Chapter 4. U.S. Conceptions of Security: Cold War Inertia Confronts New Threats[1]

Phil Williams

Introduction

Security is a rich and subtle term that is as powerful as it is elusive. Conveying great symbolism and emotional impact, security and secure are words that are as pervasive in international relations as they are in personal relationships and personal life. Not only is the term widely applicable to different kinds of situations, but it is also has several different uses that add to the difficulties in using it in a clear, consistent analytical way. As defined by Merriam-Webster, the term security has four meanings:

- "the quality or state of being secure: as a: freedom from danger: b: freedom from fear or anxiety".
- "something given, deposited, or pledged to make certain the fulfilment of an obligation"
- "an evidence of debt or of ownership (as a stock certificate or a bond)".
- a: something that secures b: (1) : measures taken to guard against espionage or sabotage, crime, attack or escape (2) : an organization or department whose task is security.

It is clear from these various meanings that security can refer to: a set of aspirations to strive towards, a set of conditions that are favorable to its attainment, or something that exists but is being challenged or threatened. It has both objective and subjective dimensions that are sometimes congruent and sometimes dissonant. People or states can

believe that they have security, and might be wrong, ignoring threats or challenges until it is too late. In other cases, threats to security are exaggerated and there is over-insurance rather than under-preparation. Security is often qualified - so that people talk about financial security, a use in which there is a connotation of predictability and continued access to adequate resources to meet needs. Some international relations scholars have developed concepts such as water security or health security, especially in relation to developing countries. Once again there is a notion of resource adequacy and predictability. In international relations theory, security is generally regarded as one of the over-riding objectives of states operating in an anarchic international system in which there is no Leviathan to guarantee order and security. The problem in anarchy is that states take defensive actions or make preparations to enhance their security and these actions or preparations are seen by others as offensive in nature. This predicament has been described as the security dilemma, in which one state's security can mean another state's insecurity. It led to the development of notions of common or mutual security involving forms of reassurance designed to mitigate or even transcend the security dilemma.

Increasingly, however, there is a recognition that security is so broad that it needs to be qualified and specified. This is most usefully done in relation to the first of the four meanings offered by Merriam-Webster – security as a condition in which there is freedom from danger or from fear and anxiety. The value of this approach is that it relates the notion of security directly to dangers or threats, whether or not these are specific or general. Indeed, it leads to a series of questions about threats that can then be crystallized into particular security paradigms. The major questions are as follows:

- Who or what poses a threat? Is the threat external or internal? Is it a military threat

or a non-military threat? If it is an external military threat does it come from one source or several sources?

- Whom and what do they threaten? Is the threat physical or ideological? Is it a threat to national existence to a way of life and the values that are a core part of it? Is it a threat to the state, the nation, the citizens, or indeed are any distinctions made among the "targets" of threat
- How are the threats implemented? Are the threats predominantly military in character or do they take a different form? Are they threats to inflict harm, to undermine core values, to create a less hospitable environment or to prevent the attainment of certain goals?
- Where are the threats manifested? Are they global or local in character? Do they come from one source or multiple sources? Are the threats from within the society, from outside, or both?
- Why do threats arise? Are they the result of inherent hostility and antipathy of others towards one's values or are they a product of the anarchic environment? To what extent do a society's or nation's own actions generate or provoke threats by others?
- What has to be done about them? What should the responses be? In particular, what is the appropriate balance of confrontation and competition on the one side and cooperation and conciliation on the other?
- When do threats emerge and when do they disappear?

The answers to these questions will do much to determine the conception of security that dominates public discourse as well as the allocation of resources within societies. How much is enough for security is an issue that most societies have to wrestle with. If threats

are remote then security needs are limited; if threats are imminent then the allocation and often the mobilization of resources takes precedence over most other goals the state is seeking. Yet the immediacy of threats is not the only variable – equally important are the nature and source of the threats and precisely what they threaten. Different societies give different answers to these questions; and the same society might well give different answers at different periods. In some cases, there is a consensus on the answers; in others the answers to the questions will be a source of dispute and debate. Moreover, the prevalent answers will not necessarily be the result of rational calculation: historical experience, values, emotions, bureaucratic self-interest, perceptions and misperceptions all combine in the formation of the conception of security that develops out of the answers to the set of questions outlined above.

These answers can be conceptualized in terms of particular security paradigms. A security paradigm can be understood as a set of judgments and assumptions about the nature of security within a particular society. In effect, the paradigm embodies a set of interlocking and complementary answers to the questions about who, whom, how, where, what and when. Paradigms can evolve, shift, and mature over time, particularly where there is debate and controversy. Yet they are also very powerful: they provide a coherent picture of the world, offer a basis for policies and resource allocations, and, not surprisingly, tend to be resistant to fundamental changes.

The basic theme here is that the United States security paradigm has been characterized by considerable stability, but has also experienced some incremental changes. During the early years of the Cold War, the dominant paradigm was one that

emphasized national security, the need for reliance on one's own military power to deter and defend against an adversary who sole objective was global domination. This gave way, at least in part, to a conception that displayed greater subtlety and sophistication, that recognized the common interests of the United States and the Soviet Union in avoiding nuclear war, and that therefore emphasized the need for tradeoffs between different strands of policy. Yet there were those in the policy-making community who were never comfortable with this notion of common or international security, who were antithetical to arms control agreements with the Soviet Union and who placed faith only in American power. At times United States security policy oscillated between these two approaches; at other times, it seemed to combine them, albeit in a manner that was both uneasy and vulnerable to political attack from those who felt that the balance between the two approaches was wrong.

Something similar appears to have happened in the post-Cold War period. The Cold War security paradigm has been modified and extended to incorporate new security challenges, some of which are very different from those that prevailed during the Cold War. Yet, there remain many in the policy-making community who are uncomfortable with a more comprehensive approach to security and want to maintain the focus on military strength, unilateral action, and challenges to United States preponderance, whether it comes from traditional great powers or rogue states. Although there has been some shift and broadening of the concept to include security against new kinds of threats, there is a conceptual overhang from the Cold War that has limited the extent of change. As a result, the concept of national security has been augmented through the addition of new threats; it has not been fundamentally altered. In the debate that occurred during the Clinton

Presidency, there were some indications of a more fundamental shift towards a new paradigm in which security threats are no longer strictly, or even primarily, military. This broader conception, however, was limited by the dominance of the traditionalists, who continue to control the bulk of the bureaucratic resources and to dominate the budgeting process. This dominance was underlined by the Bush W. Bush administration (2000-2004) in its first eight months in office when it appeared to revert to Cold War conceptions of security, albeit with a few variations that genuflected to new circumstances. With the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, however, the limits of this paradigm became very clear. In the aftermath of the attack, there were some major changes in approach. Yet there was also remarkable continuity.

Against this background, this chapter examines the U.S. conception of security. It is divided into five parts: initially it looks at the origins of the United States conception of security as national security, identifying the factors that helped to crystallize the main components of what became a very distinctive paradigm. It then considers the key components of the national security debate in the United States, suggesting that as a result of strong and vigorous differences over what needed to be done to achieve security, the concept was refined in ways that combined national and international or cooperative security. The third part of the paper examines the post-Cold War conception of United States national security, suggesting that the Clinton administration, tentatively moved towards a new paradigm, but this was not reflected in a re-allocation of resources from traditional to the new challenges. The fourth section explores the rather different emphasis of the Bush administration prior to September 11 as well as the way in which the administration subsequently responded by combining new and old ways of thinking about

security. It suggests that although the Bush administration embraced a wider concept, much of the former approach has not been jettisoned. Even September 11 prompted accretion rather than reappraisal, the addition of new security challenges not the relinquishing of old ways of thinking. The fifth and final section argues, however, that the United States conception of security needs to be expanded further as part of a more comprehensive approach, appropriate to the challenges of governance in a world that some observers see as moving towards a New Middle Ages.[2]

I The U.S. Conception of National Security

For most of its history, the United States has been relatively secure. Its geographic position, reinforced by the dominance of the British fleet throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, provided an abundance of security that combined with domestic concerns about the danger of standing armies to give military preparedness and the military services a low priority. This situation changed, initially with the Nazi threat to the balance of power in Europe in the 1930s, and then much more dramatically with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941. The subsequent development of the Cold War between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, for the first time, made wartime preparedness a peacetime imperative. Indeed, the U.S. conception of security really developed in the aftermath of the Second World War and evolved and matured in the context of the Cold War and the nuclear relationship with the Soviet Union. Influenced very strongly by the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor and shaped by the United States conception of its role as guardian of the free world, the United States conception of security focused primarily on external threats rather than issues relating to internal order. The concern was with the

Soviet nuclear threat to the United States homeland, the nuclear and conventional threat to the United States' allies, and the capacity of the Soviet Union and China to subvert western-leaning governments in the Third World.

In short, the U.S. conception of security was shaped by conceptions of duty and need, by Washington's sense of its place in the world, and by its notions of an appropriate international order. Throughout the Cold War, the United States operated with a strong sense of identity and mission, based on a complex mix of ideology and geopolitics, on idealism and power politics, on notions of order and morality combined with acute sensitivity to power and expediency. The external threats to security identified by the United States in the 1940s and 1950s were very intense both geopolitically and ideologically, threatening American values as well as its interests. Consequently, the domestic and international stakes both pointed in the same direction, leading to a narrowly defined but all-encompassing notion of security.[3]

The dominant strand in thinking about security was a conception of national security that was predominantly outward-looking, influenced as it was by geopolitics and technology. Notions of legitimacy and domestic security, however, were also part of the equation and were occasionally punctuated by real concerns over traitors and fifth-columns for foreign enemies. As Roy Godson has noted, although Americans, ever since the Revolution, have been "alert to the possibility that foreigners might undermine their liberty with spies and saboteurs" they have dealt with this problem only sporadically, "depending on political circumstances," and have rarely developed "an articulated government-wide strategy or policy with regard to counter-intelligence."[4]

There were, of course, specific actions taken to ensure that the domestic dimension

of security was not neglected. The House Committee on Un-American Activities was created in the 1930s in response to concerns over German-Americans developing links with the Nazis. During the early Cold War years, McCarthyism provided a more hysterical variant of similar concerns about communists. Significantly, though, this came in the aftermath of the Truman Doctrine of 1946 and various other statements by the Truman Administration demonizing the Soviet Union. A more enduring strand of domestic concern about subversion was evident in recently released FBI files that reflected concerns about political activists. The files reveal, for example, that prominent movie actor Burt Lancaster, who had been very critical of the witch hunt for communists in Hollywood was forced to change his position to one of public support for the House Committee on Un-American activities in order to obtain a passport to travel to Europe to make a film. Efforts to stifle domestic dissent took on even greater salience during the 1960s and early 1970s as the struggle for civil rights overlapped and coalesced with the antipathy towards the Vietnam War. The Black Power Movement and its offshoot the Black Panther Party were regarded as threats to security and the FBI initiated a series of covert operations under the rubric of COINTELPRO or "Counterintelligence Program" - a program that had been initiated by Herbert Hoover in the 1950s against the Communist Party in the United States. Under this program, the kinds of techniques used against foreign agents were deployed against those who appeared to be challenging domestic order. Political harassment, intimidation, and violence were all used against those who were seen as enemies of the state.[5]

For all this, the state and its agencies of social control had a broad legitimacy in the United States that was not always paralleled in other countries. Partly this reflected the

United States political culture, but it also reflected periodic national self-cleaning cycles that focused on institutional abuses whether of the Central Intelligence Agency overseas or the FBI and other institutions at home. It also reflected the fact that while concerns over domestic security provided a distinct strand in the United States approach to security during the Cold War, this strand was actually rather muted. When compared to the preoccupation with external threats, the domestic or internal dimensions of security were comparatively low on the priority list. There were several reasons for this:

- The U.S. conception of itself as a "melting pot" a notion that assumes, implicitly if not explicitly, that immigrants to the United States develop an overwhelming loyalty that transcends allegiance to the land of their birth. When that loyalty is not taken for granted, then strong measures such as the incarceration of Americans of Japanese origin during World War Two are initiated. For the most part, however, these are aberrations. Much more prevalent, at least historically, has been the assumption that citizens have a primary and over-riding loyalty to the United States that provides an integral security cushion that both complements and facilitates the focus on external threats and challenges;

- The U.S. conception of itself as a "city on a hill", as a unique state that offers unprecedented opportunities for the pursuit of liberty and wealth. United States thinking about security is deeply influenced by traditions that hark back to the Founding Fathers. In the U.S. conception of itself, ideals are more important than self-interest, there is great mobility in society, and the legitimacy of institutions is

unquestioned and unchallenged. The notion of democracy is buttressed by the prevalence of a self-help ethos, and by opportunities for success. The Horatio Alger story is, at once, a morality tale, a pattern to emulate, a template for success for others to follow, and a partial explanation of why the United States has not--apart from a few traumatic but relatively short periods--been overly preoccupied with domestic or public security. In effect, domestic challenges have been a law and order problem not a security problem. Elsewhere, in countries where privilege is more obvious, financial and political oligarchies more powerful, and revolution the only way of bringing about social change, then government has to be far more vigilant about domestic security than in the United States;

- The exigency of the external threat. As suggested above, in the mid-twentieth century, the U.S. security blanket disappeared and the external threat became a national preoccupation. The Soviet Union and its communist allies were seen as both a military and ideological threat. Although this threat had an insidious domestic dimension--that became a cause celebre for Senator McCarthy and a continued concern of the FBI – the predominant focus was international competition. This competition was total, encompassing the military, economic, political and ideological domains. It included a nuclear arms race, the creation and maintenance of strategic alliances and a global military basing infrastructure for the United States, and a battle for the hearts and minds of nonaligned peoples and nations; and,

- The nature of the enemy. There is a strand in U.S. thinking about the world which

assumes a natural harmony of interests among states—a harmony that traditionally allowed the United States to remain aloof.[6] The concomitant of this is that when harmony is disturbed, it is usually the responsibility of a particular state or group of states --usually those without democratic governments--which then have to be dealt with in order to restore harmony. Almost by definition those who disturb the peace are villains, and when the United States is forced to take up arms against them, it embarked on a crusade for peace and freedom. The enemy is reviled. Although the Reagan administration (1980-1988) was perhaps the most explicit of all Cold War administrations in characterizing the Soviet Union as an evil empire, this was a sentiment that was in accord with the dominant motifs of its predecessors. Indeed, the continuity from the Truman Doctrine through John Kennedy's inaugural address, to the anti-Soviet rhetoric of Ronald Regan is difficult to over-estimate. The rhetoric was both political justification and a mobilization device. It justified policies that would otherwise have been unthinkable such as becoming deeply entangled in European power politics and maintaining a substantial U.S. military presence in Europe in peacetime. Involvement was born out of duty rather than self-aggrandizement—there was no alternative state that could mobilize the forces of freedom, providing either the wisdom or the power the United States could offer. If the United States was a deeply reluctant hegemonic power, its sense of duty and self-righteousness and a deep and abiding antipathy to those who did not share the liberal-democratic capitalist ethos made it a formidable adversary.

In sum, the initial Cold War security paradigm emphasized national security.

There was a monolithic threat to the United States that stemmed from an inherently evil enemy. Moreover, the threat was to the nation in every sense of the word. The United States did not distinguish between the state and citizens (with the loyalty of the vast majority of citizens being taken for granted and domestic security focusing on relatively small groups of dissidents). Everything was threatened by communism: fundamental freedoms, a way of life, the economic system, as well as deeply cherished values and traditions. The competition was total, embracing military confrontation while also extending to propaganda and psychological battles for the hearts and minds of allied and non-aligned states. The main arena on which the competition was played out was military, with the United States pursuing a strategy of extended deterrence through nuclear guarantees and a military presence in Europe. Confrontation was rare but highly dangerous and required that the United States play the game of brinkmanship very effectively. The aim was to make the adversary back down, an aim that was achieved, the proponents of this strategy believed, through a capacity for escalation dominance. This paradigm continued to have powerful adherents right up to the collapse of the Soviet Union and there were those who claimed that it was the basis for the policies that enabled the United States to win the Cold War.

II National Security and Cooperative Security

While the national security paradigm dominated the 1950s and remained powerful thereafter, it was increasingly subject to challenge by those who believed that the approach was both too narrow and too rigid. Critics claimed that the national security paradigm

encouraged distortion and exaggeration, a tendency to engage in worst case thinking and threat inflation, a loss of subtlety and nuance, and the demonizing of adversaries. They also noted that the Soviet Union was not the only danger: equally, if not more compelling, was the danger of nuclear war. And this was far less likely to be initiated by deliberate Soviet aggression than by miscalculation in a crisis or a war on the periphery of the superpowers' spheres of influence. Indeed, the security paradigm was broadened during the 1960s to encompass notions of joint security.[7] As many commentators pointed out, the superpowers were not only adversaries but also partners in managing their adversarial relationship. Notions of strategic stability—resulting from the interdependence created by mutual vulnerability to nuclear weapons—were gradually integrated into U.S. strategic thinking which moved from a zero-sum conception of security to a recognition that some kinds of initiatives could enhance both U.S. and Soviet security. The intellectual impulse for this emerged in the writings of analysts such as Thomas Schelling, who contended that even adversaries had common interests that could usefully be embodied in certain kinds of stabilizing arms control agreements; the political impulse emerged in the aftermath of the October 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, which highlighted the stark reality of strategic interdependence and the importance of mutual restraint in superpower confrontations; and the technological impulse came with the emergence of the capacity for mutual assured destruction as the overwhelming reality of strategic life, a reality that subsequently was underlined by the Soviet attainment of strategy parity. The notions of mutual security reflected an increasingly sophisticated conception of the superpower relationship as an adversary partnership, and of superpower crises as a mixture of coercing prudently and cooperating cheaply.[8]

For many Americans, however, the need to rely on the restraint of an enemy generally believed to be evil incarnate was uncomfortable to say the least. Not surprisingly, therefore, although the notion of common or cooperative security gained considerable ground in American thinking during the Cold War, it was never fully accepted: strategic stability enshrined in arms control agreements between Moscow and Washington was a major departure from a conception of national security that required strategic superiority over the Soviet Union. This unilateralist strand of thinking underwent a major resurgence in the early 1980s as the first Reagan administration (1980-1984) opted for the restoration of American strategic superiority. The competitive strategy was manifested in the enunciation of a strategy for prevailing in a protracted nuclear war, the development of an aggressively forward maritime strategy, and, most significantly, President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), which was intended to nullify the Soviet capacity to strike the American homeland with nuclear weapons. SDI, more than any other program symbolized the rejection of notions of strategic stability and mutual or cooperative security developed by the community of academic strategic analysts. In effect, it was more concerned with national than with international security, and was part of a strategy that was designed to coerce the Soviet Union rather than cooperate with it.

In the second Reagan administration (1984-1988), however, this position was softened as Reagan and Gorbachev found common cause in a vision of a nuclear free world that for all its limitations restored a sense of momentum to arms control and contributed enormously to the end of the Cold War. The rhetoric remained that of national security (unilateral strength to overcome the evil empire) but the end of the Cold War was achieved through a cooperative process in which Reagan and Gorbachev worked

together to transcend the security dilemma, to overcome a lack of trust, and to draw down the military confrontation in Europe and at the strategic level. The great irony of the end of the Cold War is that President Reagan, the supreme unilateralist, embraced a cooperative conception of security. He was able to do so successfully, in large part because he had pursued the unilateralist conception with such vigor that the United States seemed to be negotiating from strength to a greater extent than ever before. In the final analysis, however, the end of the Cold War was a triumph not for a narrow unilateral and nationalist conception of security but for more integrated cooperative approach.

The dialectic between U.S. conceptions of national security and cooperative security contributed to an effective strategy that proved capable of managing the Soviet Union and the dangers of nuclear war. Yet, the two conceptions of security also had much in common: they both focused on the core relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States and especially the strategic nuclear balance. The difference was in policy prescription and not in the focus of attention – which in both cases was military. Also, the differences were over strategic choices, not the fundamental importance of strategic nuclear weapons.

Not surprisingly, therefore, the U.S. conception of national security has continued into the post-Cold War world. The revolution in international relations has not been matched by a revolution in U.S. thinking about security. Indeed, there is an intellectual, emotional, and political legacy from the Cold War era that retains its hold on the way in which security is understood, discussed and conceptualized in the post-Cold War era.

III The Post Cold War Conception of Security

1. Continuity and Change: New Forms of Traditional Threats

With the end of the Cold war and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the U.S. conception of security changed, but not radically. There were additions and accretions, shifts of emphasis and focus, but at a fundamental level, there was less of a shift than might have been expected.

The conceptual overhang from the Cold War fundamentally influences the way in which the United States thinks about security. Security is now about other things as well as military challenges posed by great power; but it is still predominantly about nuclear weapons, threats from great powers as well as lesser nuclear powers, and a concern with maintaining technological advantages over all competitors, actual and potential. It is also about U.S. conceptions of order and stability, conceptions that continue to be rooted in American values, and an updated variant of Wilsonian idealism in which international peace is a product not only of the dominance of functioning democracies but also the prevalence of market economies. Indeed, the U.S. conception of security is bound up with a continuation of its role as benevolent hegemon and a sense that its power is the key factor underwriting international security and order. A sense of responsibility is combined with a sense of destiny, a sense of opportunity, and a profound belief that the United States can reshape the world in its own image. Wilsonian idealism has not so much disappeared; it has been integrated into U.S. thinking about international order and international security after the Cold War. It has taken on the hard edge of realism, yet remains--potentially at least--as expansive and as activist as it has always been. For the United States, international order requires that other states adhere to norms and forms of state behavior that accord with U.S. conceptions of what is appropriate and permissible. The United

States is not sensitive to the notion that one nation's order is another nation's hegemony. In effect, many of the concepts and ideas underlying U.S. notions of security during the Cold War have been perpetuated into the post-Cold War era.

Indeed, the United States still thinks about security predominantly in terms of military threats from hostile powers. Not surprisingly, therefore, it has been concerned about the spread of nuclear weapons and the continued challenge posed by rogue states, as well as the capabilities and intentions of potentially hostile great powers:

- Nuclear weapons and rogue states. The proliferation of nuclear weapons has become probably the single biggest issue for U.S. national security policy-makers, especially when combined with the spread of both ballistic and cruise missile technologies. In this connection, there have been important initiatives and programs for cooperative threat reduction. Working with Russia in dealing with the potential diffusion of nuclear materials, the United States devised a program, for Material Protection, Control and Accountability that has been innovative and important. This program rests upon notions - developed during the Cold War especially in the arms control community - that the security of the United States and the Soviet Union was interdependent and not a zero sum game. The thinking that infused strategic arms control has been carried over to a recognition that it is in the U.S. interest to stem the leakage of materials and possibly weapons. Nuclear concerns though loom much larger than this. Inhibiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons--and especially their acquisition by "rogue states" (which can be defined either as states that do not uphold the norms of international society or as states that do not accept U.S.

conceptions of how they should behave) has become one of the main priorities of U.S. policy. In some cases, this has allowed others to exploit a kind of "nuclear neuralgia" in Washington, with North Korea, in particular, succeeding in extracting economic concessions from the United States as part of the Clinton administration's effort to prevent the regime from acquiring nuclear weapons. The United States recognizes, however, that success in the effort to halt proliferation is far from certain. Consequently, there has to be a fallback. And because, of the "rogue" nature of some of the regimes involved, there is an assumption that they cannot be deterred by the threats of nuclear retaliation that worked during the Cold War. Consequently, ballistic missile defense is seen as essential. This concern with rogue states is understandable, but is also based on double standards: nuclear weapons in the hands of the United States are a force for stability; nuclear weapons in the hands of nations like Iraq and Iran are a major force for instability; and,

- Great powers as potential enemies. The United States, while enjoying its status as the sole remaining superpower, is concerned over future challenges to its power and status. Great powers, unless closely allied to Washington, are viewed as potential enemies. In this connection, China is critical. United States conceptions of, and attitudes toward, China are an uneasy combination of attraction and suspicion. On the one hand, China offers intriguing possibilities for market expansion; on the other hand, it offers major opportunities for military expansion. In some respects, the U.S. security debate on relations with China mirrors the arguments over policy towards the Soviet Union during the period of detente, when the key division was between

those who felt that enmeshing the enemy in a web of interdependencies through trade and other economic relationships would enhance stability and those who felt that a military competition, which the United States, with its superior technological and economic base, would win, was the only real guarantor of U.S. national security. This debate is likely to continue for some time with the United States' adopting a hedging strategy until driven by events to opt for a more definitive approach. Along with the concern over China there is also muted anxiety over a long-term resurgence of Russian military power. Indeed, there are some ironic and even paradoxical elements in United States thinking about Russia. The United States is far from comfortable with a weak Russia that no longer exerts total control over its inventory of nuclear materials, and that suffers from pervasive corruption and symbiotic linkages between organized crime, business and politics. At the same time, it does not particularly want to see the re-emergence of a strong and assertive Russia. Yet it is hard to see how Russia can deal with domestic problems of crime, corruption, and economic development without a renewed accretion of power at the center.

One response of the United States to security challenges from great powers that are potential competitors and rogue states is to maintain technological superiority. The United States has long held a position as the world's technological leader, and maintaining this edge over actual and potential competitors is still regarded as critical to national security. This is often cast in terms of international order; yet it has as much, if not more, to do with the perpetuation of American hegemony as with notions of order and stability. For American policy-makers, though, the two are indistinguishable: the United States is the

custodian of global order and stability and needs a technological edge to uphold its position as benevolent hegemon. Conversely, should the U.S.'s technological edge be lost and its hegemonic position diminished, the result would be major breakdown of order and stability in the global system. In effect, the United States has tacitly merged the notions of stability and technological superiority, so that they have become functional equivalents of one another. The technological edge has to be incorporated into military systems that would ensure continued U.S. military preponderance against any conceivable combination of enemies. In many ways of course this harks back to the Cold War. Indeed, the significance of the Cold War legacy in thinking about security has been evident in the money that continues to be poured into traditional military systems for land, sea and air combat and in the reluctance of the U.S. military through the 1990s to move away from the notion of simultaneously having to respond to two major regional contingencies. The U.S. military is smaller than it was during the Cold War, but its shape, structure, equipment, deployment, and budget are still recognizable as smaller variants of the old model.

At the same time, there has been a recognition that the world has become more complex than it was during the Cold War and that the United States cannot focus exclusively on traditional geopolitical threats. It is in this connection that the concept of security has been broadened to cover an array of new threats

2. The Emergence of Asymmetric Transnational Threats

Although powerful factors of continuity shape United States thinking about security, there are some significant changes. The components of the post-Cold War security paradigm are generally more diverse and diffuse than during the Cold War. This

is especially the case in terms of the sources of threat. Traditional threats from great powers and rogue states are accompanied by transnational threats that focus on non-traditional targets and that cannot be dealt with through traditional means. Current threats are less predictable than those in the past and come from more diverse sources: computer hackers and criminals, disaffected domestic groups and radical terrorists, including those motivated by Islamic fundamentalism.

In addition, there are new vulnerabilities that can be exploited by this new mix of actors and potential adversaries. This is especially the case in the area of information systems, where U.S. technological sophistication has actually created new dependencies and vulnerabilities that could be exploited by hackers, terrorists, criminals, and hostile states. With the information infrastructure used to control oil and gas pipelines, electric power grids, transportation systems, global financial transactions through Fedwire, Chips, and Swift, as well as many commercial enterprises, it has become a very tempting and lucrative target for any group or state wishing to do harm to the United States. Moreover, this is an area where there has also been a diffusion of attack capabilities as well as a decoupling of the traditional linkages between territorial integrity and security. Indeed, there now exists a new set of vulnerabilities that are wholly independent of territory or physical resources. As Roger Molander and several other analysts at the RAND Corporation argued in *Strategic Information Warfare* (1996), extensive reliance on computerized and linked information systems has rendered the U.S. homeland vulnerable to what is, in effect, a new strategic threat. Hackers, terrorist groups, criminal organizations, and rival states could target the United States information infrastructure, creating chaos and disruption of business and government. "Given the increased reliance

of the US economy and society on high-performance computer networks, U.S. infrastructures represent a new set of 'strategic' targets. Threats against key NII targets may have an extremely coercive value, while outright attacks may have a powerful disruptive effect on the national decision making authority. US borders will not provide sanctuary from this kind of conflict."[9] Moreover, the entry costs to be able to pose such a threat are very modest, especially when compared to the damage that can be inflicted. This could act as a great leveler or equalizer, something that could prove particularly important not only in regional conflicts but also when the United States attempts to take offensive actions against transnational criminal and terrorist organizations. An additional complication is that the perpetrators of cyber-attacks are difficult to identify, providing a veil of anonymity that is uncomfortable for a national security community that has long been accustomed to very explicit threat assessments and a keen sense of who the enemy was (if not always knowledge of what the enemy might do next).

The anonymity of cyber-attacks is mirrored by the anonymity of what is sometimes called "the new terrorism."[10] Along with all this goes a rather more diverse set of targets than the United States has to be concerned about than in the past. As well as "virtual targets" with major consequences in the physical world, the United States has to be worried about a terrorist attack against major cities, as well as its citizens, armed forces and corporations overseas. Terrorists are not always identifiable; nor are they easily deterred – as is evident from the number of suicide bombings in the Middle East. In one sense, therefore, the U.S. conception of security has to be disaggregated. During the Cold War, there was no real differentiation between an attack on the state and an attack on its citizens; both were secured through the threat of nuclear retaliation. In the post-Cold War

world, however, homeland security has taken on greater immediacy with money being allocated to disaster management at the city and local level, targeted especially to upgrade the capacity for immediate response in the event that weapons of mass destruction are used.

Terrorism, of course, is far from a new threat. During the Cold War, though it was simply one more component of the much broader struggle. Moreover, Soviet and other state sponsorship for terrorism had a silver lining: the sponsors were concerned that they not suffer as a result of terrorist actions against the United States and its allies. Consequently, strict conditions and restraints were imposed on terrorist organizations as the price for support. Terrorism was also relatively small-scale and in some respects almost predictable. Since then, however, terrorism has become a much more serious threat and loomed increasingly large for several reasons:

- The change in the nature of terrorism itself and the rise of new terrorism - a form of terrorism driven by religious fanaticism or nihilism rather than class struggle, using criminal activities or individual wealth to fund itself, and unconstrained by the restrictions that traditionally accompanied state sponsorship. It is a form of terrorism that, according to some observers, is likely to result in the infliction of mass casualties. It was symbolized in the figure of Osama bin Laden;

- A greater sense of United States vulnerabilities. Although the United States was concerned about terrorism during the Cold War, it was essentially a problem related to forward deployment of forces and one that affected the European allies

much more than it did the United States itself. This has changed: the United States homeland has become a target and is no longer immune to attack. Terrorism is no longer someone else's problem; it is now immediate, direct, and painful;

- Concern over terrorist use of weapons of mass destruction. Traditionally, there was a belief that although terrorism targeted the innocent, it was political theater, designed to convey a message rather than create destruction for its own sake. Large-scale casualties were not something that terrorists necessarily wanted, and indeed something that they recognized could prove counter-productive. Comforting assumptions of this kind were ripped away in March 1995 when Aum Shinri Kyo used Sarin gas on the Tokyo underground. As Bruce Hoffman noted, this action crossed what had been an important psychological threshold.[11] Although, in the short term at least, there have not been the imitative acts that might have been expected, the breaching of the threshold also crossed a psychological barrier that is no longer likely to act as a constraint. In one sense, of course, U.S. vulnerability to WMD is nothing new. Since the advent of a Soviet strategic nuclear capability, the U.S. population has been vulnerable to nuclear attack. That vulnerability was mitigated, however, by the operation of nuclear deterrence and the similar exposure of the Soviet population. Mutual assured destruction, in effect, blunted the sense of vulnerability. In a world where threats are more diffuse, where enemies are less easy to identify and, therefore, more difficult to retaliate against, deterrence does not provide the same surety that it did during the Cold War. Moreover, the Cold War vulnerability, in effect, was latent.

It only came to the fore in a crisis and even then there were believed to be several thresholds that had to be crossed and multiple steps on the escalation ladder that had to be taken before the homeland was in imminent danger. Seen against this background, the idea of a possible terrorist bolt from the blue involving nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons is both novel and disturbing. Not surprisingly, the insidious nature of the biological warfare threat and the demands it would place on emergency preparedness in general and the medical community in particular have become the stuff of popular novels, the rationale for contingency planning for a series of worst case scenarios, and the source of significant federal funds for emergency preparedness at the local level; and,

- The rise of domestic terrorism. Perhaps nowhere has the traditional area of concern about national security taken on a domestic dimension than in response to the new terrorism. Although the main reason for this is a new sense of vulnerability, it is also explicable as a response to the rise of the militias and other groups that reject the legitimacy of the federal government and that are willing to use force to halt what they see as the aggression of the state against them. In part, the rise of these groups is based on a notion that government has let them down, a feeling that is especially strong in rural America, where in the last two decades farm foreclosures reached record levels.[12] Waco and Ruby Ridge, however, also provided "confirmation" of the notion that the government had declared war on at least a segment of its citizenry, and thereby justified these citizens' declaring war on the government. Although efforts have been made to monitor the militias more

effectively since Oklahoma City, there is still a reluctance to accept that domestic terrorism is as much of a threat to the United States as international terrorism. Fortunately, by preparing for the international variant, the United States is also better prepared for domestic terrorism.

In addition to cyber-attacks and terrorism, a third component of the new transnational threat category was transnational or international organized crime. Although drug trafficking had been declared a national security threat by President Reagan in 1986, it became clear during the 1990s that the organized crime problem was developing in a way that both subsumed and accentuated the security problems created by drug trafficking and consumption. The most obvious aspect of the problem was its impact on states in transition. While the end of the Cold War initially appeared to be a triumph for freedom and the market, the result was not the emergence of well-functioning democracies and privatized market economies in states in transition. Instead, there has been an epidemic of crime and corruption, in which the new rulers are not so much good democrats as a new breed of criminal entrepreneurs. It also became clear that organized crime was one of the main beneficiaries of globalization and that it was exploiting the global trade, global financial and global communications systems to develop unprecedented power and reach.

There are at least three ways in which transnational organized crime impinges on security. Some organized crime activities such as trafficking in weapons, drugs, or people can threaten political stability, contribute to violence in society and violate fundamental human rights that governments are supposed to uphold. Second the concentration of illegal power in society can in significantly influence political, economic, and social life.

In some countries organized crime embeds itself not only in the social fabric and the economy but also in the political system, developing a deeply symbiotic and collusive relationship with the political and administrative elites that distorts the purposes that state structures are designed to serve. In some cases, this symbiosis takes the form of what Godson has termed the political-criminal nexus. When the criminal organizations are the more powerful partner in this relationship, then the state can be understood as a captured state – a development that clearly negates hopes for democratic transitions. The third, and closely related, way in which organized crime can threaten national security is through strategies and processes designed to manage the risks posed by governments and law enforcement agencies. Most transnational criminal organizations adopt some kind of risk management strategy to protect the organization and its activities. One of their most potent tools is corruption, which is intended to neutralize the control powers of states but can also undermine their power and authority. Indeed, organized crime–corruption networks can be understood as the HIV of the modern state, circumventing and breaking down the natural defenses of the body politic. This was recognized in a National Security Council report of December 2000 that examined the impact of organized crime on U.S. interests worldwide. The report reviewed emerging trends such as growing criminal cooperation and also highlighted multiple activities ranging from money laundering, alien smuggling and environmental crimes, to hi-tech crime, counterfeiting and intellectual property theft. It suggested that by 2010 there could well be problems with criminal states, a development that would combine the old and new agendas of international security in a very convenient and neat package.[13]

3. The Clinton Administration's Responses

The Clinton Administration, in developing a security posture to support its strategy of engagement and enlargement, explicitly acknowledged the need to contend with security risks that are not solely military in nature. In particular it was necessary to recognize "an emerging class of transnational environmental and natural resource issues, and rapid population growth and refugee flows, are increasingly affecting international stability and consequently will present new challenges to U.S. strategy. Other increasingly interconnected, transnational phenomena such as terrorism, narcotics trafficking and organized crime also have security implications both for present and long-term American policy: the destructive forces we face inside our borders often have their origins overseas in rogue nations that breed and harbor terrorists, in countries where drugs are produced and in international organized crime cartels, which are principally headquartered outside our borders; and free and open societies, in a world brought closer together by a technology revolution where information, money and people can move rapidly and easily, are inherently more challenged by these kinds of forces."[14] Accordingly, the three major challenges identified above, i.e., terrorism, information attacks against U.S. critical infrastructure, and transnational organized crime, have received attention as part of what is sometimes described as asymmetric threats. In effect, the asymmetric threat scenarios are an acknowledgment that threats can emanate not only from other states but also from transnational and sub-national actors.

At one level, the Clinton Administration gave considerable attention to the terrorism threat, the threat to information systems, and the transnational organized crime threat. In June 1995 Presidential Decision Directive 39 enunciated U.S. policy on counter-terrorism,

a policy that covered deterrence of terrorist actions, reduction of U.S. vulnerabilities, and preparations for consequence management. Subsequently, in May 1998, PDD-62 outlined "a new and more systematic approach to fighting terrorism by bringing a program management approach to U.S. counter-terrorism efforts."[15] The Directive also established an Office of the National Coordinator for Security, Infrastructure Protection and Counter-Terrorism. The creation of an institutional basis for coordinating policy was followed by increased allocation of resources and in FY 2000, for example, the Administration allocated 10 billion dollars to deal with the threat of biological terrorism through vaccine research and development, public health surveillance, and metropolitan medical response systems. At the same time, it was clear that the administration's most important goals were domestic and economic – and it wanted to do nothing that might jeopardize these priorities. As a result, at the implementation level, the response was far less vigorous than might have been expected from the rhetoric. Although some steps were taken against Bin Laden and the Al Qaida network after the attacks on the U.S. embassies in Tanzania and Kenya, the response was neither sustained nor systematic, and had more symbolic importance than substantive impact. Although PDD-62 was an important step forward, therefore, it was still merely an incremental shift.

PDD-62 was accompanied by another Presidential Decision Memorandum--PDD-63. As well as reiterating the importance of the Office of the National Coordinator, PDD-63 established several other bodies to deal specifically with cyber-threats.[16] These included the National Infrastructure Protection Center and the Critical Infrastructure Assurance Office. Although these presidential directives revealed clearly that terrorism and cyber-threats were on the agenda and receiving high level attention, a lot more needed

to be done to develop coherent policies, particularly in the area of information security. Indeed, in spite of PDD-63 the United States still did not have a coherent policy for dealing with information security, partly because of differences between government and the private sector over both the seriousness of the problem and the role of government as opposed to market forces in combating it, partly because of continued bureaucratic rivalry and competition and exacerbated by the failure to establish clear and exclusive lines of responsibility.

Transnational organized crime was also a focus of Presidential attention. Clinton, in October 1995, issued PDD-42 which described organized crime as a threat to United States national security and provided the basis for the subsequent development of an International Crime Control Strategy, finally completed and released in 1998.[17] The strategy had gone through a long inter-agency process and, in spite of the obvious compromises, effectively elucidated both domestic and international responses. It articulated eight broad goals with thirty related objectives. Among the goals were to extend the first line of defense beyond US borders; to protect US borders by attacking smuggling; to counter international financial crime; to foster international cooperation and the rule of law; and to deny safe haven to international criminals.

One theme that was explicit in this strategy and often figured in the administration's pronouncements was that these new threats required new forms of institutional cooperation at home and new forms of international cooperation. Internationally, the theme was multilateral cooperation. The U.S. government was responsible for protecting the lives and personal safety of Americans, maintaining political freedom and independence as a nation and promoting the well-being and prosperity of the

nation, but as the document acknowledged, "no matter how powerful we are as a nation, we cannot always secure these basic goals unilaterally. Whether the problem is nuclear proliferation, regional instability, the reversal of reform in the former Soviet empire, international crime and terrorism, or unfair trade practices, the threats and challenges we face frequently demand cooperative, multinational solutions. Therefore, the only responsible U.S. strategy is one that seeks to ensure U.S. influence over and participation in collective decision-making in a wide and growing range of circumstances."[18] Domestically, the theme was inter-agency cooperation. Because transnational threats blur the distinction between national security and law enforcement the responses also have to combine diplomacy and defense on the one hand with domestic law and order strategies on the other. Institutional adaptation is essential. The FBI, for example, is the lead agency on terrorism, but also needs to work with the intelligence community as well as the Department of Defense. The need for cooperation was also evident in peacekeeping contingencies, which generally result from state weakness rather than strength. This was acknowledged in Presidential Decision Directive 71, which directed the State Department to establish a new program that would train civilian police for international peacekeeping missions around the world.[19] Criminal justice, both in the United States and overseas was becoming integrated into what was a broader strategy of national security.

In sum, the Clinton administration moved towards a broader conception of national security. Unfortunately, it did too little to establish or legitimize this conception either with the U.S. public or in the national security apparatus. The allocation of resources was not congruent with either the new challenges or the new roles and missions that had been identified. At the political level, national security, even more broadly defined, was far less

important and compelling than domestic policy issues and domestic politics. At the bureaucratic level, the military still focused on traditional challenges, clinging to the need to be prepared simultaneously to meet two major regional contingencies. The result was that, although the administration had made considerable progress, the United States in effect retained the Cold War security paradigm with a few additions and accretions.

IV The Bush Administration and September 11

Prior to the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the Bush administration had reverted, at least in part, to a narrower conception of security than the vision enunciated, albeit imperfectly, by its predecessor. At the same time, the administration was doing far more than any of its predecessors to modernize and adapt U.S. military policy to the post-Cold War world. The Bush administration gave a high priority to ballistic missile defense, focused its attention on rogue states and downgraded some of the Clinton administration's emphasis on new threats such as transnational organized crime. Implicitly at least, some of the new challenges were dismissed as "boutique" security issues rather than seen as enduring components of a new and very different world. One area in which there was a distinct shift of policy, for example, was the effort to combat money laundering. This had been a key component of the International Crime Control Strategy, but was significantly downgraded in the early months of the Bush administration. At the same time, the Department of Defense was undertaking its Quadrennial Defense Review and, in strictly military terms, the Bush administration was clearly going further than its predecessors to adjust military policy to

the Post-Cold War world. This was evident on September 5, 2001, when Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, in testimony before the Senate Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, elucidated key components of the revised military posture. Among the changes were the following:

- A new approach to planning for and sizing forces that "focuses less on specific regional conflicts, and more on building a portfolio of U.S. military capabilities to meet the wide range of contingencies we are likely to face in the future. Because we cannot anticipate who might threaten us in the future, but can predict with some confidence the means an adversary is likely to employ, we will likely be shifting from a "threat-based" to a "capabilities-based" approach to long-term planning;[20]

- A revised approach to force-sizing that replaced the two Major Theater War standard with a new construct would prepare forces to defend the U.S., deter in four critical regions, prevail in two overlapping conflicts, while leaving the President the option to commit forces in either of those conflicts to impose our will on the adversary—including regime change and occupation.[21]

- A major reduction of nuclear weapons as part of the effort to achieve a strong, credible deterrent with the lowest number of nuclear weapons consistent with U.S. national security needs and alliance commitments. (It was subsequently revealed that the Nuclear Posture Review envisaged a cut in the U.S. arsenal to 1,700-2,200

operationally deployed nuclear weapons over 10 years period from about 6,000 now in the inventory.[22]); and,

- "A re-focused and revitalized missile defense program, shifting from a single-site 'national' missile defense approach, to a broad-based research, development and testing approach that will explore many previously untested technologies and approaches, and lead to the development and deployment of defenses able to intercept missiles of various ranges in various stages of flight. This will include the capability to defend not only the American people, but our friends, allies and deployed forces as well, from limited threats."[23]

The Secretary of Defense also emphasized the efforts to make the Department of Defense more efficient. Significantly, and somewhat prophetically, he also noted that in the 21st Century, "U.S. homeland defense takes on increasing importance."[24] Noting that the Cold War, with its threat of missile and bomber strikes had ended US geographic advantage, Rumsfeld suggested that the "proliferation of weapons with increasing range and power into the hands of multiple potential adversaries means that the coming years will see an expansion of the risks to U.S. population centers—as well as those our allies. We will face new threats—from satchel bombs, cruise missiles, and ballistic missiles of varying ranges. This is a major change in our circumstance. We can no longer count on future conflicts remaining largely contained within their region of origin far from our shores."[25] The Secretary of Defense also suggested that without missile defense the United States might be loathe to intervene against regional aggression even to protect its interests:

"the alternatives would be to do nothing and thereby let aggression stand, to repel the aggression (and thereby put our populations at risk), or to attempt to preempt, a difficult decision for any country."[26] In effect, he argued, without ballistic missile defense the United States would no longer be able or willing "to project force to defend peace and freedom in this new century". [27] Rumsfeld also noted that if the United States is "to remain engaged in the world, the capability to defend the United States from a range of new asymmetric threats must be a high priority."[28]

There are three striking aspects of this statement. First, the emphasis on homeland defense is unprecedented, surpassing even that of the Reagan Administration and its Strategic Defense Initiative. Second, the threat to the United States homeland is seen largely in traditional military terms. It is, in effect, a post-Cold War version of the United States conception of military security during the Cold War – but without the reassuring faith in deterrence. In spite of the inclusion of satchel bombs the emphasis is almost exclusively on the missile threat. Third, the testimony was given less than a week prior to the September 11 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

In the aftermath of this attack, the Bush administration revised its conception of security in several ways, acknowledging that the threat to the United States no longer came exclusively from states – or exclusively from overseas. Indeed, what was most striking about the response was its comprehensiveness, something that was reflected in the role played by a variety of different administration figures. As expected, the Secretaries of State and Defense were prominent. Significantly, however, the Attorney-General and the Secretary of the Treasury were equally involved, reflecting the fact that the enemy was

both foreign and domestic, and that going after the finances of the Al Qaida network was an important component of the U.S. response.

The domestic dimension of the response was evident in the prominent role played by the Attorney General and the FBI, the number of detainees who were thought to be supportive of or involved with Al Qaida, and the continued warnings about sleeper cells. Moreover, the government was given new powers with the Patriot Act for Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act (October 25, 2001).[29] The Act was specifically designed to deter and punish terrorist acts in the United States and around the world, and to enhance law enforcement investigatory tools. One of the key provisions was enhanced authority to intercept wire, oral, and electronic communications relating to terrorism as well as to intercept the same communications relating to computer fraud and abuse offenses. Another was authority to share investigative information regarding the contents of such communications with "any other Federal law enforcement, intelligence, protective, immigration, national defense, or national security official to the extent that such contents include foreign intelligence or counterintelligence… to assist the official who is to receive that information in the performance of his official duties".[30]

The legislation also strengthened the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act and provided for easier use of pen registers and trap and trace devices. It also included measures to protect the borders and more stringent immigration procedures. Other provisions covered the arrest of terrorist aliens who could be retained in custody for six-month increments where they were deemed to pose a national security threat.

Critical infrastructures protection was to be enhanced through the establishment of

a National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center (NISAC) to serve as a source of national competence to address critical infrastructure protection and continuity through support for activities related to counterterrorism, threat assessment, and risk mitigation.

In addition, many of the provisions of the Patriot Act were designed to strengthen the prevention, detection, and prosecution of international money laundering and the financing of terrorism. These included not only domestic measures but also "a clear national mandate for subjecting to special scrutiny those foreign jurisdictions, financial institutions operating outside of the United States, and classes of international transactions or types of accounts that pose particular, identifiable opportunities for criminal abuse."[31] The Secretary of the Treasury was given broad discretion to take measures tailored to the particular money laundering problems presented by these jurisdictions, institutions, and transactions and types of accounts. The Act also provided for what was termed "long-arm jurisdiction over foreign money launderers," and-- as suggested below--provided a basis for multilateral initiatives.[32]

In addition to all this, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld began to use the language of networks, acknowledging the amorphous nature of the enemy. There was still a traditional element in the response with the focus on state support for terrorism reflected in the decision to attack Al Qaida in Afghanistan, hitherto a safe haven for the terrorist network. Significantly, however, this was accompanied by a major law enforcement effort to identify and disrupt Al Qaida cells and arrest their members. Moreover, this effort was multilateral with authorities in Western Europe taking action in parallels with those in the United States. An administration, which had previously appeared to be somewhat unilateralist in its approach to security and indeed other issues, embraced multilateralism

with enthusiasm. Nowhere was this more obvious than in the campaign against terrorist finances. Indeed, this represented a remarkable about-face as the Administration began to use instruments designed to combat transnational organized crime to trace and freeze terrorist assets. The Financial Action Task Force, a body set up by the Group of Seven in 1989 to develop financial standards to combat money laundering extended its mandate to facilitate the search for terrorist funding.

Perhaps most dramatic of all, however, was the creation of the Office of Homeland Security, with the mission of developing and coordinating the implementation of a comprehensive national strategy to secure the United States from terrorist threats or attacks. The Office has a coordinating role for all efforts by the executive branch to detect, prepare for, prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks within the United States. Its task includes identifying priorities and coordinating efforts for collection and analysis of information regarding terrorist activities and groups within the United States, and, in collaboration with the National Security Adviser, establishing priorities for collection of intelligence outside the United States regarding threats of terrorism within the United States.[33] It has a mandate to work with federal, state, and local agencies to facilitate and coordinate intelligence collection, but also to ensure that such intelligence is disseminated to all appropriate agencies.

Important as this initiative is, there are question marks about its likely effectiveness. Critics have likened the role of the director to that of the Drug Czar who has wide responsibility but no budgetary authority and whose impact has, therefore, been limited. Homeland security is certainly a high priority and the Administration has allocated major resources to the effort. In the FY 2003 Budget, $37.7 billion is devoted to homeland

security, almost doubling the FY 2002 figure of $19.5 billion.[34] The four priorities for this money are supporting first responders, defending against bio-terrorism, securing the borders, and using 21st Century technology to secure the homeland. The extent to which the Director of the Office for Homeland Security will determine resource allocation is uncertain. Under these circumstances, there is a real danger that, as the shock of September 11 wears off, there will be a reversion to bureaucratic normality, with departments and agencies acting as semi-independent fiefdoms pursuing independent strands of policy rather than participating in a cohesive and coordinated collective response.

Questions have also been raised about the domestic implications of the new laws to combat terrorism. Privacy advocates and those concerned about civil rights and traditional American freedoms worry that the always delicate balancing act between security and freedom has swung too far towards security. This debate will be a recurrent one as the terrorism threat is unlikely to go away even if the Al Qaida network is severely degraded. It is clear that the United States provides an immensely rich and attractive target set for terrorists of all kind, domestic and foreign. Moreover, as those who have emphasized the emergence of asymmetric threats have long noted, the diffusion of technology and the capacity to inflict harm have spread well beyond state actors.

In many respects, the Bush administration's response to September 11 has been remarkable. The administration reversed some policies, created new bureaucratic entities, adopted the language (if not always the reality) of network warfare and allocated resources to areas that had been largely neglected. Yet there are still signs that the administration is clinging in some respects to a traditional security paradigm. President Bush, for example,

in his 2002 State of the Union address focused not only on terrorism but also on the "Axis of Evil" – Iraq, Iran and North Korea, all of which have nuclear programs that help to justify Ballistic Missile Defense. The administration has also used the events of September 11 to underline the need for a missile defense system even though the imaginative approach used by the terrorists – often described as "high concept, low tech" – highlighted the limits of such a system. Certainly, the three states identified by President Bush cannot be ignored. A case can also be made for ballistic missile defense--on the (unproven) assumption that nuclear deterrence would not be effective against rogue states. A defensive missile system could also be part of a broader defensive strategy which recognizes that non-traditional attack methods are more likely than the known and familiar. In other words, although many aspects of the Bush administration's approach to national security are laudable, there is also a regressive tendency to revert to familiar and known threats when the real challenges are elsewhere. This is understandable: developing a slightly novel variant of the traditional conception of security is easier than acknowledging that the United States is in a new security environment in which the real challenge comes not from states but from transnational entities that compensate for limited power with fierce determination, imagination, and an ability to exploit the strength and sophistication of its own economy and society against the United States.

There is a deep irony here. The Clinton administration made many of the necessary conceptual adjustments but lacked the will and commitment to accompany them with appropriate resource allocations. The Bush administration has the will and commitment on the resource side but seems unwilling to crystallize fully the new security paradigm that is so obviously needed. Although U.S. thinking about security has evolved considerably

since the end of the Cold War, it is arguable that there is still a need for the full articulation of a non-traditional threat paradigm that should accompany, if not supercede, the traditional paradigm. Great power rivalry and large-scale military conflicts are not going to disappear. But they are likely to be less frequent, are only one of the threats that have to be faced, and are not as pervasive or immediate as in the past. Accordingly, the final section of this paper articulates the components of a new security paradigm appropriate not only for the post-Cold War world but also for the world after September 11.

V A 21st Century Security Paradigm

In an important look ahead by the U.S. government, the National Intelligence Council, in December 2000, issued a report entitled Global Trends 2015. Comprehensive in scope, this report focused on major drivers and developed several alternative futures, providing what remains perhaps the most serious assessment of the future security environment by the United States government. Although it left policy-makers to draw out the implications, it was a step towards the recognition that security issues and governance issues are becoming increasingly entangled with one another. If anything this conclusion was reaffirmed by the events of September 11. Indeed, the challenge of security in the 21st Century transcends Al Qaida even though the network--in spite of U.S. military success in Afghanistan--is likely to remain for some time the most immediate and serious threat to United States security. The challenge is to establish a degree of governance in a world of growing disorder. It is a formidable challenge, reflecting new complexities in global politics

that call many of the existing assumptions into question, and demanding innovative and imaginative responses based on new organizational structures as well as new security mechanisms and instruments. Perhaps most of all it requires a sensitivity to enemies who make up for their lack of raw power in their capacity to fight smart – and sometimes to avoid fighting at all, preferring corruption and cooption to confrontation and conflict.

There are several characteristics of this new environment that are not ephemeral or temporary characteristics, but emergent realities that need be taken into account as policy makers struggle to establish order out of disorder. They have to be both appreciated fully and integrated into a new framework for policy and strategy. The first is the emergence of a new set of what James Rosenau termed "sovereignty free" actors, capable of exercising major influence on political and economic processes in weak, developing, and transitional states and with a capacity to mobilize resource with "the power to hurt."[35] In some cases such as Al Qaida, this is combined with a visceral hatred for the United States. Indeed, one of the most important facets of the Al Qaida network is its anti-hegemonic impulse. Adopting a role traditionally played by states, Al Qaida has challenged United States hegemony in the world. The difficulty is that governments, including that of the United States, have developed diplomatic and military systems and institutions that are prepared and equipped to deal with threats from other governments. They are familiar with a struggle of like versus like in which the actor with most resources comes out ahead; they are not prepared for a struggle in which the enemy is not only dynamic and ruthless, but also amorphous, adaptable, and highly resilient.

A second new reality is that the old distinction between foreign and domestic has broken down. Transnational networks by their very nature transcend borders and become

embedded in the society and economy of host nations such as the United States.

The third reality is that states are not what they were – or at least are not what we thought they were. The world has entered the era of the qualified state – the emergence of weak states that are unable to maintain authority and legitimacy or make appropriate provision for their citizens. Such states are often unable to eliminate no-go zones in their territory and thereby easily become safe havens for transnational criminal or terrorist networks.

The fourth reality is that the United States has to confront a new breed of smart enemies that are: network-based; transnational in scope; highly flexible and adaptable in their operations; learn from their mistakes; have an ability to both exploit and embed themselves in social and financial institutions in ways that are virtually undetectable; and possess a capacity for regeneration even when they have suffered considerable degradation. Terrorist and criminal networks are smart organizations with an impressive capacity to learn, to adapt, and to improve what they are doing. They are also organizations that fully exploit the technological diffusion that the Bush administration has recognized as a major challenge for the United States.

The implications of all this are extremely sobering. The new security environment is far more formidable than the straightforward military threat to which the United States and its allies became so accustomed during the Cold War. The Bush administration has recognized this and has adapted to some of the new realities. Yet, if the United States is to respond effectively to the challenges of the twenty first century, there are at least three thing it has to do.

The first is to meet Sun Tzu's very old imperative to know the enemy. This requires far better intelligence than ever before. Much of this can be collected only through human sources rather than signal intelligence and only through multilateral efforts. U.S. intelligence agencies need to collaborate much more fully with foreign agencies that can infiltrate terrorist and criminal networks with greater ease and far lower risk of detection than can U.S. agents. Knowing the new enemy also requires extremely effective techniques for fusion of highly classified and open source material, traditional intelligence and law enforcement intelligence, foreign intelligence and domestic intelligence, and strategic warning and tactical indicators. For many challenges and contingencies in the new security environment intelligence superiority is far more important than weapons superiority. It also requires a far greater focus on networks that goes beyond rhetoric. It is essential, for example, to understand the dynamics of terrorist and criminal networks, to anticipate their responses to both military and law enforcement attacks and the various ways in which they are able to regenerate themselves. Unless this is done, the United States will always be reactive.

Second, it is essential to adopt new ways of thinking that go well beyond the conventional wisdom. A nuclear weapon delivery system in the future, for example, might well be an inter-modal container brought into a U.S. container port as part of a legitimate shipment. Indeed, container defense (or at least detection) might be more important than ballistic missile defense. For United States national security planners and policy-makers the challenge is to think differently. Industrial or technological superiority, or even information dominance is not necessarily the key to dealing effectively with enemies for whom traditional notions of victory and defeat mean very little so long as they can continue to

inflict pain on the United States.

Finally the United States needs to reassess institutions and procedures for making national security policy. The institutional stove-piping that characterizes not only intelligence collection and analysis but also strategic planning and task implementation must give way to institutional innovation, comprehensive intelligence sharing and what might be described as the creation of smart institutions to combat smart enemies. Anything less is unlikely to succeed. Although the creation of the Office of Homeland Security was both timely and important, it has simply added one more layer of bureaucracy to a process that needs to be as un-bureaucratic as possible. Similarly, the Patriot Act mandates more information exchanges among existing institutions; it does not envisage organizing government in new ways that rely more on flexible network structures than strict hierarchies.

In the past, reinventing government was a useful political slogan; in the future, reinventing key aspects of the national security apparatus is essential.

In sum, the major challenge for the future will be closing the gap between a broadened and novel security agenda and a view of security that looks to the future but stills sees it as merely an extension of the past rather than as radically different. Critical in this process is the need for a much more profound understanding of an underlying reality--not all security challenges are military in nature and not all security challenges can be dealt with by military means. Recognizing this is crucial to the development of a U.S. national security strategy that is not only comprehensive and balanced, but also appropriate to the challenges of the twenty-first century.

[1] The author would like to acknowledge the incisive and valuable comments on an earlier draft of this paper by Joseph Lepgold. He is sorely missed both personally and professionally.
[2] John Gerrard Ruggie, "Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations." *International Organization* Winter 1993 pp.139-174;
[3] This is a point made to the author by Joseph Lepgold.
[4] Godson, R., *Dirty Tricks or Trump Cards*, (Washington: Brassey's, 1995) p.66
[5] Brian Glick *War At Home: Covert Action Against U.S. Activists and What We Can Do About It,* (South End Press; Boston, 1989)
[6] This and other cultural facets of United States foreign policy have been brilliantly dissected by Stanley Hoffmann,. See, for example, his *Gulliver's Troubles or The Setting of American Foreign Policy* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1968)
[7] A very useful and succinct analysis of this evolution is found in Richard Shultz, "An Introduction to International Security" in Richard Shultz, Roy Godson, Ted Greenwood, (eds.) *Security Studies for the 1990s* (Washington: Brassey's U.S., 1993) pp. 43-64 especially p.54

[8] Glenn Snyder and Paul Diesing, *Conflict Among Nations* (Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press, 1977)
[9] Roger Molander et al, *Strategic Information Warfare* (Santa Monica: RAND, 1996) p.16
[10] See Walter Laqueur, The New Terrorism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999)
[11] Bruce Hoffmann, *Inside Terrorism* (London: Indigo, 1998) p. 202
[12] Joel Dyer, Harvest of Rage: (Boulder: Westview Press, 1997)

[13] United States National Security Council, *International Crime Threat Assessment*. (Washington:, The Council, 2000) Available at http://clinton4.nara.gov/WH/EOP/NSC/html/NSC_Documents.html

[14] *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement*, (Washington: The White House, February 1996)
[15]. For details of this document see: www.ciao.gov/CIAO_Document_Library/archives/WhiteHouseFactSheet_PDD62.htm
[16] For the text see www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/pdd/pdd-63.htm
[17] For the text of PDD-42 see www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/pdd42.htm. For the International Crime Control Strategy see www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/iccs/iccstoc.html
[18] *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement*, (Washington: The White House, February 1996)
[19] See www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/pdd/pdd-71.htm
[20] http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/2001/s20010905-secdef1.html
[21] Ibid.
[22] Merle D. Kellerhals, Jr. "U.S. Will Rely Less On Strategic Nuclear Weapons, Reduce Arsenal" Washington File, 9 January 2002
[23] http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/2001/s20010905-secdef1.html
[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Ibid.
[29] http://www.eff.org/Privacy/Surveillance/Terrorism_militias/20011025_hr3162_usa_patriot_bill.html
[30] Ibid.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Ibid.
[33] http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011008.html
[34] http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/
[35] On sovereignty free actors see James Rosenau , *Turbulence in World Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989). The power to hurt is a notion developed by Thomas Schelling in *Arms and Influence*

(New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966)