

# INTEGRATED POWER

A  
NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY  
for the **21<sup>st</sup>** CENTURY

By Lawrence J. Korb and Robert O. Boorstin  
and the National Security Staff of the  
Center for American Progress

Center for American Progress



# **INTEGRATED POWER**

---

**A NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY**

**BY LAWRENCE J. KORB AND ROBERT O. BOORSTIN**

**AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY STAFF OF  
THE CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The National Security staff at the Center for American Progress produced this strategy. The staff includes Vice President for National Security Peter Rundlet and Senior Fellows Gayle Smith and P.J. Crowley, whose effort and expertise made this document possible. Our program directors, analysts, and research assistants all provided research and editorial guidance. They include Jake Caldwell, Andy Grotto, Ken Gude, Brian Katulis, Nicole Mlade, Peter Ogden, Caroline Wadhams, Antoine Morris, Max Bergmann, Rebecca Schultz, and Brooke Lierman. The National Security team also benefited from the help of three extraordinary interns, Ben Armbruster, Yvan D'Addario, and Jon Sherman. Dan Restrepo, the Center's Director for Congressional Affairs, provided insightful suggestions and Alys Campaigne and Ana Unruh Cohen provided invaluable guidance and expertise on energy. Kathy Cooper and Matt Brown were responsible for production and design of the document.

We were also aided by a number of outside individuals who took the time to review the manuscript, and whose comments proved invaluable to improving the arguments and analysis presented here. The Center is very grateful for their time and insight. Any errors that remain are the authors' alone.

# CONTENTS

**FOREWORD: THE NEED FOR A NEW NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY .....i**

## **INTEGRATED POWER: A NEW NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY**

Opportunities and Goals .....1

Forces of Fragmentation .....3

- Global Terrorist Networks
- Extreme Regimes
- Weak and Failing States

Forces of Integration .....9

- The Potential of Globalization
- The Promise of Democracy
- The Pursuit of New Alliances
- The Power of Technology

Principles and Priorities .....17

- Protect the American People
- Prevent Conflicts
- Lead Vital Alliances and Modernize International Institutions

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION**

Global Terrorist Networks – Attacking on all Fronts .....27

Nuclear and Biological Weapons – Quarantining the Greatest Threat .....33

Homeland Security – Building an Effective Defensive Shield .....41

Preventing Conflict, Sustaining Peace, and Promoting Shared Prosperity ..47

Freedom and Stability – Advancing Democratic Institutions and Values ....53

Energy Independence – Using Diverse and Clean Fuels .....59

## **SOURCES AND FURTHER READING**

## FOREWORD

### THE NEED FOR A NEW NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

Defending our country against all enemies, foreign and domestic, has always been and will always be the highest priority of the federal government. To carry out that task, the government needs a clear, consistent national security strategy.

Under the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986, the president is obligated every year to present to the Congress and the American people a “national security strategy.” Twelve of these documents – ranging in clarity, length and usefulness – have been published to date, the last by the Bush administration in 2002. Because nearly three years have passed since the last National Security Strategy, the Center for American Progress takes up the challenge in this document.

From the fall of the Berlin Wall to the collapse of the Twin Towers to the invasion and occupation of Iraq, the United States has lacked a national security strategy that properly reflects the reality of a new era. This despite the fact that today’s geopolitical situation is markedly different from the Cold War era, when our country had a clear, coherent and widely supported plan that focused on containing and deterring Soviet Communist expansion. And this despite the events of September 11, 2001, which reshaped the way Americans looked at the world.

One thing is clear: in the years since the end of the Cold War, the United States has firmly established its position as a power without peer. We are the dominant global military force, our economy drives many others, and our cultural influence is unsurpassed. Today we have the opportunity to increase the security and prosperity of the American people, to increase our influence in critical regions and countries, and to help others achieve economic growth and build democratic institutions.

The strategy presented here is designed to help the United States exercise the broad range of our instruments of power, exploit the opportunities ahead, and defeat the enemies we confront. It concludes that the interests of the United States will be served best by following a strategy of *integrated power*, a new concept that reflects the challenges and promise of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## INTEGRATED POWER

Integrated power means discarding previous concepts of “hard” and “soft” power and viewing them not as alternatives but as essential partners. Integrated power means using the unifying forces of globalization to defeat the centrifugal forces of fragmentation – terrorist networks, extreme regimes, and weak and failing states – that pose the greatest threat to the American people. Integrated power means leading and using alliances to increase the powers of the United States, rather than taking a solitary road. Integrated power means combining new strategies that respond to new threats with traditional strategies that respond to the kinds of enemies we have previously confronted.

Integrated power recognizes that our strength abroad is intimately tied to our strength at home. It is a strategy that applies to *what* the United States does as we relate to the world but also *how* we make national security policy here at home. It means matching resources to priorities. And integrated power means ending the artificial divisions we have created between defense, homeland security, diplomatic, energy, and development assistance policies.

Using the concept of integrated power as a foundation, the strategy presented here articulates three primary principles to guide our policies: protect the American people first; prevent conflict whenever possible; and lead vital alliances and institutions to better serve our national security. Taken together, they provide a

---

***We need a new strategy because, in just four years, President Bush has put Americans at greater risk by weakening our military, draining our treasury, and severely damaging our global power and influence.***

---

blueprint for how we can best seize the enormous opportunities ahead and enhance our security.

We need a new national security strategy because President Bush and his advisers lack a realistic plan that will strengthen our nation and protect our people. We need a new strategy because, in just four years, President Bush has put Americans at greater risk by weakening our military, draining our treasury, and severely damaging our global power and influence. We must change course.

This White House has been stubbornly consistent in its certainty that the omnipotent power of the United States will triumph no matter the challenge we face. It has also demonstrated remarkable discipline in using what it has labeled the “global war on terror” to justify almost every action. But at virtually every turn in the Bush administration’s purported drive to advance American supremacy, its policies have undermined our nation’s military, economic and political power. Consider the torturous path to our current predicament.

Prior to the attacks of 9/11, the Bush approach to national security could best be summed up in a single word: alienation. In its first eight months in office the administration appeared determined to estrange any nation, alliance, or institution that could possibly help the United States achieve its national security goals. The White House was caught in a Cold War mindset, content to let our influence erode, and focused on finding ways to justify spending billions on a speculative and destabilizing National Missile Defense system.

The terrorist attacks of 9/11 changed all that. A new enemy, personified by Osama bin Laden, was thrust upon an unsuspecting administration. Up to that very day, the White House systematically ignored or downplayed the risks posed by the network of terrorists that had proven through the 1990s that it would stop at nothing to harm the United States, its people, and its friends and allies. In the wake of the attacks, President Bush rightly acted to forcibly remove the Taliban from power in Afghanistan and launched efforts to track down bin Laden and his network. Then he diverted his attention to Baghdad.

The White House released its 2002 National Security Strategy during the build-up to the invasion of Iraq. The document was notable for its sweeping rhetoric and its emphasis on “preemption” as our primary tool in combating terrorism and achieving our national security goals. Preemption itself was not new; every president has had the option to attack an enemy if convinced that a group or regime posed an immediate and direct threat to American citizens or interests. Many have exercised that power. But by turning preemptive attack into preventive war and making it the centerpiece of U.S. policy, the Bush administration diverted us from the real challenges, put the American people at greater risk, and further alienated the world.

Some two years later – flush with electoral victory at home, empty handed after searching Iraq for weapons of mass destruction, and lacking an exit strategy for his war – President Bush embraced the promotion of democracy and freedom. This goal has taken center stage in the latest version of the “Bush doctrine” and has occasioned great debate. “It is the policy of the United States,” the president declared, “to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world.”

The core of this vision has, in fact, been central to U.S. foreign policy since President Woodrow Wilson occupied the White House. But President Bush has stretched the notion of promoting democracy into something unrecognizable. He has attempted to claim a partisan monopoly on a goal that is shared across party lines. He has made grand rhetorical statements about democracy, while

## INTEGRATED POWER

selectively making exceptions and excuses for nations that are reversing democratic trends. He has developed virtually no concrete plan of action to achieve his goals.

---

*Every day the American people are witness to the terrible cost of the president's simplistic world view and the blind certainty that drives those around him. The situation the United States faces today in Iraq is what happens when ideology trumps the facts, when a country acts without a strategy.*

---

What is worse, President Bush has cast aside the Wilsonian goal of “making the world safe for democracy” in favor of imposing democracy by military force. That Saddam Hussein no longer rules Iraq is a blessing. That the president wants to spread democracy is laudable. But in the past two years we have learned that it matters a great deal how you achieve your goal. Every day the American people are witness to the terrible cost of the president's simplistic world view and the blind certainty that drives those around him. The situation the United States faces today in Iraq is what happens when ideology trumps the facts, when a country acts without a strategy.

Our leaders' obligation is to put forward a national security strategy that is based on sober judgments of how things are, not what some

ideologues wish them to be. It must reflect complex realities, not a naïve black-and-white view of the world. A national security strategy should provide solid and steady principles to guide our actions – to help us define where we want to go, to seize opportunities, and to stop those who would do us harm.

This new strategy is presented in two parts. The first segment outlines the goals of the national security strategy and the broad argument behind the concept of integrated power. The strategy outlines the primary threats that the United States faces and the opportunities for combating these threats and advancing our national interests. It goes on to set forth the critical principles that should guide our actions.

In the second segment, recommendations for actions needed to achieve our strategy are presented in six areas: combating global terrorist networks; quarantining nuclear and biological weapons; securing the homeland; preventing conflict and advancing prosperity; promoting democracy; and securing energy independence. Many of the recommendations are based on previous studies by the Center for American Progress.



The strategy that follows, by necessity, focuses on the most important threats and opportunities and does not aspire to provide all of the tactics and plans necessary to implement the broader strategy. In future documents, the Center will spell out detailed plans for military transformation and an agenda for economic competitiveness. In some places a single sentence summarizes concepts or reports that have been the products of years of work. Unlike recent national security strategies, this document does not tour the world, or address challenges country by country or region by region.

Our goal is to move beyond that increasingly outdated framework, and explain how the progressive principles we promote can guide us as we move toward our goals. The Center for American Progress aims to continue the debate on America's role in helping bring security, prosperity, and freedom to people around the globe the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

*Lawrence J. Korb and Robert O. Boorstin*  
*June 2005*

# **INTEGRATED POWER**

**A NEW NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY**

## OPPORTUNITIES AND GOALS

**A**t the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, America has unprecedented global influence and strength. Our military is unsurpassed; our economy can fuel opportunity for billions at home and abroad; and our traditions of fairness and hope have the power to inspire individuals in all cultures to seek democracy and freedom. Future generations will judge the leaders of this era by whether they solidify these American advantages and reduce our vulnerabilities.

Today Americans can look back at the years since the end of the Cold War and those since the attacks of 9/11 and begin to forge a more coherent understanding of the opportunities we can seize and the threats we must address. It is a complex picture of unfamiliar enemies, more dangerous weapons, and a more fluid world.

The greatest danger to the American people today is not a single great power or a group of rising powers, but rather three primary forces of fragmentation. They are terrorist networks with a global reach; extreme regimes that aspire to nuclear weapons and threaten their neighbors; and the ever-growing group of weak and failing states that can provide safe harbor for terrorists and destabilize critical regions.

Arrayed against these are strong forces that can integrate the world and reinforce our power and influence. The United States has the chance to marshal these dynamic forces – globalization, democratization, the rise of new powers, and technology – to promote the interests of the American people and to help others find the road to security, prosperity, and freedom.

The United States today needs a national security strategy that protects the American people, counters our greatest threats, and makes the most of new global opportunities. *Integrated Power* is a multidimensional strategy that goes beyond traditional “hard” and “soft” power notions of national security and merges the many and varied powers of the United States to strengthen our country and help spread our values across the world. It casts aside the false divisions that prevail today and unifies disparate ideas and actions. *Integrated Power* offers a strategy that reflects the complex realities of the world –rather than a series of actions that are disconnected from each other *and* disconnected from reality.

The strategy of integrated power hews to three fundamental principles. First, protect the American people. Second, prevent conflict. Third, lead vital alliances and modernized international institutions to better advance our national interests.

## INTEGRATED POWER

This strategy's primary goals are to:

- Protect the American people by taking military action, alone if necessary, destroying global terrorist networks, cutting off access to nuclear and biological weapons, and investing in a comprehensive program to secure the homeland.
- Increase economic opportunities in the United States and across the world by helping developing countries join the global economy and create new markets.
- Prevent conflict by deterring extreme regimes, bolstering weak and failing states, intervening before disaster strikes, and undermining the long-term appeal of extremist ideologies.
- Increase the power and enhance the legitimacy of the United States by leading the vital alliances and modernized international institutions that ultimately can help save American lives and dollars.
- Promote the spread of democratic institutions and freedoms to give people the chance to determine their own future, better ensure stability, and create new allies.

---

*These goals reflect the complex realities of our times. They are pragmatic in their emphasis on achievable steps yet they embody the fundamental American values that have long made our nation a beacon to the world.*

---

These goals reflect the complex realities of our times. They are unyielding in their application of military force to eliminate global terror networks, but subtle in their approach to undermining the appeal of the extremist ideology that provides their recruits. These goals stress prevention of conflict but fortify our ability to respond when tensions erupt and threaten stability. They will maintain our dominance and strengthen our independence while making sure we benefit from alliances and cooperative action.

These goals – and the strategic principles – are pragmatic in their emphasis on achievable steps yet they embody the fundamental American values that have long made our nation a beacon to the world. Most of all, they reflect the power, energy, know-how and commitment of the American people – and their desire to build security, prosperity, and freedom at home and abroad.

## FORCES OF FRAGMENTATION

America's national security landscape changed when the Cold War ended. September 11 made us painfully aware of this, even if our security strategy had not yet recognized the shift. A more complex picture of the threats we face has emerged, one that includes unfamiliar enemies, more dangerous weapons, and a more fluid world.

Today the greatest danger to the American people is not a single great power or a group of rising powers. Instead, the greatest threats are the forces of fragmentation – forces that can take the shape of countries, loose networks, or an erratic dictator in a critical region. These threats are terrorist networks like al Qaeda that have global reach; extreme regimes that aspire to join the nuclear club and threaten their neighbors; and the ever-growing group of weak and failing states that can provide safe harbor for terrorists, can destabilize critical regions and fail to provide for their people.

---

*Today the greatest danger to the American people is not a single great power or a group of rising powers. It is the forces of fragmentation – forces that can take the shape of countries, loose networks, or an erratic dictator in a critical region.*

---

The primary enemies of the United States are operating in a global environment that has vastly increased their potential to harm Americans and U.S. interests in both the short- and long-term.

First, it has become increasingly easy to obtain and use nuclear or biological weapons – weapons that pose the greatest risks because of their potential to claim millions of lives and the increasing ease with which they can be acquired. Today groups and individuals can break the governmental monopoly on nuclear expertise, weapons-grade fuel and delivery systems. Barriers to building and detonating a nuclear or radiological bomb are rapidly eroding. Scientific and technological advances combined with the rising commercial use and availability of biological agents have vastly increased the odds that a small, skilled group of people could secure the necessary materials and launch an attack. What is more, terrorists have explicitly expressed their intention to acquire and use the deadliest weapons they can procure. A terrorist group only has to be successful once, while the United States must stop them each and every time.

Second, these enemies are taking advantage of the dilution of national boundaries and the rising prominence of non-state actors on the global stage. True, neither the fall of the Soviet empire nor the attacks of 9/11 marked a fundamental,

## INTEGRATED POWER

historic change in the ways great powers and countries relate to one another – and these relationships continue to define geopolitical strategy. But violent and destructive transnational groups – terrorist networks, international gangs and drug cartels – have found footholds, flourished and metastasized. They step into the voids where countries have no control and they take advantage of weak states. The world is beginning to create capacity and institutions that can respond to such transnational threats, but progress has been slow.

Finally, these enemies are operating in a world in which the United States is viewed unfavorably by far too many. Our actions in Iraq and the Middle East, which instantaneous communications bring every day to the far corners of the world, have increased the virulence of these feelings. Survey after survey over the past four years has shown dramatic jumps in hostility toward the United States, not only in Muslim-majority nations but across the world. Whether these perceptions are fair or not, the United States must deal with them realistically.

Taken together, these trends present new challenges to our national security. For the United States to know its enemies has never before been more difficult nor more important. A comprehensive national security strategy must address the following three primary forces of fragmentation: global terrorist networks, extreme regimes, and weak and failed states.

### **Global Terrorist Networks**

Securing a stable future requires a clear-headed understanding of who we are fighting in the inaptly named “war on terror.” Terrorism, after all, is a tactic – albeit a horrifying and barbaric one – that has and always will be employed by groups seeking to achieve political and military goals. As others have trenchantly argued, saying we are in a “war on terror” is like saying we were at war against U-boats in World War I, or blitzkrieg or kamikaze in World War II.

We are fighting – and must focus first on – the small but powerful networks of terrorists exemplified by al Qaeda that embrace the long-term goals of killing the American people and destroying the power and influence of the United States. These dangerous radicals are relatively few in number and they do not represent the mainstream Islamic world. In fact, they are caught in a war within Islam; they are a force of reactionaries who want to return the Muslim world to what they see as a golden age and rescue it from the so-called “modernizers.” They have profited from their audacity, their discipline, their patience, and the advantages of “asymmetric” warfare.

These extremists share a commitment to wage war against the United States and the influence of Western culture. They see the United States as the root of global evil and their shared grievances are fueling the emergence of an international Muslim identity, particularly in the so-called “arc of instability” that stretches from Central to Southwest Asia. They believe that U.S. support for Israel is the prime reason that the Palestinians are denied a homeland and basic human rights. They feel that the autocratic regimes in Egypt and Saudi Arabia survive only because of American support. They look at the U.S. military in Iraq and see an occupying force reminiscent of colonial times, not an army that liberated an oppressed people. These perceptions drive their anger and adhesion to their cause.

The ranks of terrorist networks are rapidly increasing due to the absence of opportunity in societies hungry for hope. The exponential growth in the youth population in many Muslim-majority countries has not been matched by economic opportunities or the provision of basic services to their populations. Tensions are rising, particularly in countries where autocrats pay lip service to dissent while tightening their grip on power. Many young men are taught to hate the United States *madrassas* – religious schools – that can serve as radical incubators. They have what at present seems to be an endless supply of recruits for a cause that extols death in its service.

Tactically, success in our efforts to prevent attacks and control the spread of non-state actors like al Qaeda requires us to set aside policies traditionally used against our enemies. Deterrence will not work against the radical extremist core of terrorist networks. The United States cannot strike at their territory. They are elusive and hydra-headed, growing new branches even as we cut off others. They appear infinitely patient. And they are actively seeking to acquire nuclear or biological weapons to attack us.

Disassembling the global terrorist networks requires a different, more nimble use of deadly force, and we must do everything we can to eliminate their hard inner core. We must also counter the supportive second ring that supplies the terrorists with the money and arms they need to stage attacks. Finally, we must launch a long-term campaign to undermine the basis of their recruiting efforts – to demonstrate through concrete action that the United States can be a force for good in the Muslim world and elsewhere and to bring their passive supporters to our side by the power of our values and example.

## INTEGRATED POWER

### Extreme Regimes

The second primary threat facing the United States are extremist regimes that aspire to join the nuclear weapons club, threaten to destabilize critical regions and often play host to terrorist networks. These states have also been referred to as “rogue regimes” and they range from Iran to North Korea and from Syria to Belarus. The primary danger they pose stems from the combustible combination of unchecked rule, extremist views, and the potential to produce and use weapons of mass destruction.

Today North Korea and Iran are the most dangerous of the extremist regimes. One is a ruthless Communist dictatorship, run by a leader often described as erratic and irrational, that starves its citizens. The other is a strong, seemingly stable Shiite theocracy facing the challenge of allowing dissent while retaining power. But they both seem determined to develop nuclear weapons capability in the face of international opposition. They both occupy strategic territory next to countries that are longtime allies of the United States.

The Bush administration has taken a consistent, misguided stance toward both. It labeled them members of the “Axis of Evil” and has refused to engage with them directly, despite numerous opportunities. It has unsuccessfully sought to isolate these countries, only reversing course when forced, such as in the administration’s recent decision to support the efforts of the group of Europeans who have been negotiating with Iran. By failing to directly confront and engage with these countries, the Bush administration has only exacerbated our problems with them.

The end result: an increase in North Korea’s nuclear arsenal and Iran on the verge of nuclear weapons capability.

---

#### *Confronting these regimes*

*successfully requires a strategy that*

*integrates the goals of the United*

*States with the circumstances and*

*ambitions of each nation – and the*

*wisdom to employ every weapon,*

*incentive and tool we possess.*

---

Handled poorly, extreme regimes will separate the United States from key allies and fragment the united front that is required to contain their aspirations to acquire deadly weapons.

Confronting these regimes successfully requires a strategy that integrates the goals of the United States with the circumstances and ambitions of each nation – and the wisdom to employ every weapon, incentive and tool we possess.

The best route for the United States is to confront and engage these regimes, preferably through international and regional organizations, but unilaterally when necessary. In concert with other countries we must use incentives – such as economic assistance



and trade concessions – to pull these countries away from their pursuit of deadly weapons. The United States must also use economic sanctions and other instruments to punish countries that do not cooperate. We must work to contain the damage they can do to their neighbors and encourage the kind of democratic changes that can result in moving these regimes toward peaceful partnership in the community of nations.

We must also use traditional strategic doctrines such as containment and deterrence that involve using our military supremacy to deal effectively with these kinds of regimes. Consider the case of Saddam Hussein. From 1991 to 2003, containing Saddam Hussein cost America less than \$2 billion per year and not a single American was killed by hostile fire. Since the invasion of Iraq more than 1,650 Americans have lost their lives, 12,000 have been injured, and American taxpayers have spent more than \$200 billion, with no end in sight. Despite the changes of the post-9/11 era, there is no need to abandon strategic doctrines that work.

### **Weak and Failing States**

Nations that teeter on the edge of chaos and failure have long posed threats to their neighbors. But today weak and failing states pose as great a danger to the American people and international stability as do potential conflicts among the great powers. The National Intelligence Council predicts that as we approach the year 2020 “weak government, lagging economies, religious extremism, and youth bulges will align to create a perfect storm for internal conflicts in certain regions of the world.” We ignore this warning at our peril.

Weak and failing states have been defined as those countries with governments unable to protect their citizens from internal or external threats, unable to provide basic services, or unwilling or unable to respond to their population’s needs. Civil wars, declining resources, and economic migration from rural to urban areas have put unprecedented stress on governments and economies throughout the developing world. Many countries now pose significant threats to their neighbors and regions because they yield the space for terrorist organizations to make camp and take root, lack mechanisms to stop the spread of outbreaks of infectious disease, and cannot – or will not – check trafficking in arms, drugs or precious minerals.

September 11 shined a harsh spotlight on the dangers posed by weak and failing states. In need of financial support and unable to control its territory, the Taliban regime in Afghanistan provided safe harbor for Osama bin Laden, who had already been chased out of Sudan. By ceding territory for training camps to

## INTEGRATED POWER

bin Laden and allowing him to strengthen his network and support, the Taliban proved that even regimes that cannot control their own territory can aid and abet those with a global reach.

Fragile regimes frequently result from civil wars and studies estimate that about one-half slide back into conflict within five years of a cease-fire or a peace agreement. Many of these conflicts are confined within nations or regions but others cause mass flights of refugees and have the potential to ignite long-simmering disputes over land and resources. In the worst cases, they are staging grounds for ethnic cleansing and genocide.

Over the past decade the deluge of news – live, worldwide, 24-hours – has highlighted events in countries once consigned to oblivion. It has also raised standards of international and domestic accountability. U.S. military actions in Somalia and Bosnia testify to this trend, as does pressure for the United States to intervene in western Sudan.

Increasing focus on these countries since September 11 – and fresh memories of the unchallenged Rwandan genocide of 1994 – have helped create a growing international consensus that traditional notions of state sovereignty should be set aside when governments cannot or will not protect their own citizens. One of the best ways to protect weak and failing states is to adopt the “responsibility to protect” doctrine – the idea that countries have a right to violate another country’s sovereignty and intervene militarily to prevent genocide and ethnic cleansing.

In both practical and moral terms, the dangers posed by these states means the United States must redefine how best to project its power. Our ultimate goal is to help transform these weak and failing states into countries that are capable of protecting their citizens, providing basic services, maintaining secure borders, and committing to democratic and free market institutions. In pursuit of this goal, the United States must invest in preventing conflict and crisis; significantly increase its own post-conflict reconstruction capabilities, including those of the military; and implement long-term foreign assistance programs that foster economic growth and help democratic institutions take root.

## FORCES OF INTEGRATION

**T**oday the United States has the opportunity to use its dominant power to prepare the American people for what lies ahead, to gain the confidence of those in newly rising powers, and to use our influence to help others find the road to democracy and economic growth.

Moving forward requires us to take advantage of the transnational forces of integration and modernization that are shaping today's world. In confronting the forces of fragmentation, the United States must unleash the potential of globalization, champion the promise of democracy advance the pursuit of new alliances, and harness the power of technology. None of them is a silver bullet for progress, of course, and these forces can create new inequalities and tensions. But if used wisely, they can become integral elements of a national security strategy that advances the interests of the American people and hundreds of millions worldwide.

### **The Potential of Globalization**

During the past decade, the promise and perils of globalization have become a cliché. Economies the world over are undergoing the most profound change in a century as information technology and interdependence bring quantum changes in the way people and nations work and relate to one another.

The global marketplace has given U.S. corporations and individuals astonishing new ways to do business, create new markets, and find new profits. To date, globalization has brought great advantages to the core of industrialized nations. It has also provoked tremendous anxiety among those who see the old order or their way of life turned upside down, be it the loss of an entire industry or a single job. The United States must now work to ensure that globalization is a positive force in our domestic economy, making sure that we invest in education and research and development. Innovation will be the key to competition and training the crucial link to maintaining confidence within our labor force.

The United States must also maintain its ability to act without constraints despite the world's increasing economic interdependence. Today foreign investors own more than 50 percent U.S. Treasury bills, notes and bonds and once-fictional scenarios involving the ability of other nations to destabilize our markets grow more real every day. We must restore our fiscal credibility and lower the deficits that could one day give foreign investors the power to restrain economic growth.

## INTEGRATED POWER

At the same time, it is in the interest of the United States to help developing nations to achieve steady economic growth, to build strong middle classes, and to participate fairly in the global economy. The United States will continue to profit from globalization only if others do well and markets for our goods are expanded.

---

*Spreading prosperity is one of the most important ways we put our values into action. The creation of wealth in developing nations is an integral element of a 21st century national security strategy.*

---

Making globalization work – increasing economic opportunities in developing countries and helping governments provide basic services – can also help reduce the potential pool of recruits for global terrorist networks, and reduce the chances that resource competition will lead to conflict. Finally, but no less important, spreading prosperity is the right thing to do; it is one of the most important ways we put our values into action. The creation of wealth in developing countries is an integral element of a 21<sup>st</sup> century national security strategy.

So, too, is a rational approach to the unprecedented mobility of populations. In almost every sphere, mobility presents huge opportunities and tremendous risks. Mobile populations are powering economic growth in many poor countries in Central and South America, where remittances – funds sent back to families from those working overseas – outstrip foreign direct investment. Our government can help maintain our country's economic and technological edge by ensuring a healthy influx of foreign students, scientists and entrepreneurs from overseas. In addition to bringing their knowledge and money to the United States when they arrive, these people return home as unofficial ambassadors for the United States, becoming tremendous assets in improving our image abroad.

The United States must also be prepared, however, to deal with the challenges of mobility. We must reach a delicate balance in immigration policy, finding a solution that powers economic growth without creating a political or social backlash. The United States must also commit itself to the kind of immediate response that can prevent conflicts that result in the flight of refugees across national borders. Globalization brings new responsibilities in addition to new opportunities.

### **The Promise of Democracy**

The 15 years since the end of the Cold War have seen the gratifying, sometimes dramatic, spread of democratic ideas across the world. Very soon after the fall of the Berlin Wall the proportion of the world's countries considered democratic rose to 60 percent from 40 percent. From Eastern Europe to East Timor to Africa

to the Balkans and now to Ukraine and Central Asia, people the world over have stood up and demanded the rights and liberties to shape their future. The appeal and power of democracy are clear.

But the past decade has also demonstrated that building stable democracies is neither inevitable nor easy. Many embryonic democracies have slipped back to old habits and failed to mature or to deliver economic growth and political stability. In Russia, leaders nostalgic for the days of Soviet dictatorship are dismantling fragile institutions of democracy. There has also been a proliferation of “illiberal democracies” and “liberalizing autocracies” – regimes that have learned to appease leaders in the United States and Europe with superficial changes while maintaining a harsh monopoly on power. And Iraq has demonstrated the limitations and dangers of delivering democracy at the point of a gun.

The United States has a tremendous opportunity to help bring to life our belief that no nation or people has a monopoly on the desire for basic human rights and liberties. Political participation and free markets are more likely than despotism and command economies to promote long-term development and stability. Adding new countries to the democratic ranks, moreover, will help us combat the forces of fragmentation and achieve our national security goals.

---

***The United States has a tremendous opportunity to help bring to life our belief that no nation or people has a monopoly on the desire for basic human rights and liberties.***

---

Getting there, however, requires that the United States stop creating unrealistic expectations and abandons the idea that American democracy can be exported wholesale. Instead we must press forward and spark, support, and sustain the development of democratic institutions. We must work with the non-governmental organizations, like foundations and even private individuals, who are promoting civil society from within. In this drive, we must resist the temptation to stamp a “made in the U.S.A.” label on those we support; silence will sometimes be the best ally. Our influence and impact on democracy in certain countries will inevitably be limited. We must recognize that elections sometimes will bring to power those who do not have the best interests of the United States at heart.

The habits of democracy can be the glue that binds countries together in common cause in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. But the United States can only lead the way if we make a renewed commitment to lead by example.

## **INTEGRATED POWER**

The United States must correct the dramatic departures from our fundamental values of the past few years. A record here at home of disposing of the judicial process, violating civil liberties and allowing the president to arrogate to himself extra-Constitutional powers makes it difficult to sustain support for advancing democracy abroad. In Muslim-majority countries and elsewhere, the abuse of prisoners at Abu Ghraib, humiliating treatment of detainees at Guantanamo, and the rendition of prisoners to countries that use torture have made our calls to advance freedom and liberty ring hollow. In many ways democracy promotion in the coming years will be an exercise in rebuilding trust through concrete action. We must restore our credibility and reset our country's moral compass to advance the promise of democracy.

### **The Pursuit of New Alliances**

One of the principal forces of change in the 21<sup>st</sup> century will be the rise of powers in Asia – particularly China and India. Although the United States will never dismiss the importance of traditional great power politics or our need to maintain and advance historic alliances in Europe and Asia, it is past time for our country to engage and act more closely with the leading countries of the developing world.

The reasons are clear. China and India are reshaping the global economy and, according to the National Intelligence Council, “will transform the geopolitical landscape.” By the year 2020, together they will account for 2.7 billion people, about one-third of the 8 billion global total. Their economies are growing at extraordinary rates and their combined political influence promises to shape future negotiations on everything from agricultural subsidies to the proliferation of nuclear and biological weapons.

These emerging powers create new opportunities for the United States and will pose some of the most fundamental questions in national security policy in the decades ahead. In the simplest terms, the United States should attempt to avoid conflict and benefit from cooperation by strategically planning today. We must be realistic about our ability to influence the policies of these emerging giants, and actively work to draw them into the international community and a world of order and rules.

Consider the competition for oil. Both China and India need vast new supplies of energy to fuel their economic growth, and both are reshaping their national security strategies to secure access to these supplies. This increasing demand and the continuing dependence of the United States on foreign oil will not only spike global energy costs but could create new tensions. The United States will be in



the strongest position in the future if we make significant investments now to diversify our energy sources and help make clean energy technologies available to these countries.

We should also strive to create relationships that will provide us access and understanding when conflicts do arise. For example, the Taiwan question has not prevented advances in our bilateral relations with China, but – both publicly and behind the scenes – we will do well to encourage both parties to reach a peaceful agreement. This is a far preferable option than waiting for the day when we are forced to decide whether to defend the island from a Chinese military invasion. The continuing battle between India and Pakistan over Kashmir provides another example of the need for measured, sober action.

Encouraging rapprochement between the two nations is a far preferable choice to getting drawn into the century's first nuclear showdown.

Beyond China and India, the United States has an historic opportunity to work with other developing countries as they move from cameo appearances in times of crisis to leading roles on the global stage. Argentina, Brazil, Egypt, Indonesia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Africa, and Turkey are just a few of the countries that demand our attention. Continuing to treat them as second-rate powers will come back to haunt us in the decades ahead. Engaging them as allies and partners will advance our interests, stabilize key regions, and lift up people throughout the developing world.

These countries form the backbones of regional organizations that can help relieve our global military, humanitarian and political burdens. They can be indispensable allies in solving the growing challenge of weak and failing states.

They are the source of vital resources: two-thirds of the top 15 countries from which America imports oil are developing countries outside the Middle East. And developing countries represent far and away the largest potential new markets for American goods. Brazil, China, and India alone make up for 40 percent of the world's population. Finally, treating developing countries as allies, rather than imposing solutions upon them, is the best recipe for gaining their confidence and improving our country's reputation in critical areas of the world.

---

***The United States has an historic opportunity to work with leading developing countries as they move from cameo appearances in times of crisis to leading roles on the global stage. Continuing to treat them as second-rate powers will come back to haunt us in the decades ahead. Engaging them as allies and partners will advance our interests, stabilize key regions, and lift up people throughout the world.***

---

## INTEGRATED POWER

The structural outlines for working with these powers are becoming increasingly clear. The Asian financial crises in the late 1990s first prompted the creation of what became known as the G-20, a group of financing and banking ministers from leading developing and industrial countries, along with the World Bank and International Monetary Fund.<sup>1</sup> This forum quickly established itself as a group for fostering an open dialogue between industrial nations and emerging-market countries – much as the G-8 had emerged in the 1970s as the primary locus for the world’s leading industrial nations to launch initiatives aimed at solving transnational problems.

Another G-20 – this one composed solely of countries from the developing world – emerged in the run-up to the 2003 World Trade Organization negotiations in Cancun, Mexico.<sup>2</sup> Taken together, these nations accounted for 63 percent of the world’s farmers and 51 percent of the global population. They joined together to do nothing less than “change the dynamics of multilateral trade diplomacy.” As new alliances such as these form, the United States must work with them for our mutual security, prosperity, and freedom.

### **The Power of Technology**

New technologies present the United States with tremendous opportunities to help reduce human suffering, spur economic growth and protect the homeland. The ability to use and apply biotechnology, nanotechnology, materials science and new communications capabilities will mean advances in health care, economic development and environmental protection. It will allow us to create new markets for U.S. products and to bring cutting-edge programs and hope to developing nations.

The information revolution has had perhaps the greatest impact, giving us powerful new weapons, intelligence-gathering capabilities and methods for tracking those who would do us harm. Technological breakthroughs have given the U.S. military demonstrable battlefield advantages and improved the accuracy of many weapons. Our satellites and intercept techniques are extraordinary,

---

<sup>1</sup> The members of the G-20 are the finance ministers and central bank governors of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the European Union.

<sup>2</sup> This Group of 20 developing countries was originally composed of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, India, Mexico, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, South Africa, Thailand and Venezuela. Membership has since increased, but the group continues to call itself the G-20 regardless of the actual number in its ranks.



as is the amount of information the intelligence community collects every day. Biometric technology has great promise in helping to maintain border security.

Advances in medical technology and discoveries about the value of basic solutions promise to help the world as we confront new and old pandemics, from AIDS to tuberculosis to the avian flu. Institutions such as the Global Fund to Fight for AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria have demonstrated that we can multiply exponentially our power to find solutions and provide access to treatment when the United States works with others. There is also tremendous promise in environmental and clean energy technologies that can help us avoid conflicts as the world's appetite for energy increases.

The most important questions for the United States are two: Can we maintain (in some cases recover) our technological prowess to power our economy? Can we take advantage of the technology to protect the American people and pursue our national security interests?

The first question is a subject of tremendous importance for our future – and one where there are ominous signs for our country from test scores to patent filings. The United States needs a plan to promote our competitive position through investments in innovation, technology, education and training.

On the second question, developments since the attacks of 9/11 suggest that our current government has failed to take advantage of technology and maintain a much-needed perspective. Armed with the communications technology that allows us to penetrate the world and gives us a chance to win the long-term “battle of ideas” with Muslim extremists, the Bush administration opted for shallow public relations campaigns. Given an opportunity after 9/11 to launch a new energy era for the United States – one driven by technology and unhitched from oil-rich regimes of the Middle East – the President passed. In thrall to the technology that helped power our military victories in Afghanistan and Iraq, the civilian leaders at the Pentagon lost focus on the basics that protect our armed forces in battle and ignored critical manpower needs. And presented with a balanced picture and doubts about intelligence alleging the existence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, the architects of the war dismissed it and created their own reality. It is no exaggeration to say this record of ignorance, certainty and willful manipulation has been devastating to our national security.

Technology has given the United States powerful tools to save lives, battle the forces of fragmentation and spread prosperity. Now it is up to the United States to use those tools correctly to advance our cause and improve the lives of millions around the world.

## PRINCIPLES AND PRIORITIES

The strategy of integrated power has three principles at its core: protect the American people; prevent conflicts whenever possible; and lead vital alliances and modernized international institutions. To follow these principles requires basic changes in the way the United States approaches and implements national security policy.

America's dominant power will best be maintained by using a multidimensional approach that links threats to priorities, and priorities to actions by institutions. A simple concept, yes. But we are not following it today. Neither our approach nor our institutions have adjusted to reflect the blurring of once-familiar lines between domestic and foreign threats. We continue to segment, categorize and divide when today's world requires integration. Integrated power requires a broader definition of national security – and concrete actions that can bring to life the new thinking.

---

*Neither our approach to national security nor our institutions have adjusted to reflect the blurring of once-familiar lines between domestic and foreign threats. We continue to segment, categorize and divide when today's world requires integration.*

---

First and foremost, the United States must have economic policies that support national security goals. Leaders can no longer afford to pretend that economic strength at home is divorced from national security capabilities. We must return to the fiscal discipline of the 1990s and begin to address the enormous, unsustainable foreign ownership of our debt as well as our huge trade imbalance. In addition, the combination of skyrocketing federal deficits and cuts in domestic programs threatens to undermine public support for foreign policy programs.

Integrated power calls for a critical change in how we pay for national security: the establishment of a unified national security budget that would replace today's confusing system of divided accounts.<sup>3</sup> It simply no longer makes sense to treat separately the budgets of the Departments of Defense, Homeland Security, State, Treasury and Energy, among others. Integrating the offensive, defensive, and preventive elements of our national security budgets is a complex undertaking that requires gradual transformation. It will demand hard choices by the Department of Defense and the Congress. But budgets are the true measure of national priorities and unifying them is the only sensible course in the long run.

---

<sup>3</sup> For more information, see Center for Defense Information & Foreign Policy in Focus, *A Unified Security Budget for the United States, 2006*, May 2005, available at <http://www.fpif.org/pdf/reports/USB.pdf>.

## INTEGRATED POWER

In the same vein, it is time to tear down the false bureaucratic barriers that separate national security and foreign policy from homeland security and energy policies. Some changes – such as merging the National Security Council and the Homeland Security Council in the White House – will be largely invisible but will help transform priorities and attitudes over time. Other policy shifts – such as developing clean, renewable energy sources – will require significant attitudinal change and long-term commitments of resources.

Making these kinds of changes in approach, resources and institutions will require enormous political will, a commitment to bipartisanship, and a great deal of creativity. If leaders can summon these forces, however, the United States will have the foundation it needs to pursue the three principles at the heart of integrated power.

### **Protect the American people.**

A coherent national security strategy must aim first and above all to protect the American people. Everything else – promoting democracy, creating new markets, intervening to protect others – is secondary to this task.

---

*We must clearly define our military and political objectives and a concrete exit strategy so that the Congress and the American people are aware of the potential costs before we risk lives and treasure.*

---

Protecting our people will at times require that we take unilateral military action. We will strike to stop imminent threats. Any country that has intelligence that it is about to be attacked has the right under the international legal doctrine of anticipatory self-defense to strike first or launch a preemptive attack.

If there is no evidence an attack is imminent, however, no country has the right to launch an attack or wage a preventive war on another sovereign country. Imagine if every country arrogated to itself the right to attack a state or group that had the capability to inflict harm in the future. Adopting such behavior establishes a new standard of international behavior that will increase the chance of conflict in global hot spots and haunt the United States in the long term.

When the United States uses military force – unilaterally or with our allies – we must employ all of the force that is necessary to achieve a military victory quickly and decisively. We must clearly define our military and political objectives and a concrete exit strategy so that the Congress and the American people are aware of the potential costs before we risk lives and treasure. Seeking and maintaining

strong domestic support for war, as our experience in Vietnam taught us, is critical to success on the battlefield and after.

The United States must also commit the necessary personnel, both military and civilian, to translate a battlefield victory into a stable peace. Although we may hope for the best in a conflict, we must always plan for the worst. Our extraordinary servicemen and servicewomen are still paying a heavy price for our failure to send in enough troops and proper equipment to ensure public safety after the invasion of Iraq. We have learned the bitter lesson that no war – even against a comparatively weak opponent – is a “cake walk.” Reconstruction will often require more planning and commitment than invasion. Once again, our experience in Iraq demonstrates the point: we can win the conventional military battles but still lose the long-term war.

From day to day and year to year, the battles we fight require us to integrate all of the national security instruments in our arsenal, including military, intelligence, strategic alliances, diplomacy, economic and financial tools, and public education campaigns.

Let us face reality. There will be no final victory nor surrender in the “war on terror” and the forces of fragmentation will never disappear. In the face of this future, tools such as trade sanctions, intelligence sharing, stronger alliances, international treaties and the sometimes silent power of our example all have important roles to play in leading the world to enjoy the benefits of peace, prosperity, and freedom.

### **Prevent conflicts.**

We have learned since 2002 that doctrine of preventive war does not work. One of the central tenets of a 21<sup>st</sup> century national security strategy for the United States must be a focus on preventing conflict, rather than allowing it to erupt and then being forced to choose from among very difficult options. This is one of the greatest lessons of the post-Cold War era, as the United States has encountered conflicts that no longer fit into the bipolar framework that more clearly defined criteria for intervention.

The best route to conflict prevention and intervention, however frustrating at times, is to pursue the support of international and regional organizations and work aggressively to convince other countries that they should act in concert with – or instead of – us. There are many examples of when coordinated action helped us achieve our goals. The 1990 U.N. resolution authorizing the use of force to expel Iraq from Kuwait; NATO’s approval in 1999 to use force to stop Serbia

## INTEGRATED POWER

from slaughtering ethnic Albanians in Kosovo; and the 2001 U.N. and NATO approvals to remove the Taliban from power in Afghanistan are all examples of such success.

Active negotiation should also be our policy when it comes to international treaties and institutions, regardless of whether we like them or not. It is in our interest to negotiate because these agreements can play a critical role in

---

*We engage because refusing to take a seat at the table is ultimately self-defeating. Detachment and passivity guarantee only that the next generation of international rules will fail to reflect the priorities and needs of the United States.*

---

preventing and defusing potential conflicts, and they can provide a legal basis for responding in concert with allies. We should also negotiate agreements and participate in international institutions because our failure to do so risks aggravating relations with allies that one day we may need to call upon for help. Our approach to climate change has been a painful reminder of that in recent years.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we engage because refusing to take a seat at the table is ultimately self-defeating. Detachment and

passivity guarantee only that the next generation of international rules will fail to reflect the priorities and needs of the United States.

Military intervention at times will be necessary to prevent conflicts from reigniting and, in some cases, to prevent ethnic cleansing and genocide. We support the doctrine of the “responsibility to protect,” under which countries, working in concert, can justify intervention in sovereign countries when there is evidence of crimes against humanity and regimes are failing to protect their own people. The framework for action in Darfur – financial support for the deployment of African Union troops to protect refugees in western Sudan – is promising, but ultimately has fallen short. The failure of the United States to aggressively lead and support this effort has enabled killing and ongoing violent abuse of refugees even after our government acknowledged that genocide was taking place. Our failure to act has undermined the power of our example.

Preventing conflict will at times require contact with unsavory regimes. We rule out negotiations with terrorists, but the need to talk with governments has only been made clearer in the years since 9/11. Negotiation does not mean capitulation where our interests are at stake. Masterful diplomacy is nothing other than getting what you want without having to resort to the use of force.

Our current approaches to North Korea and Iran point to the advantages of face-to-face contacts. It is by no means certain that engaging bilaterally with North Korea or joining early with the European countries in their talks with Iran would have slowed developments of those countries' nuclear programs. But we certainly could not have done worse. U.S. policy toward Cuba offers another discouraging story, where our policy of isolation along with the trade embargo have inflicted little harm on the Castro regime while severely limiting our ability to influence political events. Wishing away problems or choosing to shut out objectionable or extreme regimes is a failed approach to national security challenges.

**Lead vital alliances and modernize international institutions.**

In the complex, globalized world of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, assertive American leadership of alliances and international institutions will increase our power, influence and credibility.

Generations of Americans, including Republicans and Democrats alike, have embraced multilateral action not because they value multilateral goodwill *per se*. They have weighed the balance between the enhanced power created by alliances against the compromises they require. They have concluded – after making hard, realistic calculations about protecting our country's people and vital interests – that forming alliances and working with international institutions makes strategic sense.

---

*In the complex, globalized world of the 21st century, assertive American leadership of alliances and international institutions will increase our power, influence and credibility.*

---

To understand the value of alliances, it helps to look back to the critical choices U.S. leaders faced after World War II. In confronting the destruction of the international system and the emergence of the Soviet Union, the United States had to develop a series of overlapping alliances and institutions that would unite the countries of the world in a cohesive and stable system. These included the United Nations, organizations like NATO, the international financial institutions, and development initiatives like the Marshall Plan. Each of these visionary commitments required the United States to take a long-term approach.

Today marks a similar turning point. The years since 9/11 have only reinforced the need for powerful partnerships and compacts – to prevent weapons of mass destruction from falling into the wrong hands, to uncover terrorist plots, and to dry up the financial resources that enable terrorist groups to strike another



## INTEGRATED POWER

day. In an age when the gravest threats to the United States are the forces of fragmentation, we must rebuild and revitalize alliances and institutions. Any country that thinks it can solve these problems on its own is on a fool's errand.

By working to undermine the thin, but thickening, international framework of agreements and rules that exist between countries, the Bush administration has weakened the United States, divided our allies, and boosted the fortunes of those who flourish in chaos. It has demonstrated a striking lack of faith in the ability of our country to lead. Equally important, it has shown that it lacks confidence that fundamental American values will prevail when set against others.

Yes, treaties will be violated, rules will be broken, and efforts to impose collective order may not always lead to stability. There may at times be treaties that work against U.S. interests and those the United States should oppose. But it is a

---

*The United States must also lead a new drive to endow regional alliances with the authority and ability to solve problems in their own neighborhoods. Regional groups are in many cases more likely to produce positive results than action by the international community as a whole.*

---

victory for the United States against the forces of fragmentation every time an agreement or institution takes root that deepens freedom, democracy, and the rule of law. The United States must again begin to lead – to shape the treaties, global institutions, and organizations that unite countries around shared values and enhance collective security.

Modernizing the international and regional institutions and alliances that we helped establish after World War II is not only necessary but advantageous. A stronger, more effective United Nations will better help the United States isolate global terrorist networks, prevent conflicts, bolster weak and failing states, and keep the peace. A reformed Security Council, one that better reflects today's geopolitical reality, can

help prod countries to action and give much-needed legitimacy to our policies. Modernized financial institutions, as the World Bank has proved in recent years, have the potential to better fight global poverty and disease, equalize the benefits of globalization in the developing world, and open new markets. These institutions are not going to disappear. Embracing and leading change is our best option.

Established alliances are preferable to temporary "coalitions of the willing." Permanent alliances and international organizations help the United States better share the burden of maintaining and managing the global order. Fewer of our

armed forces will be drawn into conflict and the cost to American taxpayers will be reduced. In times of war and peace alike, alliances also strengthen the credibility of U.S. actions and increase a mission's chance of success. Comparing the human and economic costs of the Gulf War with the current war in Iraq is evidence enough. Or consider the costs of restoring political and economic stability to Iraq and Afghanistan by ourselves, let alone promoting democracy throughout the Middle East.

The United States must also lead a new drive to endow regional alliances with the authority and ability to solve problems in their own neighborhoods. Institutions like the African Union and Organization of American States – sanctioned and supported financially by other countries – are in many cases more likely to produce positive results than action by the international community as a whole. In areas ranging from the Indonesian archipelago to the Sahel, regional powers and military force have proved effective in solving conflicts and reconstructing countries because they have a far greater chance of acceptance by local citizens, and command greater cultural understanding and territorial knowledge.

Over time, supporting regional intervention will mean that the United States will end up dispatching far fewer troops to other countries. Reducing these kinds of deployments, in turn, will result in financial savings and a chance to redirect funds to other vital national security programs.

\* \* \*

These principles are not meant to provide step-by-step solutions for every challenge the United States meets, nor to limit our actions or ambitions. They are guideposts to help us meet our goals, to counter the threats our country faces, and to exploit the opportunities ahead. Used properly, they can help leaders deal with, rather than deny, the realities of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Clearly, the United States must move beyond actions that are disconnected from each other and disconnected from reality. Integrated power offers a new strategy to help bring order to our thinking and actions as we encounter unfamiliar and age-old challenges in a world grown both more interdependent and atomized.



## **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION**

## GLOBAL TERRORIST NETWORKS: ATTACKING ON ALL FRONTS

*Preventing future attacks requires us to marshal all of the instruments of our power, including intelligence, military, law enforcement, economic, and a long-term commitment to public diplomacy and foreign assistance.*

Of the many enemies the United States faces today, none is greater than the terrorist networks with a global reach and their financial supporters. Deterrence will not work against the extremist core for many reasons. They cannot be persuaded to abandon their holy war against the United States. They have embraced catastrophic attacks and the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction. They fear no strike against any specific territory. They appear infinitely patient. Negotiation is not an option.

To counter this asymmetric threat and prevent future attacks, we must focus first on rooting out terrorist networks with a global reach, eliminating or bringing to justice their leaders, cutting off their financial support, and countering their propaganda.<sup>4</sup> Whenever possible, we must cooperate with our allies because coordinated efforts will yield fresh leads and intelligence that will redound to the benefit of the American people. We must also calibrate our counterterrorism cooperation with non-democratic countries – such as Russia, China, Pakistan and Uzbekistan – to ensure that we do not reward their internal crackdowns against minorities or other anti-democratic actions. We must never write a blank check in the name of “fighting terror.”

Making headway against the global terrorist networks will require the United States to recalibrate its policies toward the Muslim world. The United States must re-engage in the Middle East peace process as an honest broker, working closely with its allies to help Israelis and Palestinians achieve a just and lasting settlement. In Iraq and Afghanistan, the United States must demonstrate that sustained support for political transitions will not lead to a long-term U.S. military presence in those countries. The situation in Iraq also requires us to produce a strategy for disengagement that reassures the Iraqi people that we will meet our commitments to them while also firmly establishing that we are not in the business of permanent occupation. Finally, the United States must no longer look the other way, as oil-rich monarchies and autocracies crush all forms of legitimate opposition.

---

<sup>4</sup> For more information, see Daniel Benjamin, *Strategic Counterterrorism: A Framework for Safeguarding America*, The Center for Strategic and International Studies (forthcoming 2005).

## INTEGRATED POWER

Accomplishing our goals requires us to marshal all of the instruments of our power, including intelligence, military, law enforcement, economic, and a long-term commitment to public diplomacy and foreign assistance.

***Intelligence.*** Having reliable and timely information about our enemies is essential to achieve our objectives of preventing attacks, tracking down terrorists, and dismantling terrorist networks. The failure to prevent the attacks of 9/11 and the false information surrounding weapons of mass destruction in Iraq accentuate the need to improve and integrate our intelligence capabilities. The United States must realign its domestic intelligence activities, improve and increase intelligence sharing with allies, and assist countries that offer concrete information in return for their cooperation. The president and Congress must work together to adopt and implement the full range of recommendations proposed by the 9/11 Commission; in particular, they must ensure that the new Director of National Intelligence (DNI) is empowered with the strong personnel and budgetary controls contemplated in the new Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004. The DNI should focus on reconstructing and expanding the clandestine service, improving data collection and analysis, and building an effective National Counterterrorism Center. In addition, the U.S. government should:

- Ensure that the CIA and the defense intelligence community institute new efforts to recruit, train and retain a professional intelligence corps. Advancement, education and exchange opportunities should be enhanced and modeled on current military programs.<sup>5</sup>
- Accelerate and institutionalize the FBI's ongoing efforts to strengthen counterterrorism and develop new intelligence capabilities.
- Expand liaison efforts with allied intelligence services in order to fill gaps in U.S. intelligence penetration. This will require increased sharing of intelligence, greater integration of systems, and constant exchange among senior officials.
- Significantly enlarge the Anti-Terrorism Assistance Program and provide more resources and training opportunities to developing countries whose goals are consistent with the United States and who have unique access to and knowledge of terrorist networks.

***Military.*** The United States must use every means at its disposal, including military force, to destroy terrorist groups with global reach, such as al Qaeda. We must also take offensive action against states that support or harbor the radical jihadists, as we did in Afghanistan. We must always be prepared for war and

---

<sup>5</sup> For more detailed recommendations, see Center for American Progress, *Better Spies, Better Intelligence: A Progressive Strategy for Creating a Professional Intelligence Corps*, Progressive Priorities Series, April 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8O VF&b=505523>.

ready to use conventional forms of military power against states that threaten us, our allies, or our interests. We will act with other countries when we can and alone only when we must.

In pursuing global terrorist networks, we will concentrate our energies and set careful priorities for our military. As we have learned from our invasion and occupation of Iraq, military misadventures driven by ideology waste precious lives and resources. They also strengthen our enemies, giving groups like al Qaeda vivid recruiting tools and emboldening extremist regimes like the Iranian theocracy. The United States cannot afford to take its eye off the ball again.

The changing nature of the threats we face – and the need to destroy terrorist sanctuaries, to conduct anti-insurgency campaigns and to safeguard nuclear materials – demand that we adapt, transform and modernize our armed forces.<sup>6</sup> In particular, the United States must give due attention and support to our volunteer army, which has been overstretched by the campaign in Iraq, and take action across a broad front, including the following major steps:

- Expand the active-duty Army by 86,000 troops, including two division-sized units devoted to peacekeeping and stabilization.
- Double the size of the active-duty Special Forces to 100,000, allowing them to expand counterterrorism efforts.
- Change current military service obligations in order to increase recruitment and retention and relieve the undue burden on the National Guard and Reserves.<sup>7</sup>
- Work more closely with NATO and other allied countries, through careful power-sharing arrangements that reduce the burden on our armed forces.

**Law enforcement.** Even though the FBI has refocused its efforts to prevent terrorist attacks, it still faces critical shortages in key areas that hamper its ability to adequately perform its new mission. Despite vastly increased funding, the FBI does not have adequate numbers of agents with counterterrorism experience or language or area specialists. It has been forced to cancel a desperately needed information technology upgrade that would have modernized its case file system and improved communication between field offices and headquarters. And it still struggles to build and maintain strong working relationships with state and local officials.

---

<sup>6</sup> A detailed strategy for military transformation is beyond the scope of this document. The Center plans on issuing its own version of the Quadrennial Defense Review in late 2005

<sup>7</sup> For more detailed recommendations regarding military manpower, see Center for American Progress, *For Soldier and Country: Saving the All-Volunteer Army*, Progressive Priorities Series, December 2004, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=269841>.

## INTEGRATED POWER

The one area where the FBI is not lacking is legal authority. Sweeping legal changes passed by Congress in the weeks after 9/11 have given the FBI greater powers to investigate criminal and terrorist activity. Although it was necessary to update aspects of the law to keep pace with modern technology, in some cases, the FBI was given unnecessary power with too little oversight from the judiciary or Congress.

Distance from 9/11 has afforded us the opportunity to examine what has worked and what has not. We must focus our attention on the people on the front lines in the fight against terrorism and ensure that they have the tools and skills they need to prevent terrorist attacks.

- Improve recruiting, hiring and training of law enforcement personnel with critical skills, such as language and area studies.
- Improve relations with, and recruit from, Muslim and Arab-American communities.
- Improve information sharing technology and build working relationships with state and local laws enforcement officials.
- Amend the Patriot Act to rescind all authorities that do not enhance American security from terrorists. Require the FBI to demonstrate clearly that any request for additional authorities will enhance our security from terrorists without unnecessarily limiting our civil liberties.

***Financial.*** Efforts since 9/11 to identify and dry up sources of financial support for al Qaeda and other global terrorist networks have been hampered by a shortage of resources, institutional support and presidential leadership. There has been virtually no follow-up to promising actions (*i.e.*, seizing and freezing assets) taken immediately after the attacks. The United States must develop a concrete plan and priorities that will allow us to crack down on banks, charities, front companies, intermediaries and unregulated networks that cloak the activities of terrorist networks. We must get to the roots of terrorist financing by establishing new structural mechanisms, forging cooperative ties with the private sector and committing to punish countries that do not cooperate in efforts to track down financiers, freeze assets and cut off resources that fuel terrorist groups. Specifically, the United States should:

- Work more closely with multilateral institutions including the Financial Action Task Force and the G-8 Counterterrorism Action Group to combat terrorist financing.
- Continue to strengthen alliances with private sector organizations,

banks and corporations to streamline investigations into suspected terrorist financing.

- Require annual reports to Congress on steps that foreign countries have taken to cooperate with our anti-terrorism efforts.
- Prescribe appropriate retaliatory actions against countries like Saudi Arabia when their citizens aid and abet terrorists and their governments do nothing in return.

***Public diplomacy.*** Over the long run, efforts by the United States to diminish the threat posed by terrorist networks with a global reach will falter without a broad campaign to internationalize the counterterrorism fight and counter distorted perceptions of U.S. policies and values.

To move beyond rank cynicism about our motivations in many countries around the world and diminish the pool of potential recruits for al Qaeda, the United States must integrate public diplomacy into all components of our national security. This campaign will require creative thinking, tremendous financial resources, enormous political will and the patience to await gradual change. The United States should:

- Provide substantial financial support to help countries develop new schools and textbooks offering alternatives to *madrassas* that promote extremist, anti-American teachings; focus particularly on developing schools that also educate girls.
- Reexamine visa policies that have significantly slowed the flow of scholars, students and entrepreneurs who want to come to the United States to study and work.
- Increase funding for people-to-people exchanges with Muslim-majority countries and promote studies of American history, religion and culture abroad.
- Form partnerships with private media companies to develop television programs and other media that transmit accurate information about American life and culture.

## NUCLEAR AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS: QUARANTINING THE GREATEST THREAT

*The United States must secure nuclear weapons and materials wherever they exist, revitalize international anti-proliferation regimes, cooperate with other countries to stop those with nuclear ambitions, and adjust the U.S. nuclear posture to reflect today's realities.*

The most serious threat this nation faces is a weapon of mass destruction, particularly a nuclear weapon, falling into the hands of a terrorist group or extreme regime with a global reach. Al Qaeda has publicly stated its desire to use a nuclear weapon to attack our citizens, and terrorist networks have little or no reason to constrain their actions. Since 9/11 we have also seen evidence that terrorist groups are actively seeking access to deadly biological agents and the materials needed to make radiological weapons. We must do everything in our power to minimize their chance of success, including using offensive military strikes when necessary.

We focus here on nuclear, biological and radiological weapons, considering each type of weapon separately. Our objective is to move beyond rote warnings about “weapons of mass destruction” and prescribe specific remedies to very different threats. In each case we must focus on the choke points that can stop the development of weapons and prepare in the event of attack.

The devastating potential of a single nuclear explosion and the relative ease of acquiring the knowledge or expertise to assemble a bomb demand that the United States take every possible step to prevent groups from gaining access to weapons-grade materials. Our country must also address biological weapons because the raw materials are relatively easy to acquire and deliver, although the odds of a devastating attack are less likely than nuclear. The United States must also treat seriously the risks posed by radiological bombs (so-called “dirty bombs”); while such an attack would claim relatively few lives, they are the most easily assembled and detonated of these weapons and can render extensive economic damage.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> *Integrated Power* does not address the threat of chemical weapons, given that they are almost always limited to battlefield use and pose a relatively small threat to civilians. Nor do we prescribe actions to cut off supplies of conventional arms, which account for nearly all the casualties in wars around the world today. The Center has separately addressed this challenge and will issue another report on small arms trafficking this year. For more information, see Lee Wolosky, *Severing the Web of Terrorist Financing*, Gayle Smith and Peter Ogden eds. *Terror in the Shadows: Trafficking in Money, Weapons, and People*, Center for American Progress, October 2004, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/atf/cf/%7BE9245FE4-9A2B-43C7-A5215D6FF2E06E03%7D/TerrorinShadows-Wolosky.pdf>



## INTEGRATED POWER

### Defeating Nuclear Threats

The threat from nuclear weapons is complicated by three factors. First, we face a nuclear hangover from the Cold War, with thousands of nuclear weapons and hundreds of tons of weapons-grade material scattered throughout Russia and other countries. Second, we have witnessed the pursuit of nuclear weapons capabilities by North Korea and Iran. Their activities threaten our interests and have brought the global nonproliferation regime to the brink of collapse. Third, the years since September 11 have seen a so-called “nuclear weapons revival” in the United States, and the Pentagon has undermined nonproliferation policies by trying to develop new nuclear weapons such as the “bunker buster” and rushing to deploy a National Missile Defense capability that has failed every realistic test.

The United States must secure nuclear weapons and materials wherever they exist, revitalize international anti-proliferation regimes, cooperate with other countries to stop those with nuclear ambitions, and adjust the U.S. nuclear posture to better protect the American people. Our strategy for updating and streamlining America’s nuclear arsenal integrates the need to deter strategic threats with our efforts to curb nuclear proliferation.

To prevent nuclear terrorism and proliferation, we target key steps in the process that any actor must take to acquire nuclear weapons. The United States must help lock down the materials, components and expertise to build bombs, and ensure the greatest possible security of nuclear weapons. Countries like Iran and North Korea must be denied the ability to make nuclear threats against the United States and its allies. The United States must also leverage its strength to reduce global reliance on nuclear weapons – especially in China and Russia – and inspire global commitment to strong rules against the spread of these deadliest of weapons.<sup>9</sup>

***Secure nuclear weapons, materials and know-how.*** Our first goal is to secure and neutralize, by the end of this decade, all nuclear weapons and materials that make up the “gunpowder” of a nuclear bomb. There has been great progress over the course of the past ten years, such as the removal of nuclear weapons from Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus, the deactivation of more than 6,000 Russian nuclear warheads, and Libya’s renunciation of its nuclear arsenal.

But our government has not given sufficient priority to this task since 9/11. Vulnerable nuclear materials will not be fully secured for another dozen years, unless efforts to secure them rapidly accelerate. Efforts have lagged to find long-

---

<sup>9</sup> For more information, see Center for American Progress, *Agenda for Security: Controlling the Nuclear Threat*, Progressive Priorities Series, March 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/p.p.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=401017>.



term, gainful employment for Russian nuclear scientists and technicians, while a new cadre of potential nuclear mercenaries is emerging from Libya and Iraq. We have yet to gain direct access to A.Q. Khan, who ran a global black market in nuclear know-how and technology – despite billions of dollars of aid given to Pakistan. Russian tactical nuclear weapons – ideal weapons for terrorists due to their small size and portability – remain outside the scope of joint U.S.-Russian efforts to secure Russian nuclear weapons from theft.

The United States must aggressively target would-be and existing proliferators, build on the best of existing programs, and leverage our global influence to draw more countries and resources into the effort. The United States should:

- Accelerate and expand global nuclear security programs, such as the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction effort, by settling conflicts over liability for accidents and sabotage with Russia; doubling annual funding; and aggressively expand the scale and scope of programs to secure dangerous weapons, materials or expertise to include all countries that have them.
- Develop and fully fund programs to create long-term, sustainable alternative employment for former nuclear scientists, engineers and technicians.
- Negotiate a verifiable accord with Russia that reduces and eventually dismantles the tactical nuclear weapons arsenals of both Russia and the United States.
- Condition fulfillment of U.S. aid commitments to Pakistan on full access to A.Q. Khan.
- Strengthen efforts to interdict illicit weapons shipments in transit by expanding the Proliferation Security Initiative, ratifying the Law of the Sea, and developing a Security Council mechanism for “fast track” approval to interdict vessels when the country that controls the ship refuses permission to board and inspect its cargo.

***Revive international efforts to curb proliferation.*** As we move to secure nuclear materials, we must also reinvigorate the international treaty regime that helps prevent the spread of nuclear and biological weapons. Chief among these agreements is the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), which entered into force in 1970. The NPT is essentially a bargain whereby countries with nuclear weapons agreed to gradually disarm and help other countries acquire peaceful nuclear technologies in return for the non-nuclear countries agreeing not to seek nuclear weapons capabilities.

## INTEGRATED POWER

The norm the NPT created against pursuing nuclear weapons has been instrumental in keeping the number of countries acquiring nuclear weapons below the quantity projected when the treaty was enacted. But the treaty has a major loophole that allows countries that acquire nuclear materials under the guise of a civilian program to withdraw from the treaty and quickly shift to developing nuclear weapons. About 40 countries possess peaceful nuclear programs that could be retooled to make weapons. This is the situation we are facing in Iran, which claims its fuel enrichment program is merely for peaceful purposes.

The United States must improve the international nonproliferation regime and work with allies to prevent noncompliant countries from going nuclear. In particular, the United States should:

- Vigorously advocate for a global five-year moratorium on the production of Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU), including the construction of new facilities to make it, with the goal of negotiating a global ban on HEU by 2012.
- Forge a consensus on how to close the NPT loophole that facilitates the ability of states to pursue weapons under the guise of a civilian program.
- Negotiate a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty that prevents the production of weapons-usable fissile materials for any purpose and includes an inspections regime.
- Submit the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to the Senate, and work with senators to ensure that it is ratified.
- Strengthen the inspections authority of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and contribute to a 50 percent increase in its safeguards and security budget.
- Implement a global prohibition on the export of sensitive nuclear equipment to countries that are not in full compliance with international inspection regimes.
- Develop a strategy and specific timetable among participating countries for achieving the goals of the G-8 Global Partnership to Prevent the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction.

***Rationalize the U.S. nuclear arsenal.*** If the United States is to succeed in curbing nuclear threats it must reevaluate and change its nuclear posture. Current U.S. development of new nuclear weapons and capabilities weakens national defense, wastes taxpayer dollars, and damages our credibility. In the face of this nuclear weapons revival, the United States should not be surprised that the rest of the world is resisting U.S. demands for them to not develop nuclear weapons capability.

To end the nuclear weapons revival, and rationalize our nuclear arsenal, the United States must demonstrate with concrete actions that it is committed to nonproliferation. This requires that we:

- Develop a new Nuclear Posture that deters strategic threats, avoids triggering arms races or rash behavior, and compliments our efforts to prevent proliferation.<sup>10</sup>
- Accelerate by five years the reduction of nuclear weapons agreed to in the Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty.
- Reach agreement with Russia on a timetable for reducing the number of nuclear weapons on high-alert, hair-trigger status.
- Stop research on new nuclear weapons including the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, also known as the “bunker buster.”
- Halt further deployment of the National Missile Defense system while continuing research.

***Take action on North Korea and Iran.*** Reversing the nuclear ambitions of North Korea and Iran requires a separate strategy for each country. But in both cases, we should balance rewards for relinquishing nuclear weapons with penalties for pursuing them; work towards a unified strategy with allies and regional powers; and make clear that we will take any and all necessary steps to stop either country from using or exporting these weapons.

The best current estimate is that North Korea has at least two nuclear bombs and access to enough fissile material to make at least a half dozen more. It withdrew from the NPT in 2003. This year, Pyongyang has publicly declared itself a nuclear power, boasted of harvesting enough plutonium for several additional nuclear weapons, tested short-range missiles, and showed signs that it may be preparing to test a nuclear weapon.

Now we must substitute a clear plan for the indecisiveness that has marked U.S. policy towards North Korea since President Bush came to office. In close consultation with the regional powers and our Asian allies, the United States must immediately engage in a process that leads to direct, bilateral discussions with North Korea, led by senior leadership from both countries. It should work with South Korea, Japan, China and Russia to develop a package of economic, trade and diplomatic incentives, including a non-aggression pact and, eventually,

---

<sup>10</sup> For more information, see Lawrence J. Korb & Peter Ogden, *The Road to Nuclear Security*, Center for American Progress, December 2004, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJR J8OVF&b=271664>; see also Center for American Progress, *Nuclear Posture Strategy*, (forthcoming 2005).

## INTEGRATED POWER

reestablishment of diplomatic relations – in return for a verifiable renunciation of all nuclear weapons programs and the means for delivering them.

Iran spent 18 years working secretly on nuclear technologies, obstructed subsequent IAEA investigations into its nuclear activities, and is now on the verge of achieving the capability to manufacture fuel for a nuclear bomb. It is also working to enable its missiles – currently able to reach Israel and central Turkey – to carry them. These developments belie Iran's claim that it is pursuing nuclear technology for peaceful purposes alone.

The Bush administration, meanwhile, dismissed three separate invitations in the past four years to open back-channel communications aimed at resolving the range of issues between the two countries. Instead, it hardened Iran's resolve for nuclear weapons by provocatively labeling Iran a member of the "Axis of Evil" and then invading Iraq, one of the two other spokes (along with North Korea). The administration's refusal to seriously consider concrete incentives, coupled with its lack of credible punitive measures to coerce Iran into abandoning its sensitive programs, has left the United States with neither carrot nor stick, forcing it to cede leadership and responsibility on the issue to European governments.

The United States must support our British, French and German allies in their attempts to compel Tehran to abandon its sensitive nuclear activities. But rather than sit passively on the sidelines, we must become an active player, ready to offer compelling positive incentives for significant progress and credible punishments for backsliding. Resolving the nuclear issue is the immediate and most pressing priority, though we also support the possibility of a grand bargain that resolves a broader range of issues, such as ending Iran's support for terrorism and unfreezing Iranian assets.

If talks fail, however, Iran must know that the United States and its European allies will refer Iran to the U.N. Security Council for possible enforcement action and explore other multilateral avenues for isolating the regime. We would also open discussions with Iran's neighbors with the goal of averting a regional arms race and preventing a near-nuclear Iran from threatening the United States or its neighbors. The leaders in Tehran and throughout the world must also understand that any attempt to use or transfer nuclear weapons or their key components would result in decisive military action.

## **Preventing Biological Weapons Attack**

The threat of attack by biological weapons has emerged from the collision between terrorism and technology, as the same biotechnological advances that have improved our health care and fueled our economy can also be used to engineer and spread new deadly diseases. Despite the demonstrated threat that germ terrorism poses, the United States has not taken the necessary steps to protect the American people – even after the anthrax attacks in the fall of 2001. Our response to the threat of bio-weapons so far has focused primarily on domestic preparedness, but even here we have made only modest advances.

The United States needs to jump-start a global effort to lock down and destroy remnants of bio-warfare programs; build safeguards around legitimate research activities to deny terrorists access to deadly pathogens; encourage stronger global partnerships to rapidly contain outbreaks; and strengthen domestic preparedness in the event of a biological attack. In particular, the United States must:

- Support the conclusion and eventual ratification of the Biological Weapons Convention Protocol and fully support development of a global inspections regime, as we have done with chemical weapons.
- Develop uniform global standards for laboratory security under the auspices of the Biological Weapons Convention.
- Secure and destroy pathogens developed for use in bio-warfare, particularly those stored in the former Soviet Union.
- Strengthen the capacity of the World Health Organization to identify and contain outbreaks caused by weaponized pathogens.
- Create an advisory board on bio-defense to provide oversight, to maintain all information on experimentation and testing in the United States, and to offer guidance on self-governing for each science institution.
- Invest in increasing capacity for rapidly identifying, containing, and treating outbreaks in the United States.

## **Countering the Threat of Radiological Weapons**

So-called “dirty bombs” – made by lacing conventional explosives with radioactive materials, which are then dispersed when the bomb detonates – pose a different kind of danger.<sup>11</sup> The components of a dirty bomb are relatively easy

---

<sup>11</sup> For more information, see Center for American Progress, *Defusing the Dirty Bomb Threat* (forthcoming 2005).

to procure and assembling the bomb and detonating it require little technological expertise. Little wonder that many experts believe that the next attack on U.S. soil could well be one using a radiological bomb.

Experts believe that a radiological weapons attack would not result immediately in high casualty rates, but under certain conditions a single dirty bomb could render swaths of urban territory uninhabitable for years, and have devastating effects on our economy. Those exposed to radiation may have an elevated risk of cancer.

The United States must prevent global terrorist networks and others from succeeding in their efforts to acquire radioactive materials as well as develop an integrated strategy for responding to radiological attacks. To counter this threat, the United States should:

- Strengthen domestic and global efforts to control the transfer and security of radiological materials by upgrading disposal mechanisms and tracking down and securing radiological sources that have been abandoned or improperly disposed of by their owners.
- Institute an international regime to identify and interdict illegal shipments of radioactive materials, with a focus on sharing information and improving port and container security in high-risk locales.
- Set national standards for emergency response and clean-up following a radiological attack, including integrating federal, state and local procedures and broad public education.

## **HOMELAND SECURITY: BUILDING AN EFFECTIVE DEFENSIVE SHIELD**

*Urgent action is required to prevent future attacks,  
reduce existing threats, and manage the consequences  
of a successful attack.*

**F**ighting terrorist networks abroad is a vital part of protecting the American people but it is far from a comprehensive strategy. The United States must also work relentlessly to ensure that we do not suffer any more devastating attacks on our territory. Homeland security is one of the most complex tasks we face, but complexity is no excuse for inaction. Terrorist groups like al Qaeda have the luxury of targeting Americans at the time and place of their choosing.

To be sure, the United States has made some progress in safeguarding the homeland since the attacks of September 11 2001. Over White House objections, Congress created the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to consolidate in a single agency border protection, immigration, transportation safety, emergency management and more. In 2002, the Department issued the first National Strategy for Homeland Security and more recently identified the kinds of attacks most likely to cause catastrophic casualties and damage. Washington has also increased funding for federal agencies, state governments and local communities. And some companies have increased security.

But almost four years after 9/11, homeland security is not the priority it should be. The administration's efforts to protect the homeland have been slow at best and reckless at worst, leaving the American people far less secure than we should be today. Policies and funding priorities only vaguely reflect the professed strategy or the numerous other blueprints that have followed. Despite the greater likelihood that a nuclear weapon will enter our country in a shipping container and not on a long-range missile, the United States today spends six times more per year on ballistic missile defense than port security, and the missile defense budget is larger than that of the Coast Guard. DHS has made only limping progress in the admittedly difficult task of integrating 22 agencies and 170,000 employees. Homeland security remains bureaucratically separated from national security inside and outside the White House. Federal and state databases have not been rationalized and our borders remain insecure.

Perhaps most egregiously, the government has failed to take the necessary steps to protect citizens from catastrophic risks posed by terrorist attacks on our critical



## INTEGRATED POWER

infrastructure, 85 percent of which is owned by the private sector. Every day thousands of chemical plants manufacture and use deadly chemicals such as chlorine that, if released into the atmosphere, can cause massive casualties. Yet the White House has effectively turned over responsibility for protecting the public to private companies that too often have chosen not to abide by voluntary safety standards. The government has defended industry's right to ship toxic substances through major urban areas, been lax in safeguarding civilian and military nuclear facilities, and removed potentially life-saving public information from the Internet. It has underfunded and given scant attention to the protection of railways, the electrical power grid, the country's computer systems, and emergency personnel. Nor has it adequately prepared communities for a potential catastrophe.

Urgent action is required to prevent future attacks, reduce existing threats, and manage the consequences of a successful attack. Given current federal budget deficits and constant constraints on resources, we must apply our energies and resources to those targets where an attack would cause the greatest loss of life and economic damage. We must also escape the "protect against the last attack" mentality that followed 9/11 as evidenced by disproportionate spending to protect airline passengers while shortchanging other important areas.

Our homeland security strategy has three primary components: detecting and disrupting potential terrorist attacks while protecting civil liberties; guarding critical infrastructure; and improving emergency planning, response and recovery.<sup>12</sup> In each of these areas, the United States must provide funding according to the magnitude of the vulnerability; increase transparency; and – where applicable – invest in research and development. The combination of trained personnel and our country's natural advantages in technology and science will prove critical to our success.

***Preventing attacks.*** As the 9/11 Commission and others have argued, the United States must move immediately to improve our domestic intelligence agencies, upgrade detection and warning systems, and improve border security. Achieving these goals will require extraordinary efforts to change institutional cultures and will mean long-term commitments of resources.

As part of this, we must also reverse the policies adopted in the wake of 9/11 that violate core American values, threaten our economic growth and pose false choices. We can both disrupt terrorist networks and protect civil liberties. We can keep our doors open to non-citizens who make a real and lasting contribution to

---

<sup>12</sup> For more detailed recommendations, see Center for American Progress, *Securing America, Protecting Our Freedoms after September 11*, Progressive Priorities Series, March 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=474133>.

our society and still bring to justice terrorists who have taken up residence in the United States. The United States must take the following actions:

- Increase dramatically the FBI's counterterrorism capabilities and upgrade its analytic staff and information technology.
- Improve intelligence sharing within the federal government and establish Homeland Security Operations Centers in critical locations to improve the flow of threat information between federal and state and local authorities.
- Update airline passenger screening to include use of consolidated terrorist watch lists and improve the speed with which international and domestic airlines share passenger manifests with appropriate authorities.
- Introduce biometric technology within three years at all land, port and air terminals while implementing strong and appropriate privacy safeguards.
- Implement immediately the top priority recommendations of the National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace, including special efforts to guard the banking and financial sectors.
- Amend the Patriot Act to rescind all authorities that do not enhance American security from terrorists. Require the FBI to demonstrate clearly that any request for additional authorities will enhance our security from terrorists without unnecessarily limiting our civil liberties.

***Securing critical infrastructure.*** The years since 9/11 have taught us that purely voluntary approaches are insufficient to safeguard communities from attacks on chemical plants and other potential terrorist targets. Tax incentives, low interest loans and homeland security grants to relieve some financial burden on industry can encourage the upgrading and implementation of stronger security standards. But where voluntary codes and incentives fail, the United States should create new regulations and legal safeguards. These should be based on a national infrastructure protection plan with priorities guided by a comprehensive inventory and assessment of public and private critical infrastructure. At every step, the United States should increase transparency and provide communities with as much information as possible about hazards and emergency procedures while protecting data that is classified or could be used to assist an attack. The United States should:

## INTEGRATED POWER

- Implement a 12-month action plan to reduce risks posed by chemical facilities by creating a priority list of vulnerable sites; issue new federal guidelines to reduce hazards, introduce safer chemicals; and institute hazard-reduction and target-hardening measures.<sup>13</sup>
- Improve port security by increasing Coast Guard funding; accelerate implementation of the Maritime Transportation Security Act; and promote global standards, research, and installation of state-of-the-art container safety and scanning technology.<sup>14</sup>
- Improve air security by instituting 100 percent air cargo screening funded by a surcharge on shippers; upgrade explosive detectors at airports; increase perimeter security at airports; and fund continued research to deter the threat to commercial aircraft from shoulder-fired missiles.
- Redirect hazardous rail shipments away from urban centers, including prime targets such as Washington, D.C.; provide resources to help localities better protect rail tracks and train stations; and implement comprehensive security standards for the transport of hazardous materials.<sup>15</sup>
- Set and enforce more stringent security standards at nuclear power reactors and other facilities where nuclear and radiological materials are used or stored, and transfer responsibility for safety at all nuclear facilities to the National Nuclear Security Administration.
- Design and coordinate new regional plans to provide protection and backup for the country's electrical power grid.

***Improving emergency preparedness and response.*** The United States must invest in emergency response personnel, equipment and technology that will minimize damage and speed recovery in the case of a successful attack. Much of the ultimate cost of a terrorist attack depends upon the speed and effectiveness with which the government responds. Our goal must be to prevent significant casualties, destruction of property, economic disruption, a loss of public confidence in government policies and institutions. On the positive side,

---

<sup>13</sup> For more detailed recommendations, see Linda Greer, *New Strategies to Protect America: Securing our Nation's Chemical Facilities*, Critical Infrastructure Security Series, Center for American Progress, April 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=495729>.

<sup>14</sup> For more detailed recommendations, see Joseph Bouchard, *New Strategies to Protect America, Safer Ports for a More Secure Economy*, Critical Infrastructure Security Series, Center for American Progress, June 2005

<sup>15</sup> For more detailed recommendations, see Fred Millar, *New Strategies to Protect America: Putting Rail Security on the Right Track*, Critical Infrastructure Security Series, Center for American Progress, April 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=569619>.

investments in this sector will also improve our country's everyday health, law enforcement and emergency services capabilities.

The nature of today's weapons and a terrorist group's asymmetric advantages, and public psychology mean that every incident will require a tailored plan and response. Our most effective federal plan is to focus on the basics. That means integration at all levels: unifying so-called "crisis management" and "consequence management" plans; rationalizing responses from the public and private sectors; linking federal, state and local government personnel; and standardizing preparation and response measures.

Completing these tasks requires, first and foremost, a new reporting and information-sharing system in which decision makers and emergency personnel speak the same language and understand how individual tasks fit into an overall plan. It will also require a new federal commitment to helping states and localities receive homeland security grants and get reimbursement for unexpected security costs. Only then will we build the cooperation and confidence necessary to assess, respond, recover and adapt our strategy to prevent future attacks. The United States must:

- Improve tactical counterterrorism, with a focus on response to an attack in an urban area using a nuclear weapon, biological agent, or radiological bomb.
- Create specialized National Guard units devoted to incident response that are not deployed overseas except in times of extreme national emergency.
- Invest in public and private efforts to improve chemical, biological and radiological sensors; develop and prepare to use decontamination processes; and upgrade medical surveillance capabilities.
- Increase pharmaceutical and vaccine stockpiles and invest in development and distribution systems for a broad spectrum of vaccines, preventive medications and antidotes.
- Replace the current color-coded public alert scheme with a system that issues warnings to the general public only when specific actions need to be taken.
- Work with the insurance industry to create a permanent risk arrangement system, such as a government-sponsored reinsurance corporation capitalized by the private sector and backed by the government.

## PREVENTING CONFLICT, SUSTAINING PEACE, AND PROMOTING SHARED PROSPERITY

*The United States must confront the moral, political, economic  
and security challenges posed by the poverty and oppression  
that dominate the lives of billions of the world's people.*

Neither the war against the radical core of global terrorists nor the war of ideas can be won by a small coalition of countries led and dominated by the United States. The global terrorist network poses a transnational threat that does not confine itself to a single state or operate exclusively within national boundaries. Curtailing terrorists' finances, preventing their movements across borders, and shutting down their recruitment operations all require that the United States enlist the support, engagement, and capacities of a maximum number of the world's countries. At the same time, defeating an ideology of hatred requires more than simple assertions of our moral superiority. The United States must show that people around the world are united in their support of freedom, democracy, open societies and economic cooperation.

To unite as many countries as possible, the United States must confront the moral, political, economic and security challenges posed by the poverty and oppression that dominate the lives of billions of the world's people. We cannot stand by and declare ourselves satisfied with a world in which 115 million children will never enter a school, or genocide is perpetrated in the far corners of Africa without opposition from the world's democracies. The fact that one billion people live on less than one dollar a day inhibits our ability to help forge a thriving global economy. Unchecked poverty and unchallenged oppression undermine the credibility of our commitment to a world of opportunity for all.

The majority of the world's poor and disenfranchised people live in countries where governments are unable to provide basic services or ensure the security of their citizens, in countries wracked by conflict, or in countries undergoing fragile and often unstable political transitions. Most of them have little hope and few options for the future. At worst, they are vulnerable to the appeal of violence as a means of change and extremism as a guiding ideology. At best, they live outside the boundaries of the globalization that defines the future for the world's developed nations.

Tackling poverty and oppression requires that we bolster relations with our traditional allies; expand our cooperation to include new democratic allies; and

## INTEGRATED POWER

unite to consolidate nascent democracies and to transform weak and failing states into capable members of the international community.<sup>16</sup> This means that the United States can no longer afford to single out those countries with which it will engage while ignoring others. It also means that our country must utilize foreign aid, debt relief and trade incentives as strategic investments in a more stable and equitable world, and not view them simply as charitable acts or manifestations of our benevolence.

Just as September 11 revealed the immediate danger posed by al Qaeda and terrorist networks with a global reach, so too did it shine a spotlight on the dangers posed by weak and failing states. Nations that teeter on the edge of chaos and failure have long posed threats to their neighbors. But today it is no exaggeration to say that the weakest states pose as great an immediate danger to the American people and international stability as do potential conflicts among the great powers.

Our strategy must be to manage these burgeoning crises – by acting to prevent where possible, and moving swiftly to respond when necessary. Our goal is a world in which a maximum number of states are capable (*i.e.*, able to maintain secure borders, protect their citizens, and provide basic services), democratic, and committed to the free exchange of goods and ideas. In pursuit of this goal, the United States must invest in crisis prevention and respond to a broad range of challenges, including chronic poverty, weak states, situations of active crisis or conflict, post-crisis transitions, and the demands of reconstruction or rehabilitation. And even when states are considered to be “out of the woods,” or “good performers,” the United States must continue to work to ensure that those gains are not lost.

U.S. efforts must be guided by two key principles. First, we must be prepared to take risks. Not all investments in conflict prevention will yield positive results, and countries able to achieve peace can easily revert to war. At the same time, as events in Afghanistan and Iraq have made clear, the transition from a weak state or autocracy to a new, democratic and free-market order is costly, frequently violent, and often slower than desired.

Second, the United States must remain focused on building capacity – the capacity of governments to govern; the capacity of citizens to participate in the decision-making that affects them; the capacity of regional institutions to foster trade and promote security; and the capacity of the international system to

---

<sup>16</sup> For more details on global equity and the reform of U.S. foreign assistance, see Center for American Progress, *Global Equity: An Action Plan for Global Economic Opportunity*, Progressive Priorities Series, March 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=492989>.



increase economic growth, protect regional stability, and strengthen the position of capable, democratic states.

***Reforming our national institutions.*** The proliferation of foreign aid instruments, initiatives and accounts over the past decade means that the policy tools with which the United States can influence state transformation are spread across multiple development, trade and functional agencies. Our ability to respond with agility, creativity and efficiency is hampered by the fact that there are separate pots of money within individual agencies, each with its own set of requirements, regulations and standards, and each governed by a different congressional committee. No single individual or institution within the U.S. government is mandated to oversee and implement our strategy for responding to crises, managing complex political transitions, or promoting economic development. The primary piece of legislation guiding U.S. policies and practices in this area – the Foreign Assistance Act – was written in 1961 in a different international environment.

The U.S. government must therefore pursue three major reforms:

- Pass a new Foreign Assistance Act that is tailored to reflect the realities of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, provides the U.S. government with the flexibility required to act in response to a broad array of circumstances, and combines the need for executive branch leadership with the imperative of congressional oversight.
- Create a new Department for International Development mandated to oversee all foreign aid budgets, instruments and initiatives, capable of providing diverse expertise, and charged with ensuring the effective coordination of aid and crisis prevention policies with the Departments of State, Defense, Treasury, and other relevant U.S. government agencies.
- Designate the Secretary of the Department for International Development as a member of the cabinet with full authority for overseeing U.S. policies aimed at crisis prevention and response, post-crisis transitions, and long term development.

***Leading the effort to modernize international institutions.*** The United States must enhance the impact of its own efforts by working with established alliances and international institutions whenever possible. Many of these institutions are flawed, and most are outdated. Rather than bemoaning these limitations, the United States must take the lead in shaping and promoting necessary reforms.



## INTEGRATED POWER

As in most cases, the benefits we accrue from cooperation far outweigh the costs. To adapt and update the international institutions upon which the United States relies it must:

- Help reform the United Nations. The United States can lead and shape the debate on current reform proposals and, in particular: enlist international support for the “responsibility to protect” and lead in the crafting of the standards and provisions that must be met for its implementation; back the expansion of the Security Council to include new allies from the developing world; and develop systems for ensuring that sanctions imposed by the Council are monitored and enforced.
- Lead an aggressive effort to achieve final agreement in the Doha Development Round of international trade negotiations. The United States is well-positioned to craft a proposal for the gradual reduction of agricultural subsidies that would be accepted by the developing world and thus provide a breakthrough at the gridlocked World Trade Organization. By coupling a U.S. pledge to shift subsidies from traditional agricultural crops to biofuels with increased market access for the world’s least developed countries, the United States could establish itself as the world’s leader in the promotion of a free trade regime that benefits producers in both the developed and the developing worlds.
- Reinvigorate the G-8 and begin to use the G-20 of developing countries as a vehicle for crafting specific, tangible agreements between the world’s most developed countries and the developing world, including the key areas of debt relief, the HIV/AIDS pandemic and international peacekeeping.

***Maximizing our ability to prevent crises.*** The effectiveness of U.S. policies depends in large measure on our ability to respond to complex, diverse and competing challenges with agility, creativity and multiple tools. Over time, we must shift the balance from responding to crises after the fact to minimizing risk factors for the emergence of crisis. Specifically, we must take steps to:

- Increase foreign assistance investments to meet the Millennium Development Goal of 0.7 percent of gross national product (GNP) by 2015. By increasing foreign assistance from current levels of 0.16 percent GNP to 0.7 percent, we will be able to invest in strengthening nascent democracies, shoring up weak states, and integrating the

vital markets that can serve billions who are dependent, destitute and disenfranchised.

- Develop and sustain an early warning system that is available to all relevant government agencies, and is linked to an interagency response capability.
- Create civilian and military “surge capacities” for interventions in weak and failing states.
- Realign foreign assistance funding to ensure that while we continue to invest in “good performers,” we also retain sufficient funding to respond to contingencies and invest in crisis prevention in moderate or even poorly performing states.

**FREEDOM AND STABILITY:  
ADVANCING DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS AND VALUES**

*The United States has the responsibility to shine a light where liberty is strangled, autocrats abuse their people, and basic human rights are cast aside.*

Where the Bush administration sees its role as an explosive detonator for democracy, we choose to be an aggressive catalyst. We support the expansion of freedom, the advance of democracy, and the promotion of free markets around the globe. The United States – as the dominant power that has served as a beacon of freedom – has the responsibility to shine a light where liberty is strangled, autocrats abuse their people, and basic human rights are cast aside. Supporting these goals is a matter of both principle and pragmatism.

Promoting democracy and freedom is borne of our history, cuts across generational lines, unites our diverse citizenry, and commands strong bipartisan support. True, a small group of isolationists within our country oppose spending our political capital or resources to support democracy abroad and counsel us to look inward and no further. But since the turn of the century, the overwhelming majority of American people have understood the obligation of the United States to lead by example and have willingly sacrificed lives and treasure to protect democracy and freedom.

We support the expansion of fundamental liberties – the right to free speech, free press, freedom of religion and freedom to choose one’s leaders – for many reasons. First, people in today’s industrialized democracies have no monopoly on the desire for basic human rights and liberties. Those who claim that certain religions, historical archetypes, or ethnic divisions are incompatible with democracy and liberty are wrong.

Second, open political participation and free markets are more likely than despotism and command economies to promote long-term prosperity and stability – and prosperous and stable countries are better allies for the United States in the long-run. Third, because repressive regimes breed terrorism by closing off avenues for peaceful and legitimate dissent, adding more nations to the democratic ranks is likely to help us reduce the number of terrorists who threaten our way of life. Finally, enlarging the community of democracies will help build an international environment more conducive to achieving our national security goals.

To promote democracy every action must be grounded in the understanding that democracy is best homegrown, and that the United States should not look to

## INTEGRATED POWER

introduce our own model of democracy. Here tactics become strategy. Where the Bush administration has chosen to impose democracy, at a price tag of \$200 billion and climbing in Iraq alone, the better path is to catalyze change and support those who seek freedom their own way. While the Bush administration believes that democracy can be exported wholesale, the better path is to support and sustain those working to increase greater political rights and civil liberties in their own way. Where the Bush administration believes the model for developing democracy lies in Iraq, we prefer the imperfect but inspiring examples of South Africa, Indonesia, Georgia, and Ukraine – even as we remain hopeful that Iraq will develop into a democracy.

Our choices here are grounded in four cold facts. First, democratization is reversible. Some said at the end of the Cold War that history had ended and that the model of Western democracy had won. The past decade demonstrates that this is a half-truth. Democracy has shallow, fragile roots in many nations, not only those that sprouted in the past decade but also among nations in the “third wave” of democratization that began in 1974 in Europe. Particularly in the Middle East and Central Asia, we are witnessing the rise of what have been called “liberalizing autocracies” or “illiberal democracies” – regimes that superficially support civil society groups, hold toothless elections, allow feckless political parties to exist, or grant shallow rights to women to appease the West while tightening their monopoly on power.

Democratic transitions are more lasting when change comes from within, led by broad coalitions of local groups pushing for democracy. Even in places where the process to develop democracy works and institutions are growing roots, leaders are struggling to maintain the progress because democracy is not delivering results. The gains and declines in Russia’s democratic transformation over the last decade shows that democratization is a long-term process requiring the global community’s sustained and organized involvement and support.<sup>17</sup>

Second, the United States need not choose between promoting democracy and protecting our people. Fighting the global terrorist networks and promoting democracy are *not* fundamentally incompatible goals. At specific times, such as in the aftermath of the attacks of 9/11, they may run headlong into each other, and our first priority must be to protect our people. The necessity to make momentary tactical decisions must not cause our country to abandon fundamental values and long-term goals.

---

<sup>17</sup> For more on democracy and U.S.-Russian relations, see Michael McFaul, *Russia’s Transition to Democracy and U.S.-Russia Relations: Unfinished Business*, report for the Center for American Progress, January 2004, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=19081>.

Third, the United States cannot effectively promote democracy by acting alone. Democracy promotion efforts by the United States should be integrated with efforts by other democratic allies in Europe and around the globe in order to have lasting impact. The United States should seek to elevate the importance of good governance, democracy, and human rights in key multilateral institutions, including the World Trade Organization, the World Bank, and the United Nations. Working with these organizations allows us to minimize our investment and maximize benefits to fledgling democracies.

Fourth, the United States must serve as a model – both at home and abroad. None of our democracy promotion efforts will succeed unless we lead by example. Riding roughshod over allies, debasing international institutions, and putting ideological interests before the democratic process also destroy our country's credibility as a beacon for democracy and human rights. The United States needs to take concrete steps to repair the damage from the abuse of detainees at Guantanamo, Abu Ghraib and Bagram. Unless our actions match our rhetoric, our credibility and capacity to drive change will falter.

The tactics we support to promote democratic institutions will naturally vary from region to region and country to country but common principles bind them. The United States must:

***Go beyond elections toward enduring support for institutions.*** Democracy is not just one, two or even three elections. Embracing democratic revolutions in their first bloom – as the Bush administration has done in Ukraine and Georgia, for example – or supporting elections without investing in democratic infrastructure is not enough. Our strategy must be to gradually and steadily support local groups that promote the critical elements of what has been called “liberal constitutionalism” – the rule of law, an independent judiciary, a free media, good governance, and government accountability. As we are learning in Afghanistan, the United States must commit the necessary human, political and financial resources in order to promote long-lasting democratic institutions and human rights. Today questions are emerging about the capacity of nations and civil society groups to absorb more aid and spend it well. While these are valid concerns, our goal should be to build local capacity to undertake the democracy-building effort.

***Ensure stability through the rule of law.*** In some countries, the process of democratization can exacerbate conflict and tensions within societies because it changes the prevailing power structure and threatens the power of established elites. In supporting democracy abroad, we should remain vigilant to the dangers

## INTEGRATED POWER

of instability and violent conflict resulting from political transitions. In conflict situations such as Iraq, we should take steps to ensure that the absence or collapse of law and order does not undermine the political transition. In post-conflict situations, we should place greater emphasis on the need to help countries develop law enforcement and judicial bodies with the capacity to provide law and order.

***Reach out to democratic political forces from across the ideological spectrum.***

Some of our country's greatest international failures have come from tying our future exclusively to one element in a society or one political party. No matter whom we support in an election or in a government, the United States must recognize the obvious – democracy means constant changes in leadership – and open informal channels with parties across the political spectrum. This may mean, at times, making contact with parties that do not support current U.S. policy or even spout anti-American rhetoric. Although this is distasteful to many, these parties command the largest constituencies in some critical nations, and ignoring or dismissing them will only ensure weakness in future dealings.

***Maintain credibility and keep options open.*** Promotion of democracy at times will require us to operate silently, recognizing the potential danger of stamping the “made in the U.S.A.” label on our preferred candidate or political party process, especially in the midst of roaring anti-American sentiments in many Muslim-majority countries. In many cases, publicly indicating our preference will weaken a new government's claim to legitimacy. We must also protect the credibility of elections, decreasing our involvement where necessary and giving increased political and financial support to groups such as the United Nations election organizers, depending on who can be the most effective actor (*i.e.*, possessing greater experience in a particular political environment or commanding greater trust in the developing world).

***Monitor and press for increased human rights.*** To put pressure on human rights abusers, we will continue to support the process of highlighting the state of human rights in nations around the world – and using measurements of progress to determine suitability for assistance. The United States must vigorously support the U.N. Secretary General's proposal to establish a standing Human Rights Council to replace the Commission on Human Rights, which has lost its credibility in the world community. We are hopeful that a new Council can help strengthen, update and enforce the international conventions on human rights.

***Work to end tyranny.*** There will always be recalcitrant rulers who cling to power, brook no dissent and subjugate their people. In the face of this, nations must join forces to apply international pressure – including both incentives and sanctions – that encourage the development of strong political opposition, weakens

dictators and helps force them into relinquishing power. In Zimbabwe, Burma, and elsewhere, we are learning the limits of diplomatic pressure, patchy boycotts and other shunning techniques. Working with others remains the only possible path; actions by one country or a small group are essentially futile. The United States should form partnerships with our European allies – many of whom have been investing heavily in democracy promotion – and countries such as Brazil, South Africa, and India that have growing regional and international credibility on democracy and human rights.



## ENERGY INDEPENDENCE: USING DIVERSE AND CLEAN FUELS

*Our dependence on OPEC forces us to compromise our values  
and hold hands with undemocratic leaders.*

Our national security, our economic security, our health, and the future of the global environment are fundamentally linked to the choices we make about energy. The imperative has never been greater to reshape the future of our energy supply and energy use in a way that enhances our security, provides our economy with a new engine for growth, and protects us against the dangerous consequences of climate destabilization. Transforming our energy future is in our reach; all we lack is the will to change.<sup>18</sup>

Confronted with declining oil reserves and rising demand, oil will become a source of future global conflict unless the United States and other countries address major policy challenges. Based on current trends, worldwide oil consumption is set to increase by 50 percent by 2020. To maintain their current growth rates, India will have to double its consumption and China will have to increase its by 150 percent. With few domestic oil resources, China and India are shaping their national security policies to ensure access to outside suppliers. China has already adopted a more activist role in establishing ties with energy-producing countries in South America, the Caspian region, the Middle East, Sudan, and Russia.

While global demand for energy is increasing, the United States remains heavily dependent on foreign sources of oil. Today nearly 60 percent of our oil is imported and absent changes that number will only grow over time, making the United States a perpetual hostage to the whims of the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). Our dependence on OPEC – a cartel that includes many corrupt, authoritarian regimes, hostile to the United States – sometimes forces us to compromise our values and hold hands with undemocratic leaders in an effort to ensure continued access to oil. Indeed, our dependence, and that of our allies in Europe and Asia, provides OPEC countries with the necessary profits to sustain their corrupt regimes, stall democratic reforms, and even fund terrorist networks.

The destabilizing effect of global climate change adds another imperative for transformation to a more sustainable energy system. Scientists agree that emissions

---

<sup>18</sup> For more information, see Center for American Progress, *Securing Our Energy Future*, Progressive Priorities Series, December 2004, available at [http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8O\\_VF&b=263962](http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8O_VF&b=263962).

## INTEGRATED POWER

of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases due to human activity have caused a rise in the Earth's temperature, increasing the risk of agricultural losses, water shortages, and widespread health problems. The potential for wars over resources as a result of these shortages prompted the authors of a 2003 U.S. Department of Defense study to conclude that "the risk of abrupt climate change . . . should be elevated beyond a scientific debate to a U.S. national security concern."

U.S. access to oil remains insecure. Every day roughly 25 percent of the world's oil supplies flows through the two-mile-wide channel in the Strait of Hormuz in the Persian Gulf. While the United States possesses less than 2 percent of the world's oil reserves, it accounts for more than 25 percent of global demand. The administration's efforts to drill our way to energy independence are doomed to fail. The administration's plan to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is not an energy strategy. It would, by optimistic accounts, only cut oil imports by about 4 percent by 2025. For even this modest gain, the oil would have to flow through the Alaska pipeline system, which is largely unprotected and has been sabotaged, bombed, and shot at more than 50 times.

The internal energy infrastructure of the United States is also dangerously exposed. The U.S. electrical power grid and distribution system is inefficient, old, fragile, and vulnerable to a terrorist attack in many places. Because the world is increasingly interconnected in the digital age, the economic impact of brownouts or blackouts is tremendous. The 2003 blackout that affected millions across the Northeast, Midwest and Canada demonstrated the unreliability of the country's outdated electrical power grid – and cost more than \$6 billion.

The technologies necessary to dramatically transform our energy future are well within reach. Today, programs and policies exist that could not only alleviate, but solve, many of the current challenges. Some of these ideas have already been tested, and many are endorsed by unlikely partnerships between business leaders, state and local governments, labor unions and environmentalists. State governments and some companies are already beginning to act. But until the federal government takes positive steps towards creating a purposeful, effective, creative and strategic energy policy, the United States will continue to teeter on the brink of a national security crisis.

It is time to change course. To secure the United States, we must work to end our dependence on foreign sources of energy and reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. Our strategy calls for action on four fronts: increasing energy efficiency, deploying renewable energy sources, modernizing the U.S. energy infrastructure, and tackling climate change.

***Increase energy efficiency.*** Increasing energy efficiency is the most immediate way to reduce our energy dependence.<sup>19</sup> Energy efficiency can be achieved by modernizing our transportation options, our buildings, and our household appliances:

- **Modernize transportation.** The United States must increase the fuel efficiency of the transportation sector and should adopt the following initiatives:
  - *Create incentives for efficiency.* Congress should establish a so-called “feebate” program for all new passenger vehicles sold in the United States. Based on a fuel efficiency benchmark, buyers of more efficient vehicles receive a rebate; buyers of less efficient vehicles pay a fee. Feebates should be designed to be revenue, technology and vehicle size neutral in order to preserve customer choice.
  - *Improve replacement tires.* Congress should require replacement tires to be as efficient as new car tires. Under federal fuel-economy standards, automakers equip new vehicles with tires that have a lower rolling resistance, which leads to higher fuel efficiency. By requiring replacement tires to be as efficient as new car tires, gasoline savings would begin immediately, saving more than 7 billion barrels of oil over the next 50 years.
  - *Provide incentives to make and purchase hybrid cars.* Tax breaks and other incentives should be provided to car companies to convert their assembly lines and to consumers to encourage the purchase of fuel efficient hybrid cars. If 27 percent of all America’s cars were hybrid gasoline-electric models, the United States could stop importing oil from the Persian Gulf.
  - *Foster innovation.* Congress should fund a competition to promote the deployment of super-efficient vehicles. A significant cash prize would be granted to the first company that sells one million vehicles that achieve efficiency levels of at least 80 miles per gallon.
  
- **Modernize buildings.** In the United States, buildings account for 65 percent of electricity consumption, 36 percent of total energy use and 30 percent of all greenhouse-gas emissions. Increasing the energy efficiency of buildings will reduce peak capacity pressure on the electricity grid, lowering

---

<sup>19</sup> For more information see Center for American Progress, *A Progressive Response to High Oil and Gasoline Prices*, May 6, 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=669657>.

## INTEGRATED POWER

the risk of blackouts, as well as decreasing greenhouse gas emissions. A combination of new national building model standards, tax incentives, and innovative financing mechanisms should be used to ensure that new buildings are at least 30 percent more efficient than they are today.

- **Retool manufacturing plants.** The United States should provide tax incentives and economic development grants to encourage and assist companies to retool manufacturing plants to make them more efficient and profitable. Through improved boiler operations, industrial cogeneration of electricity, and environmental retrofits, companies can reduce emissions and energy usage, saving themselves money while helping the country.
- **Update household appliances.** The National Appliance Energy Conservation Act mandates that the Department of Energy develop new appliance efficiency standards on a continuous basis, but they have fallen years behind on updates of old standards and development of new ones. The Department of Energy should immediately update overdue standards. If the federal standards fall more than three years behind the statutory schedule, states should be allowed to set their own appliance efficiency standards.

*Deploy renewable energy sources.* The United States must invest in the research, development and deployment of domestic renewable energy sources. Since 1978 our investments in renewables have fallen by almost 60 percent, while Europe and Japan have pushed ahead. Without investment and policy changes now, America will fall further behind in the growing market for clean energy technologies sought by developed and developing countries alike. To significantly increase our domestic renewable energy supply, the following actions should be taken:

- **Establish a renewable energy portfolio standard.** Congress should establish a national Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) that would require 25 percent of our electricity to be produced from renewable sources such as wind, biomass, geothermal and solar energy by 2025. Nineteen states have already adopted such programs, and a national market-based program will provide the incentives and long-term predictability that the renewable energy industry needs to invest in future growth.
- **Invest in biofuels.** The United States should make significant, strategic investments in an aggressive biofuels program, with the goal of replacing 50 percent of oil now used in the transportation sector by 2050. A strong program centered on biofuels – fuels made from organic material grown by American farmers – will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, drive innovation in our agricultural and automotive sectors, strengthen

rural economies, and save the United States approximately \$20 billion a year in fuel costs. To achieve this, we must restructure our agricultural commodity support system and redirect funds into a graduated plan for the development and commercial integration of biofuels. By coupling a U.S. pledge to shift subsidies from traditional agricultural crops to biofuels with increased market access for the world's least developed countries, the United States could establish itself as the world's leader in the promotion of a free trade regime that benefits producers in both the developed and the developing worlds.

- **Plan for future fuels.** The United States must continue to invest in research and development of technologies and fuels that would eliminate the need for oil in the transportation sector in the long-term. While hydrogen-powered fuel cells have great potential, research for the solution to our transportation challenge must include a broad range of technologies.

*Modernize America's energy infrastructure.* By investing in our energy infrastructure we can become more efficient, pollute less, and protect our economy.

- **Pass strong reliability standards.** The United States must establish mandatory standards to ensure the reliability of the electricity grid.
- **Make the power grid smart.** The United States should develop a "smart grid" electrical system to coordinate, anticipate, and optimize the performance of the electrical grid. Changes in the grid, much of which is run on 50-year-old technology, would give consumers more control over their use of electricity and help power generators reduce losses in electricity transmission.
- **Protect our energy infrastructure.** Today nuclear power plants and the country's power grid are still insecure and susceptible to both physical and cyber attacks by terrorists. The United States should implement immediately the top priority recommendations of the National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace, including efforts to secure the computer networks at nuclear power plants and power companies.
- **Invest in natural gas.** Working with the states, the federal government should review impediments to sitting natural gas pipeline and develop a plan to improve natural gas delivery that enhances security and retains appropriate public and environmental reviews. The demand for clean-burning natural gas has increased greatly in the last five years but pipeline capacity to deliver gas to market remains an obstacle.

- **Focus research on safe, cost-effective nuclear power.** The United States should support research into cost-effective, safe, and proliferation-resistant nuclear reactor designs, and develop a more comprehensive nuclear waste disposal plan. The significant role that nuclear power plays in the global supply of electricity today – and may play in a world forced to reduce consumption of carbon-based fuels must be balanced against nuclear power’s significant cost, safety, waste disposal, and proliferation challenges.

**Tackling global warming.** Because of the destabilizing ecological, economic and sociological impacts of climate change, we must take domestic and international actions now to slow and eventually reverse the build-up of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.<sup>20</sup>

- **Develop a cap-and-trade system.** The United States should establish a national greenhouse gas emissions cap and market-based trading system. The system could be based on those developed by the Northeastern states and the European Union. By limiting greenhouse gas emissions and creating an emission credit market, the system would reduce global warming pollution and encourage investment in technologies that reduce emissions.
- **Invest in carbon dioxide capture and storage.** The United States and other industrialized countries should provide substantial investments to advance carbon dioxide capture and storage. They should also provide loan guarantees and other incentives to support the construction in the developing world of new coal-fired power plants capable of capturing and storing carbon dioxide emissions. Financial support could enable developing countries to buy new Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle plants that can help limit emissions that cause global warming, acid rain and other forms of pollution. These plants are more expensive than conventional power plants, but they better capture and store carbon dioxide.
- **Re-engage in international climate negotiations.** The United States should rejoin international negotiations to provide the leadership needed to reach a global, binding climate agreement. Since withdrawing from the Kyoto Protocol, the United States has been completely disengaged from the international discussion on how to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

---

<sup>20</sup> For more information, see International Climate Change Taskforce, *Meeting the Climate Change Challenge*, January 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=306503>.



## SOURCES AND FURTHER READING

### Strategy and Doctrine

Barnett, Thomas P M. *The Pentagon's New Map*. New York: Penguin, 2004.

Beinart, Peter. "A Fighting Faith: An Argument for a New Liberalism," *The New Republic*, Dec 2, 2004.

Brzezinski, Zbigniew. *The Choice: Global Domination or Global Leadership*. New York: Basic Books, 2004.

Daalder, Ivo, James M. Lindsay and James B. Steinberg. *The Bush National Security Strategy: An Evaluation*. The Brookings Institution, 2002.

Daalder, Ivo H. and James M. Lindsay. *America Unbound: The Bush Revolution in Foreign Policy*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2003.

Fallows, James. "Success Without Victory," *The Atlantic Monthly*, Jan/Feb 2005.

Fourth Freedom Forum. *Toward a More Secure America: Ground U.S. Policy in Global Realities*, Nov 2003.

Gaddis, John Lewis. "A Grand Strategy in the Second Term," *Foreign Affairs*, Jan/Feb 2005.

Gaddis, John Lewis. "A Grand Strategy of Transformation," *Foreign Policy*, Nov/Dec, 2002.

Kleinfeld, Rachel and Matthew Spence. "Creating Truman Democrats: A Three-Step Program for Rebuilding Democratic National Security Policy," Truman National Security Project, Jan 2005, available at <http://www.trumanproject.org/trumanpaper1.pdf>.

Korb, Lawrence. *The Gulf and US National Security Strategy*. The Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research, 2005.

Korb, Lawrence. *Winning the Peace in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: A Task Force Report of the Strategies for U.S. National Security Program*, The Stanley Foundation, Oct 2003, available at <http://www.stanleyfoundation.org/reports/SNS03.pdf>.

Kupchan, Charles. *The End of the American Era: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Geopolitics of the Twenty-first Century*. New York: Vintage, 2003.

Mead, Walter Russell. *Power, Terror, Peace, and War: America's Grand Strategy in a World at Risk*. New York: Council of Foreign Relations, 2004.

National Intelligence Council. *Global Trends 2015: A Dialogue About the Future With Nongovernmental Experts*, Dec 2000, available at [http://www.cia.gov/nic/PDF\\_GIF\\_global/globaltrend2015.pdf](http://www.cia.gov/nic/PDF_GIF_global/globaltrend2015.pdf).



## INTEGRATED POWER

National Intelligence Council. *Mapping Global Trends: Report of the National Intelligence Council's 2020 Project*, Dec 2004, available at <http://www.foia.cia.gov/2020/2020.pdf>.

National Security Advisory Group to the Senate Democratic Leadership. *An American Security Policy: Challenge, Opportunity, Commitment*, Jul 23, 2003.

Nye, Joseph, *The Paradox of American Power: Why the world's only superpower can't go it alone*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Nye, Joseph, *Soft Power: The means to success in world politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004.

O'Hanlon, Michael. *Defense Strategy for the Post Saddam Era*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 2005.

O'Hanlon, Michael. "Neocon Lessons for Democrats," *The Japan Times*, Nov 9, 2004.

O'Hanlon, Michael, Susan E. Rice and James B. Steinberg. *The New National Security Strategy and Preemption*. The Brookings Institution, 2002, available at <http://www.brookings.edu/printme.wbs?page=/comm/policybriefs/pb113.htm>

Progressive Policy Institute. *Progressive Internationalism: A Democratic National Security Policy*, Oct 30, 2003, available at [http://www.ppionline.org/documents/Progressive\\_Internationalism\\_1003.pdf](http://www.ppionline.org/documents/Progressive_Internationalism_1003.pdf).

Security and Peace Institute and the Open Society Institute. *Restoring American Leadership: 13 Cooperative Steps to Advance Global Progress*, 2005, available at [http://www.soros.org/initiatives/washington/articles\\_publications/publications/leadership\\_20050401](http://www.soros.org/initiatives/washington/articles_publications/publications/leadership_20050401).

Singer, Peter. *The Rise of Corporate Warriors: The Rise of the Privatized Military Industry*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Soderberg, Nancy. *The Superpower Myth: The Use and Misuse of Military Might*. New York: Wiley, Jan 2005.

Veterans for Common Sense. *Vision for U.S. National Security in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, Policy Brief No. 1, Mar 2005, available at <http://www.veteransforcommonsense.org/files/vcs/VCS%20Vision%20for%20National%20Security.pdf>.

White House. *The National Security Strategy for the United States of America*, 2002, available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html>.

Zelikow, Philip. "Practical Idealism: Present policy in historical perspective" speech delivered at Stanford University, May 6, 2005.

## Terrorism

Benjamin, Daniel. *Strategic Counterterrorism: A Framework for Safeguarding America*. The Center for Strategic and International Studies. Forthcoming.

Center for American Progress. *Better Spies, Better Intelligence: A Progressive Strategy for Creating a Professional Intelligence Corps*, Mar 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=505523>.

Clarke, Richard A., Glenn P. Aga, Roger W. Cressey, Stephen E. Flynn, Blake W. Mobley, Eric Rosenbach, Steven Simon, William F. Wechsler, and Lee S. Wolosky. *Defeating the Jihadists: A Blueprint for Action*. The Century Foundation, Nov 2004. Available at <http://www.tcf.org/4L/4LMain.asp?SubjectID=1&ArticleID=498>

The Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction. *Report to the President of the United States*, Mar 31, 2005, available at [http://www.wmd.gov/report/wmd\\_report.pdf](http://www.wmd.gov/report/wmd_report.pdf).

“Going Global,” *The Economist*, Feb 24, 2004, available at [http://www.economist.com/world/na/displayStory.cfm?story\\_id=3700336](http://www.economist.com/world/na/displayStory.cfm?story_id=3700336).

National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. *The 9/11 Commission Report*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004, available at <http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/05aug20041050/www.gpoaccess.gov/911/pdf/fullreport.pdf>.

Papachristos, Andrew. “Gang World,” *Foreign Policy*, Mar/Apr 2005, available at [http://foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story\\_id=2798](http://foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=2798).

Factor, Mallory, Testimony before the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs. “An Assessment of Current Efforts to Combat Terrorism Financing,” 108<sup>th</sup> Congress, Jun 15, 2004, available at <http://hsgac.senate.gov/index.cfm?Fuseaction=Hearings.Testimony&HearingID=181&WitnessID=656>.

Ogden, Peter and Gayle Smith, eds., *Terror in the Shadows: Trafficking in Money, Weapons and People*. Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress, Oct 2004.

## Military

Center for American Progress. *For Soldier and Country: Saving the All-Volunteer Army*, Mar 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=269841>.

Korb, Lawrence. *A New National Security Strategy in an Age of Terrorists, Tyrants, and Weapons of Mass Destruction*. Council on Foreign Relations, 2003, available at [http://www.cfr.org/pdf/National\\_Security\\_CPI.pdf](http://www.cfr.org/pdf/National_Security_CPI.pdf).

## INTEGRATED POWER

Metz, Steven and Raymond Millen. "Insurgency and Counterinsurgency in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Reconceptualizing Threat and Response," *Strategic Studies Institute*, Nov 2004, available at <http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/ssi/insurgency21c.pdf>.

Singer, P.W. "Outsourcing War," *Foreign Affairs*, Mar/Apr 2005.

### Law Enforcement

Center for American Progress. *Securing America, Protecting Our Freedoms After September 11*, Mar 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=474133>.

O'Harrow Jr., Robert. *No Place to Hide: Behind the Scenes of Our Emerging Surveillance Society*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2005.

Center for American Progress. *Strengthening America By Defending Our Liberties*, Oct 31, 2003, available at [http://www.centerforamericanprogress.org/AccountTempFiles/cf/%7BE9245FE4-9A2B-43C7-A521-5D6FF2E06E03%7D/STRENGTHENING\\_AMERICA.PDF](http://www.centerforamericanprogress.org/AccountTempFiles/cf/%7BE9245FE4-9A2B-43C7-A521-5D6FF2E06E03%7D/STRENGTHENING_AMERICA.PDF).

### Public Diplomacy

Advisory Group on Public Diplomacy for the Arab and Muslim World. *Changing Minds, Winning Peace: A New Strategic Direction for U.S. Public Diplomacy in the Arab and Muslim World*, 2003.

Center for Strategic and International Studies' Advisory Committee on U.S. Policy in the Arab World. *From Conflict to Cooperation: Writing a New Chapter in U.S.-Arab Relations*, Mar 2005.

Council on Foreign Relations. *Finding America's Voice: A Strategy for Reinvigorating U.S. Public Diplomacy*, 2003.

Government Accounting Office. *U.S. Public Diplomacy: Interagency Coordination Efforts Hampered by Lack of National Communications Strategy*, Apr 2005.

Kaplan, David E. and others. "Hearts, Minds, and Dollars," *U.S. News and World Report*, Apr 25, 2005.

National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. *The 9/11 Commission Report*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004, 374-380, available at <http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/05aug20041050/www.gpoaccess.gov/911/pdf/fullreport.pdf>.

### Deadly Weapons

Bunn, Matthew and Anthony Wier. "Securing the Bomb 2005: The New Global Imperatives," Nuclear Threat Initiative, May 2005, available at [http://www.nti.org/e\\_research/report\\_cnwmupdate2005.pdf](http://www.nti.org/e_research/report_cnwmupdate2005.pdf).

Center for American Progress. *Agenda for Security: Controlling the Nuclear Threat*, Mar 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=401017>.

Grotto, Andrew J. "Defusing the Dirty Bomb Threat," Center for American Progress, forthcoming summer 2005.

Korb, Lawrence with Peter Ogden. *The Road to Nuclear Security*. Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress, Dec 2004, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=271664>.

National Academy of Sciences, *Biotechnology Research in an Age of Terrorism*, 2003.

National Academy of Sciences. *The Smallpox Vaccination Program: Public Health in an Age of Terrorism*, 2005.

National Academy of Sciences' Committee on the Effects of Nuclear Earth-Penetrator and Other Weapons. *Effects of Nuclear Earth-Penetrator and Other Weapons*. Washington, D.C.: National Research Council, 2005, available at <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/11282.html>.

See The Nuclear Threat Initiative at <http://www.nti.org/>.

Oelrich, Ivan. *Missions for Nuclear Weapons after the Cold War*, Occasional Paper #3. Washington, D.C.: Federation of American Scientists, 2005, available at <http://www.fas.org/main/content.jsp?formAction=297&contentId=377>.

Perkovich, George, Jessica T. Mathews, Joseph Cirincione, Rose Gottemoeller, and Jon B. Wolfsthal. *Universal Compliance: A Strategy for Nuclear Security*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2005, available at <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/UC2.FINAL3.pdf>.

Tucker, Jonathan B. *Biosecurity: Limiting Terrorist Access to Deadly Pathogens*, Peaceworks #52. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 2003, available at <http://www.usip.org/pubs/peaceworks/pwks52.pdf>

## **Democracy Promotion**

Carothers, Thomas, ed. *Funding Virtue: Civil Society Aid and Democracy Promotion*. Washington D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2000.

Freedom House. *How Freedom is Won: From Civic Resistance to Durable Democracy*, May 24, 2005, available at <http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/specreports/civictans/>

Halperin, Morton, Joseph T. Siegle and Michael Weinstein. *The Democracy Advantage: How Democracies Promote Prosperity and Peace*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 2005.

Herman, Robert G. and Theodore Piccone, eds. *Democracy: A Global Survey of Foreign Policy Trends 1992-2002*. Democracy Coalition Project, 2002.

## INTEGRATED POWER

Kissinger, Henry. "Implementing Bush's Vision: To Effectively Spread Democracy we Must Balance Values and Geopolitical Challenges," *The Washington Post*, May 16, 2005.

### Iran

Pollack, Kenneth. *The Persian Puzzle: The Conflict Between Iran and the America*. New York: Random House, 2004.

Takeyh, Ray and Kenneth Pollack. "Taking on Tehran," *Foreign Affairs*, Mar/Apr 2005, available at <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20050301faessay84204/kenneth-pollack-ray-takeyh/taking-on-tehran.html>.

### Homeland Security

Center for American Progress. *Failing Grades: America's Security Three Years after 9/11*, Sept 2004, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=183682>.

Center for American Progress. *Protecting and Preserving an Open Society: The Challenge for the Next Secretary of Homeland Security*, Mar 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=289522>.

Department of Homeland Security. *The National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace*, Feb 2003, available at [http://www.dhs.gov/interweb/assetlibrary/National\\_Cyberspace\\_Strategy.pdf](http://www.dhs.gov/interweb/assetlibrary/National_Cyberspace_Strategy.pdf).

Department of Homeland Security. *Homeland Security Act of 2002*, available at [http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/interweb/assetlibrary/hr\\_5005\\_enr.pdf](http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/interweb/assetlibrary/hr_5005_enr.pdf).

Department of Homeland Security. *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, Jul 2002, available at [http://www.dhs.gov/interweb/assetlibrary/nat\\_strat\\_hls.pdf](http://www.dhs.gov/interweb/assetlibrary/nat_strat_hls.pdf).

Department of Homeland Security. *The National Strategy for the Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructure and Key Aspects*, Feb 2003, available at [http://www.dhs.gov/interweb/assetlibrary/Physical\\_Strategy.pdf](http://www.dhs.gov/interweb/assetlibrary/Physical_Strategy.pdf).

Department of Homeland Security. *National Response Plan*, Dec 2004, available at [http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/interapp/editorial/editorial\\_0566.xml](http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/interapp/editorial/editorial_0566.xml).

Department of Homeland Security. *Securing the Homeland, Strengthening the Nation*, 2002, available at [http://www.dhs.gov/interweb/assetlibrary/homeland\\_security\\_book.pdf](http://www.dhs.gov/interweb/assetlibrary/homeland_security_book.pdf).

Flynn, Stephen E. *America the Vulnerable: How Our Government is Failing to Protect Us from Terrorism*. New York: HarperCollins, Jun 2004.

Greer, Linda E. "New Strategies to Protect America: Securing our Nation's Chemical Facilities," Center for American Progress, 2005.

Hart, Gary and Warren Rudman. *America Still Unprepared – America Still in Danger*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 2002, available at [http://www.cfr.org/pdf/Homeland\\_Security\\_TF.pdf](http://www.cfr.org/pdf/Homeland_Security_TF.pdf).

Millar, Fred. “New Strategies to Protect America: Putting Rail Security on the Right Track,” Center for American Progress, Apr 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=569619>.

## Global Development

Annan, Kofi. “‘In Larger Freedom’: Decision Time at the UN,” *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 2005.

Center for American Progress. *Global Equity: An Action Plan for Global Economic Opportunity*, Mar 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=492989>.

Center for Global Development. “Education and the Developing World,” *Rich World, Poor World: A Guide to Global Development*, 2004, available at [http://www.cgdev.org/docs/rp\\_education.pdf](http://www.cgdev.org/docs/rp_education.pdf).

Dervis, Kemal. “A Better Globalization: Legitimacy, Governance, and Reform,” Brief, Center for Global Development, Feb 2005, available at [http://www.cgdev.org/docs/CGD\\_brief\\_May04%20CRA.pdf](http://www.cgdev.org/docs/CGD_brief_May04%20CRA.pdf).

Hirsh, Michael. *At War With Ourselves: Why America Is Squandering Its Chance to Build a Better World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

“Measuring Globalization: The Global Top 20,” *Foreign Policy*, May/June 2005.

Rice, Susan. “The New National Security Strategy: Focus on Failed States,” Policy Brief No. 116, Brookings Institution, 2003.

Secretary-General of the United Nations. *In Larger Freedom: Toward Development, Security and Human Rights for All*, Mar 2005, available at <http://www.unausa.org/site/pp.asp?c=fvKRI8MPJpF&b=475721>.

The Secretary General’s High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility*. United Nations, Dec 2004, available at <http://www.un.org/secureworld/>.

Stiglitz, Joseph. “Why Wolfensohn Mattered,” Project Syndicate, May 2005, available at [http://www.tompaine.com/articles/why\\_wolfensohn\\_mattered.php](http://www.tompaine.com/articles/why_wolfensohn_mattered.php).

UN Millennium Project. *Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals*, 2005, available at <http://unmp.forumone.com/>.

## INTEGRATED POWER

### Conflict Prevention

Birdsall, Nancy and Brian Deese. "Delivering on Debt Relief," Center for Global Development, April 2002.

Birdsall, Nancy and Michael Clemens. "From Promise to Performance: How Rich Countries Can Help Poor Countries Help Themselves," Center for Global Development, Apr 2003.

Center for Global Development. *On the Brink: Weak States and U.S. National Security*, May 2004, available at [http://www.cgdev.org/docs/Full\\_Report.pdf](http://www.cgdev.org/docs/Full_Report.pdf).

Cincotta, Richard P. and others. *The Security Demographic*. Washington, D.C.: Population Action International, 2003, available at <http://www.populationaction.org/securitydemographic/pdfs/SecurityDemographic.PDF>.

Control Arms Campaign. *Shattered Lives: The Case for Tough International Arms Control*, 2003.

Defense Science Board. *Transition to and from Hostilities*, Dec 2004.

Democratic Policy Committee. "Bush Administration Slow to Deliver Critical Foreign Aid," Apr 29, 2005.

Dobbins, James and others. *America's Role in Nation-Building: From Germany to Iraq*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2003.

Dobbins, James and others. *The UN's Role in Nation-Building: From the Congo to Iraq*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2005, available at [http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND\\_MG304.sum.pdf](http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG304.sum.pdf).

Powers, Samantha. *'A Problem From Hell': American and the Age of Genocide*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, May 2003.

Radelet, Steven. "The Millennium Challenge Account: Making the Vision a Reality." Testimony for the House Committee on International Relations, Apr 27, 2005.

### Energy

See Apollo Alliance at <http://www.apolloalliance.org/>.

Center for American Progress. *Recommendations of the International Climate Change Taskforce*, Jan 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=306503>.

Center for American Progress. *Securing Our Energy Future*, Mar 2005, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=263962>.

See Energy Future Coalition at <http://www.energyfuturecoalition.org/>.



Greene, Nathanael and others. *Growing Energy: How Biofuels Can Help End America's Oil Dependence*. National Resources Defense Council, Dec 2004, available at <http://www.bioproducts-bioenergy.gov/pdfs/NRDC-Growing-Energy-Final.3.pdf>.

See National Commission on Energy Policy at <http://www.energycommission.org/>.

Podesta, John and others. "The Future of Energy Policy," *Foreign Affairs*, Jul/Aug. 2003.

Schwartz, Peter and Doug Randall. *An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and Its Implications for United States National Security*, Oct 2003, available at [http://www.ems.org/climate/pentagon\\_climate\\_change.html](http://www.ems.org/climate/pentagon_climate_change.html).

See Rocky Mountain Institute at <http://www.rmi.org/>.

The Center for American Progress is a nonpartisan research and educational institute dedicated to promoting a strong, just and free America that ensures opportunity for all. We believe that Americans are bound together by a common commitment to these values and we aspire to ensure that our national policies reflect these values. We work to find progressive and pragmatic solutions to significant domestic and international problems and develop policy proposals that foster a government that is “of the people, by the people, and for the people.”

**Center for American Progress**  
1333 H Street, NW, 10th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.682.1611 • [www.americanprogress.org](http://www.americanprogress.org)