The United States needs a military capable of fighting one major land war while simultaneously providing sustained defense of critical global strategic interests. The premise that we should remain capable of fighting two simultaneous land wars is no longer valid as a result of the collapse of the Soviet Union, and a modern preference for large states not to engage in direct confrontation. We must prepare a military capable of full spectrum operations from disaster relief and humanitarian missions, to low-intensity conflict and general war.

The Department of Defense will be responsible for continuing procurement for military hardware, but the current budgetary environment will not make future purchases easy. The Army and Marines have worn out much of their ground and aviation equipment and vehicles. The military must begin balancing the desire to develop future war fighting technologies against the need to replace battle-worn vehicles and technology from the last decade. The armed forces have also strained the readiness of service members with deployment schedules due to the over-commitment of forces during the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The United States still possesses the most powerful and capable military in the history of the world. Our goal should not be to continue our dominance, because our dominance was never the goal. Rather, we should focus on what

allowed our military to become dominant: economic dynamism, a positive demographic growth pattern, and public/private partnering for investment in research and development. Provided we achieve these benchmarks, our military will continue to lead the world as the gold standard of military capability and excellence.

Use of Force Doctrine

The United States maintains the right to use force when necessary. However, the legitimacy of our use of force is fulfilled when the international community clearly understands the conditions under which force may be used. The number of allies willing to contribute to our military action will decrease our economic and military costs while increasing the legitimacy of action. The Weinberger doctrine and the subsequent Powell doctrine guided national decisions to use force for the last two generations. Properly used, the doctrine will guide our national decision to take military action only in situations where the advantages, path to victory, and end goals are clear and achievable. While maintaining our commitment to international law and the United Nations Charter, the United States may use force in the event that the Executive Branch answers each of the following questions in the affirmative:

- Is a vital national security interest threatened?
- Do we have a clear attainable objective?
- Have the military, economic, and social risks and costs at home and abroad been fully and frankly analyzed?
- Does the cost of not acting exceed the cost of acting, even in the event that action does not follow a best or good-case scenario outcome?
- Have all other non-violent policy means been fully exhausted?
- Is there a plausible exit strategy at each stage of action to avoid endless entanglement?
- Have the consequences of our action been fully considered?
- Does the American public support the action?
- Do we have genuine broad international support that can reasonably be expected to last throughout the entire course of engagement?

Although the doctrine implies an unwarranted restriction on the use of force, it does so only to mitigate the unintended consequences that wars always have. The United States will pursue our policies within the international system with diplomacy, persuasion, and cooperation before resorting to force as a principle.

Conclusion

The United States will lead the international order as a nation first among equals to encourage stability, foster economic growth, promote democratic values, and protect global strategic interests.

The United States must remain prepared to engage the world as the international order becomes more dynamic and requires adaptability. Flexibility and creativity in perceiving and solving complex international problems will

differentiate tomorrow's geopolitical winners and losers. Reliance on dogmatic approaches to policy or ignorance of international and historical context will provide certain failure. We must be prepared to question fundamental foreign policy assumptions when success eludes us. We must be ready to implement strategies for specific problems when our interests and values conflict. Our core national value and international strategic interests will not always align. We must carefully consider our interests and values at home before considering those beyond our shores.

Our security and stability is becoming inextricably linked to security and stability elsewhere in the world. The resolve of the administration must be above reproach in executing the America's national security strategy; this provides clear evidence to allies and adversaries of our intent and capabilities so they can choose to remain within the international order as successful participants.