

# National Security Challenges

*....that we are not talking about*

November 14, 2012

Edited by Joshua Foust



*An edited volume of essays by national security experts*

## Table of Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>Introduction</b>  | 3  |
| <b>The Challenges We Face, the Opportunities We Must Seize</b><br><i>BGen Stephen A. Cheney USMC (Ret.)</i>    | 4  |
| <b>The United States and India: Translating rhetoric into substantive cooperation</b><br><i>Colin Geraghty</i> | 6  |
| <b>Want Some Security? Get Some Dirt</b><br><i>Mark Mykleby</i>  | 8  |
| <b>Why International Opinion of our President Should Matter to Americans</b><br><i>Mary Catherine Andrews</i>  | 10 |
| <b>STEM Is Key to a Sustainable and Secure Future</b><br><i>Christine McEntee</i>                              | 12 |
| <b>Climate Change: Ignoring it won't make it go away</b><br><i>Carolyn Deady</i>                               | 14 |
| <b>No SMD: A New Emphasis in U.S. Military Strategy and Arms Control</b><br><i>Seyom Brown</i>                 | 16 |
| <b>Four Critical Nuclear Security Choices loom for U.S.</b><br><i>Terri Lodge</i>                              | 18 |
| <b>The Three Defense Industry Challenges for the Next President</b><br><i>August Cole</i>                      | 20 |
| <b>Moving Towards a More Secure Energy Future</b><br><i>Nicholas Cunningham</i>                                | 22 |
| <b>A Dangerous Blind Spot in the Intelligence Community</b><br><i>Joshua Foust</i>                             | 24 |
| <b>The Road Ahead for the American Message and the Next President</b><br><i>Matthew R. Wallin</i>              | 26 |
| <b>Author Biographies</b>  | 28 |
| <b>Further Reading</b>   | 32 |

## Introduction

With the election behind us, it's time to look toward the future. The American Security Project is dedicated to fostering fact-driven, non-partisan debate about critical national security issues. To that end, we asked our friends and colleagues both within ASP and associated with the Consensus for American Security to answer the question: what is the biggest issue facing us in the next four years that isn't on anyone's radar?

In the interest of fairness, and of avoiding any partisan angle to our answers, we wrote these essays before the election and chose to publish them after, so that nothing in them is influenced by the election's result. As such, these essays reflect an honest and ideologically diverse view of the non-conventional challenges facing the country.

The burgeoning opportunity of partnership with India (covered by Colin Geraghty) seems obvious but went unremarked during the campaign.

Some topics, like the degradation of soil quality and food production (discussed by Col. "Puck" Mykleby), are not generally considered national security challenges.

The heart of this collection is looking at unconventional challenges to America's security. MC Andrews writes about how the perception of America in the world is as important to our security as what we actually do – and the way people talk about us can have a big effect on us in the future. Christine McEntee explains our education system actually has national security implications, for if we lose our edge in science, math, technology, and engineering, we will lose in the global economy.

There are more traditional security topics that simply didn't make campaign news this year. Carolyn Deady argues that we need to view climate change as a major national security challenge. Dr. Seyom Brown explains that adopting a radically different posture toward how we use our nuclear arsenal might actually make us a lot safer in the long run. Terri Lodge, who runs ASP's Nuclear Security program, elaborates on four big challenges facing us.

August Cole notes that, whatever wrangling happens over budgetary issues, the fate of the defense industry is vitally important to the country. And I discuss how we can reform the intelligence community to plan better for future emergencies.

Through all of these pieces, a common thread appears: whatever the challenge, there is no need to devolve into partisan bickering to discuss it. America will face some very real, very complex challenges over the next four years. It is vital that the country at least agree to common terms so we can have a realistic, rational debate about how best to tackle them.

--- *Joshua Foust, editor*

## The Challenges We Face, the Opportunities We Must Seize

*By Stephen A. Cheney*

As the United States looks toward the next four years of foreign policy, we have a difficult job. There are many challenges to face, but also many opportunities we must seize as well.

National security is not an issue of the Left or Right. In fact, both sides agree on the major issues facing America in the world today. We can best address those issues not as Democrats or Republicans – but as Americans.

We also need the unvarnished truth, removed from partisan or ideological bias.

Often, debates about foreign policy get mired in detailed tactical discussions. The best way forward in Afghanistan, understanding the changing events in Libya, or figuring out the best course of action in Syria are all ultimately questions of tactics and operations.

Public debate about national security is does not focus enough on the strategic long-term perspective of our foreign policy. They derive from the bigger questions about what America's role in the world is and should be, and what the challenges and opportunities are that might affect that role.

Looking ahead, we need to realize that the twentieth century is over – the Cold War has ended, China is no longer internationally isolated, there is a complex global economy, technology is advancing at an incredible rate – events are changing faster and faster.

The twenty-first century has new global challenges for us. In the broadest strokes, they boil down to energy security, climate change, nuclear proliferation, asymmetric threats, and the economy.

The way we generate and consume energy is probably one of the biggest threats we face as a country. We have built our entire economy on the availability of cheap petroleum.

Ever since the discovery of vast amounts of oil in the Middle East, our foreign policy has been held hostage to the governments in that region. And no matter what politicians say, drilling in America will not change that. Because oil is a global market, even domestically produced oil responds to global pressures – making energy security a global challenge.

Another global challenge that threatens us as a country is climate change. I spent from 2006 until 2011 in south Texas, as president of a private school. My last year there – 2011 – saw the worst drought in Texas history. I lived in an agricultural area, but there isn't much agriculture there now. Cotton, corn, wheat, and sorghum crops were decimated. The economy – already in recession – tanked. Cattle ranchers gave up and sold their cattle. It was devastating.

2012 was even worse. The severe droughts we've faced will only get worse over time as the climate shifts. Arctic ice is at its lowest level in recorded history. Many climate scientists believe Hurricane Sandy was so devastating because the decline of Arctic ice "trapped" it near the east coast, destroying communities.

Globally, climate change is causing economic instability, worsening poverty, exacerbating political instability, and driving conflict. The military already considers climate change a serious threat; it's time the rest of us do, and start talking about how to manage this crisis.

Nuclear proliferation presents a nightmare scenario for the country. But how we manage nukes here at home is important too.

Striking the right balance between cost, our defense posture, and our deterrent is no easy task, and there is a desperate need for facts in the nuclear security debate.

Asymmetric threats are a relatively new challenge: how failed states and non-state actors contribute to global instability is not easy to predict. We as a country are in the early stages of learning how to manage this new problem, and we need to keep an eye on the long term interests of America while trying to manage the many crises rippling across northern Africa.

Lastly, there's no doubt that the economy will affect our national security. America's economy is being stressed on all sides, from our national debt to the winnowing investment we make in our own society and our own citizens. Yet building a strong economy is vital to our long term health as a country.

All of these challenges are also opportunities to push ahead and think of solutions. They are not insurmountable.

But solutions start with having the facts.

Examining the facts, and understanding America's interests in the long term, will offer us the best path toward coping with these many complex issues.

-----

*BGen Stephen A. Cheney USMC (Ret.) is the CEO of the non-partisan American Security Project*



## The United States and India: Translating Rhetoric into Substantive Cooperation

By *Colin Geraghty*

When the President of the United States looks at a world map on January 21<sup>st</sup>, it may well resemble a series of challenges and crises. Yet one country continues to be synonymous with opportunities for the United States: India.

India's rise to promising opportunity is not a recent feature of U.S. foreign policy. Both Republican and Democrat presidents have pushed for closer ties with India for well over a decade. President Clinton initiated the rapprochement between the two nations, and embraced the term "natural allies."<sup>1</sup> President Bush transformed the relationship into a partnership, and altered the tone of the relationship by signing the 2005 civil nuclear cooperation agreement with India and expanding ties beyond South Asia.<sup>2</sup> President Obama has further institutionalized the partnership by establishing a framework for regular consultations across a wide range of issues and emphasizing India's inclusion in Asian-Pacific dynamics.<sup>3</sup>

The challenge facing policymakers now is to give the strategic partnership more substantive meaning. This may require focusing on issues beyond the nuclear deal where teasing out the details of US-India cooperation will yield significant results down the road.

At the same time, the next administration will have to keep in mind that the U.S. is making, in the words of Hillary Clinton, a "strategic bet"<sup>4</sup> on India by taking some risks of deepening partnership in the hope of a long term payoff. Structuring this partnership to secure new gains without jeopardizing past successes will be challenging. As the U.S. "pivots" to Asia, it is crucial to understand India's own geopolitical positions to further strengthen the Indo-American partnership.

India has tremendous potential for economic growth, but still lacks the society-wide technological expertise to make it a reality. India also has a strong commitment to preserving its strategic autonomy and will reject any attempt to forge a transactional relationship with the U.S., even while it seeks to upgrade its military and technological capabilities and develop its indigenous industrial base.



The civil nuclear deal has proved a difficult political sell within India,<sup>5</sup> and the United States' continued support of India's international rise won't automatically generate business for U.S. companies. Both prospects are going to spark concern in the U.S.

As an emerging power, India's overriding priority will remain for the foreseeable future how to sustain its economic growth. The U.S. should focus on India's growth. Pursuing U.S. priorities to the exclusion of India's concerns will risk a backlash that could set back cooperation for the immediate future.

As India moves to open up new industries to foreign investment, U.S. companies should take advantage of these opportunities, and the U.S. government has a role to play in promoting American businesses.

The next administration needs to continue working on export control reform to streamline the investment process and ensure U.S. companies remain competitive.

There remains room for enhanced military cooperation between the two nations, as well. Given India's reluctance to any major agreement that could revive internal debates over its foreign alignment, the next administration should focus initially on smaller deals instead of high-profile contracts.

limited until India develops a comprehensive strategic vision to guide its foreign policy, and accept to focus on small areas of concrete cooperation to strengthen the overall relationship in the meantime.

-----

Maritime security is an obvious shared concern, and one that entails great potential between the Indian and American navies. The initial steps on naval cooperation have been promising; the U.S. should seek new opportunities to engage India in Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief (HADR) exercises, which the Indian Ministry of Defense has indicated it is more willing to allow the Navy to engage in than other types of maneuvers. Until civilian leadership at the Indian Ministry of Defense is willing to allow the Navy to pursue deeper cooperation on "hard" security issues, the U.S. will have to focus on creating shared interests in areas where India is more willing to cooperate.

*Colin Geraghty is an Adjunct Junior Fellow at the American Security Project and a non-resident associate with the Raoul Dandurand Chair for Strategic and Diplomatic Studies at the University of Quebec at Montreal (UQAM).*



There will remain areas of disagreements, as well as challenges that will require skillful management. If navigated successfully, with the right combination of incentives and persuasion, the next administration will be able to seize the opportunities of its partnership with India. This will strengthen U.S. power and influence in the broader Asia-Pacific region.

Ultimately, though, the next administration will have to recognize that progress on numerous areas will be

## Want Some Security? Get Some Dirt

By Mark Mykleby

It is clear from the recent presidential election that both parties hold the earnest belief that the highest responsibility of the President of the United States is to ensure the safety of the American people. Accordingly, in the debates there was quite a bit of discussion about national security: foreign policy, defense budgets, military capabilities, geopolitical redlines, and so on.

Given the complexities of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, such an exclusive focus on linear, 20<sup>th</sup> Century notions of national security is dangerously limited. While the parties spin their wheels debating how to control all the things America cannot realistically control (Iran, China, Russia, Pakistan, Al Qaeda), the most basic, essential security requirement of our nation -- the long-term capacity to produce food -- is being eroded.

That isn't a typo. If anything, it seems America has too much food.

American households currently throw away approximately 40% of their food each year.<sup>6</sup> At the same time, two thirds of Americans are overweight (over a third are clinically obese) and the CDC reports that, in 2009, over 70% of the approximately \$2.5 trillion we spent on health care went to preventable diseases, many of which are linked to obesity.<sup>7</sup>

As a nation, we've let ourselves go so much that the average American stands a 1:2,681 chance of dying from an obesity related cause as compared to a 1:20 million chance of dying in a terrorist related event. 40% of this year's corn harvest is going into our gas tanks in the form of ethanol.<sup>8</sup> So there cannot be a

shortage of food, right?

But how long can this gluttony continue? We would do well to heed the prescient warnings of the British botanist, Sir Albert Howard. In his 1940 work, "An Agricultural Testament", Sir Albert Howard<sup>9</sup> noted that the destiny of the Roman Empire was largely determined by the condition of its soils. He also reflected on what that would mean for modern civilization:

*"The agriculture of ancient Rome failed because it was unable to maintain the soil in a fertile condition. The farmers of the West are repeating the mistakes made by Imperial Rome... The Roman Empire lasted for eleven centuries. How long will the supremacy of the West endure? The answer depends on the wisdom and courage of the population in dealing with the things that matter. Can mankind regulate its affairs so that its chief possession -- the fertility of the soil -- is preserved? On the answer to this question the future of civilization depends."*



While referencing a past empire can seem a bit cliché, that doesn't mean it's any less relevant. According to the University of Michigan's Global Change Program, 96% of North America's soil erosion comes from food production (66% from agricultural activities; 30% from overgrazing).<sup>10</sup> The majority of this erosion is occurring in the central portion of the United States, right where farmers grow the bulk of our

food. Significant portions of this region have been designated as “Areas of Serious Concern” where up to 75% of the topsoil has been lost, mostly due to modern farming techniques.

We’re playing with fire. The collapse of the Atlantic cod fishery and its associated 500-year industry is a stark reminder of how Mother Nature reacts to man’s mindless mismanagement of resources.<sup>11</sup>

It’s unclear how much longer our soil can withstand the ecological damage we impose through our agriculture. We don’t know how precisely, but it took tens of thousands of years to produce our current stock of soil (it takes up to 100 years to generate one millimeter of it). The erosion issue is very serious.

There is good news: we have an opportunities-based way out. According to the Rodale Institute’s recently released 30-year study, “The Farming Systems Trial,”<sup>12</sup> organic farming techniques outperform our current conventional agriculture model.

Organic farming produces equivalent yields per acre (30% greater yields in times of drought), all the while using 45% less energy, producing 40% less greenhouse gases, and, most importantly, regenerating the soil. Even better, organic farming can yield three times more profits per acre.

Given that world food prices are at an all time high, the global demand for regenerative food production will continue to grow for decades: the OECD reports world food production has to increase 60% by 2050 and 100% of that growth has to be regenerative due to ecosystem limitations. Now is the time to make the transition to a new national food production model for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

It just makes sound economic, and security, sense.

So if the greatest responsibility of the President is in fact the safety of the American people, he’ll need to find the wisdom to which Sir Howard referred and focus a bit more attention on the pressing, long-term problems we face today, starting with our soil.

He will also need Sir Howard’s courage to confront the praetorians of the agricultural status quo, not to mention the American trillion dollar “right” to get fat.

-----  
*Col. Mark “Puck” Mykleby is a Senior Fellow in the Smart Strategy Initiative at the New America Foundation, a member of the Consensus for American Security and the former Special Strategic Assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.*



## Why International Opinion of our President Should Matter to Americans

*By Mary Catherine Andrews*

As the world watched the American presidential election, it became clear there are reasons why international opinion of our presidential choice matters to our national interests.

Much has been said, particularly in the run-up to the third debate between President Barack Obama and Republican challenger, Mitt Romney, about how foreign policy really does not matter in 2012 presidential elections. According to that argument, international issues are not important when Americans are focused on the economy, jobs, the budget, and perhaps, differing views of health care, women's issues, or the role of government in society.

According to Nielsen ratings, there were about 5 million fewer viewers for the foreign policy debate than the first<sup>13</sup>, and this in spite of two factors: the candidates' surprising performances in the first two debates, and significant discussion, particularly among conservative media, about the assassination of the American Ambassador in Benghazi.

But the foreign policy debate, like the issues surrounding use of drones, China, Iran, and Libya, is important to every American whether or not they particularly care about foreign affairs.

International support for Barack Obama was most evident at his 2008 speech to more than 200,000

people in Berlin and his campaign stop to talk with Israeli and Palestinian leaders.<sup>14</sup>

President Obama was sworn into office with international public opinion soaring and international belief in our new leader as a transformational figure. Four years later, President Obama suffers from waning global confidence. According to the Pew Global Attitudes Project, "Global approval of President Barack Obama's policies has declined significantly since he first took office, while overall confidence in him and attitudes toward the U.S. have slipped modestly as a consequence."<sup>15</sup>

Pew points to the reasons for this drop of support including: the perception that China (as opposed to the U.S.) is the world's leading economic power, anger over the Obama Administration's use of drone strikes against terrorists, and the more general perception (particularly in predominately Muslim countries) that America acts unilaterally in international affairs.



When President George W. Bush left office in 2009, international opinion of the 43<sup>rd</sup> American president had slipped from high support across the globe after the 9/11 attacks to record lows at the end of his presidency. The reasons for the drop were, according to Pew, the international financial crisis blamed on the United States, the war on terror, and Iraq.<sup>16</sup>

America's image across the globe is largely tied to the image of our President. America's favorability in the world dropped from 58 percent favorable in 2010 to 43 percent in 2012 while confidence in President Obama dropped from 52 percent 38 percent, according to Pew.<sup>17</sup>

Moreover, the world's opinion of America and the

president can have serious consequences for the country. As such, it is important for the president, whether Mr. Obama or Mr. Romney, to foster and grow a positive image of America for three reasons:

1. America's economic and political strength are inextricably linked. According to Pew, international audiences overwhelmingly blamed President Bush for the international financial crisis in 2008, and today, those same audiences perceive that international economic power has shifted from America to China. As an important step to help America regain our international economic strength, which in turn will aid America's domestic economic recovery, the next president needs to focus on rebuilding the favorability of America and confidence in his leadership.
2. Go it alone policies in international diplomacy will not allow America to garner the international diplomatic support the country needs to help implement, and perhaps more importantly in the current financial crisis, share the cost of, its international engagements. Whether negotiating with the United Nations or seeking bilateral support from allies to take action in international crises, America needs our friends abroad, and this starts with the strength projected by the president.
3. The President's image abroad is the foundation on which America's moral leadership is built. Like 9/11 was unexpected, America will face future unexpected challenges. A clear vision of America's national interests, and international public support for that vision, are critical to the future leadership of America in times of unexpected crises.

What can the president inaugurated in January

2013 do in pursuit of these goals? He can:

Show vision and leadership in the management of foreign affairs. Tell our allies what America believes and stick by the vision. Act with clarity and alacrity against activities that are not in America's national interest. This is the kind of leadership practiced by Presidents Bill Clinton and Ronald Reagan.

Translate the vision and leadership into policy. Speeches, such as President Obama's highly lauded 2009 Cairo speech, are only as lasting as the policies they initiate. As Rosa Brooks pointed out on a recent Foreign Policy blog when discussing President Obama, "strategy, structure, process, management, and personnel" as much as new policy initiatives are critical to successful foreign policy.<sup>18</sup>

Take few actions, but take them well. If rebuilding America's economic image in the world is most important, then the next president needs to focus like a laser on that issue. If strengthening democracy and advocating respect for human rights in Middle East transition is important, then let these issues take center stage across our foreign policy. If nonproliferation of nuclear weapons is the focus, then be serious and comprehensive in policies toward, not only Iran, but other nuclear weapons proliferators.

America needs presidential leadership to repair our standing in the world. While Americans are focused on the economy in 2012, it is in the interest of all Americans to consider how important foreign policy is to their future.

-----  
*Mary Catherine (M.C.) Andrews is a Washington, DC based senior strategist for Vianovo, focusing on international affairs and communications. She previously served as a director at the National Security Council and ran the White House Office of Global Communications.*

## STEM is Key to a Sustainable and Secure Future

By Christine McEntee

History and experience show that scientific and technological innovations can help to protect us from natural and man-made threats, as well as support and fuel our economic prosperity. This makes science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education vital to the future security of the United States.

Scientific research and discovery have brought us such monumental achievements as human flight, life-saving drugs, telecommunications, and abundant food.

Looking to the future, we face many difficult challenges on a global scale, all of which have the potential to significantly improve or jeopardize economic and security conditions around the world – from ensuring that families have access to clean and adequate water supplies to providing communities with efficient, effective, and sustainable sources of energy; and from establishing and supporting a foundation on which business can thrive to mitigating and adapting to the effects of climate change.

Despite this obvious impact on competitiveness and security, scientists and engineers make up less than five percent of the American workforce, and the U.S. ranks 27th among developed nations in undergraduate science and engineering degrees.

In the Earth and space sciences, there is a little more than a quarter of a million geoscientists working to-



day, but by 2021 that number will need to increase by nearly 20 percent to meet demand. And half of the current workforce is within 10 years of retirement age; given current graduate rates, we could be facing 150,000-200,000 unfilled geoscience jobs by 2021.

With the strains placed on society by a growing population and limited resources, our long term success in solving these problems will hinge on the strength of our science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) workforce. But with competition for students' attention and limited federal, state and local funding coming from all directions, not to mention a lack of political support, what can be done to address the critical issue of our leaking STEM pipeline?

As an organization, the American Geophysical Union is dedicated to advancing scientific research for the benefit of humanity, and to building an Earth and space science talent pool reflects our nation's diverse population. That's why we offer an assortment of opportunities that expose students, teachers, and life-long learners to the freshest, most accurate scientific knowledge and the excitement of discovery. This includes training for K-12, undergraduate and graduate teachers; recognition and mentoring opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students (including a new program targeted specifically for community college students); and networking and career programs for early, mid and late career scientists.

Unfortunately, AGU's efforts alone will not solve America's STEM problem.



It's not a challenge any single organization can solve.

Solving a problem of this magnitude will require a joint commitment from business, industry, academia, government and professional organizations, working together to make a long-term, sustainable impact. And, because the problems we face don't stop at our own borders, STEM partnerships have to take shape around the world.

Building a reliable STEM pipeline will require teachers and organizations like AGU to identify new and creative ways to build STEM into both the formal curricula and information education programs. It will require industry and business leaders to commit to investing in the STEM workforce of the future while continuing to support those working today, and policy leaders will have to identify it as a top priority and support it as such.

ment should be simple, celebrated and bi-partisan.

A healthy and robust STEM education community and a thriving STEM workforce pipeline are critical to protecting public safety and national security, building a foundation for our economic competitiveness, and ensuring a sustainable future for our nation and the world.

The goal is too important and the potential consequences are too dire for us to delay action any further. The time to act is now.

-----  
*Christine W. McEntee is Executive Director and Chief Executive Officer of the American Geophysical Union (AGU) and a member of the Consensus for American Security.*



Given the impact STEM can have on business – in 2008 alone, university research was responsible for the creation of nearly 600 new companies – and national security – a changing Arctic ecosystem resulting from warming temperatures presents numerous challenges and opportunities – this kind of commit-

## Climate Change: Ignoring it Won't Make it Go Away

By Carolyn Deady

For the first time in 24 years climate change was not mentioned in a presidential debate. It was conspicuously absent, treated as a third rail by both presidential campaigns. Both candidates avoided the topic, not wanting to risk alienating voters by focusing on something that could be perceived as adding to the economic problems in this country.

Climate change should not be a political risk. It is a national security issue. Climate crises due to food and fresh water shortages, flooding, and drought could cause political instability, increase the risk of conflict and put a strain on our military. Climate change knows no political or ideological bounds. The next administration needs to address this challenge, assessing the costs of actions on climate change while considering the costs of inaction.

During his first term, President Obama established limits on greenhouse gas emissions, made investments in clean energy and reduced carbon emissions within the federal government. Other efforts included the failed cap and trade bill of 2010. Mr. Romney implemented the Massachusetts Climate Protection Plan while Governor of Massachusetts in 2004. He reasoned, “If climate change is happening, the actions we take will help. If climate change is largely caused by human actions, this will really help. If we learn decades from now that climate change isn't happening, these actions will still help our economy, our quality of life and the quality of our environment.”

In the absence of political toxicity, both candidates took positive action and displayed foresight essential in addressing the effects of climate change.

Climate change deniers have succeeded in making the issue unsavory for political leaders and lawmakers

since the 2008 elections. Their success in influencing politicians and the public can be attributed, in part, to a failing economy.

“The issue is what's the appropriate level of management of the risk not that the science is a fraud”, says Henry Jacoby, co-founder, emeritus, of the MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change. “There's a lot of uncertainty. We don't know exactly how serious it is. But there's enough evidence that we ought to be taking measures to manage the risk.”

Countries such as China, Japan, Australia and South Korea have made measures to reduce emissions and invest in clean energy technology. For instance, the Australian parliament has passed legislation aimed at reducing carbon emissions. Also, nearly one million solar panels have been installed in domestic houses in Australia.



“From my perspective, acting on climate change is an economic diversification to broaden the economic base and generate growth,” says Andy Pitman, Director of the ARC Centre of Excellence for Climate System Science in Sydney. He adds, “I don't think that the US should do anything around economic development in part driven by renewables and solar. I think they should stay focused on coal and oil and leave the

technological innovation to China, Europe and Australia. This leaves a major market for Australian exports to the US of high tech green technologies, manufactured in China. It leaves the US economy in the 19th and 20th century and leaves 21<sup>st</sup> century innovation to other countries. Suits us fine!”

Both the international community and the U.S. have taken some concrete steps to address climate change. Corporations, individuals, and non-profit organizations are undertaking voluntary actions to reduce their contribution to climate change. One example is the [Carbon Disclosure Project \(CDP\)](#) which has the largest global collection of self-reported climate change and water-use information among companies.

Cities, states, and whole regions have started initiatives to limit environmental damage. One of the most ambitious plans is California’s Global Warming Solutions Act which sets a state goal to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. There are also multi-state cap-and-trade systems such as the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) formed by 10 Northeast and Mid-Atlantic states.

Actions at grassroots and even state level have the effect of reducing our nation’s contribution to total emissions. Yet, the sum of these efforts do not amount to an aggregate effect that meets the scale of the problem. The United States shares a lot of responsibility for the global climate challenge, so we should act accordingly. Action and education at the national level by the next administration is essential to reduce the threat.

By casting the potential impacts or effects of climate change as a question of risk (i.e. the likelihood of something happening combined with the costs of the damages), the President can help to clarify what actions we should take now and what we can worry about later.

The fact is that the climate will change. Pitman points out, “The laws of physics do not look at how people vote, or what people believe. So climate will affect the US exactly the same whether Congress does or does not address the issue.”



The President should lead the charge to educate both the public and lawmakers on the risks involved in climate change.

Foresight is crucial in crafting and implementing policies which will prepare our country for the long-term effects of climate change. Right now, the candidates seem wary of starting a debate about the challenge of climate change. As long as this political threat continues, climate change and with it our quality of life, our economy and our national security, will remain at risk.

-----

*Carolyn Deady is an Adjunct Fellow at the American Security Project and freelance journalist. Previously, she was an international producer at C-SPAN (Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network) in Washington, DC.*

## No SMD: A New Emphasis in U.S. Military Strategy and Arms Control

*By Seyom Brown*

Nearly a quarter century after the end of the Cold War the political and moral challenges of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and their proliferation remain. Rather than the elimination of WMD, which anti-nuclear weapons advocates concede is unlikely in their lifetimes, the United States should renounce strategies of mass destruction (SMD) and operationalize this policy in its force posture and contingency planning. The United States should also attempt to get others to subscribe to the No-SMD policy –perhaps in the form of an international treaty – but need not wait on reciprocity to declare and incorporate it into its own grand strategy and diplomacy.

No-SMD is in accord with the evolving American revulsion –in part in reaction to terrorism -- against killing civilians. Moreover, the United States has an expanding range of capabilities for deterring, physically preventing, or responding to, even the most horrendous enemy actions –without having to resort to such strategies itself.

The policy and its rationale

The strategies the United States would unequivocally foreswear, and work to get others to abandon, would include those designed to massively kill non-combatant civilians or to destroy or disrupt physical structures and environmental conditions in ways that would have this mass destruction effect. Building on the 1948 Geneva Accords banning attacks on civilians and civilian facilities, the policy would explicitly enlarge the prohibition so as to encompass even attacks made in retaliation for enemy strikes against one's own cities.

Such a demarche might seem to negate the core

premise of U.S.-Russian strategic arms control agreements –namely, Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD): the idea that each side would retain enough nuclear forces to survive a nuclear first strike by the other and to deliver a devastating retaliatory blow of such magnitude to render such a first strike wholly irrational.

However, for mutual deterrence to prevail, the destruction that is assured does not have to include the massive slaughter of innocent civilians. Deterrence of the use of WMD against the United States will be better maintained if the opponent knows that the U.S. will not have to respond with massive attacks upon civilian populations. Planners have explored this idea since the early 1970s. The Pentagon has developed targeting menus the president could choose from in the event of nuclear war that, at least at the outset, would be limited to the destruction of military assets located away from cities. The Carter Administration publicly revealed this “countervailing strategy” in order to inform friends as well as potential aggressors that the U.S. president -- no matter how serious the provocation -- will have alternatives to getting on an irreversible path toward nuclear holocaust.

Strategically realistic and morally acceptable



Since World War II, which featured massive civilian devastation (including the nuclear incineration of Hiroshima and Nagasaki), U.S. presidents have avoided patterns of conflict escalation that would require them to attack centers of population. President Eisenhower announced a capacity for massive retaliation for deterrent purposes, but confessed in his memoirs that he regarded the massive

killing of civilians to be “barbaric.” President Nixon’s coercive bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong with conventional weapons, which inflicted a lot of civilian casualties, stands out as an exception. Otherwise, in all U.S. military engagements, including Iraq and Afghanistan, U.S. forces have operated under strict orders to minimize civilian casualties.

Yet MAD is still on the books – not just as one of the design criteria for the strategic forces, but to provide the president with a credible – and therefore presumably useable -- option to go “all out” in case the threat of nuclear retaliation fails to deter WMD attacks against the United States or those brought under the American “extended deterrence” umbrella.

But is such a massive nuclear response to a WMD attack – whether nuclear, biological, or chemical-- really credible? The reason why Washington, in its nonproliferation policy and its Nuclear Posture Review, has appeared so anxious to reassure its extended deterrence partners that they need not acquire their own WMD arsenals is that there are indeed grounds –geostrategic and moral—for for the partners’ doubts that in a “moment of truth” a U.S. president would authorize nuclear retaliation.

The needed shift in U.S. military strategy and arms control policy would make No Strategies of Mass Destruction an essential part of U.S. grand strategy, not just a particular prohibition to be considered case-by-case. The U.S. would openly proclaim it and press for its adoption as a universal norm. The corollary to No-SMD, however, would be a publically- proclaimed U.S. force posture designed to decisively punish WMD aggression against the United States or those Washington has provided a security guarantee, without attacking the aggressor’s cities. The objective of the retaliatory strikes would be to forcibly disarm the aggressor of even his normal military assets. Prime targets to be destroyed would include, for example, air and missile bases and their protective defenses, naval fleets, weapons arsenals and production facilities, troop encampments, and

command centers not located in civilian facilities.

Much of the accurate and powerful weaponry the United States requires to implement such a strategy –while minimizing civilian casualties-- currently exists or is being developed: not just precision air-to-ground weaponry, but weapons with a deep-penetration capability for destroying enemy missiles in their underground bunkers, or even cyber-offense capabilities that can disable missile-launch systems. The publically-revealed rationale for the buildup of the non-WMD capabilities, however, is to deter major conventional aggression and, in case deterrence fails, to implement robust conventional-war strategies, as in the much-touted Air-Sea-Battle concept. Yet the brunt of the responsibility for deterring WMD attacks continues to be borne by the morally problematical – and therefore not really credible -- mass-destruction arsenal.

The No-SMD policy is not without problems –such as how to deal with enemy psychological counter-strategies, like deliberately locating their prime military assets in population centers, or trying to intimidate the United States and other No-SMD adherents with a threat that an impending war will escalate to kill millions of people anyway. But these nightmare scenarios, while posing serious ethical quandaries for force planning, are just as plausible, if not more so, under the still-prevailing MAD syndrome. Nor do they obviate the need and value of the world’s greatest military superpower taking the lead – on the long road toward a world without nuclear weapons -- in showing nuclear wannabes that having a grand strategy reliant on WMD can be more of a liability than an asset.

-----

*Dr. Seyom Brown is Adjunct Senior Fellow at the American Security Project, a Senior Advisor to the Security Studies Program at MIT, and author of The Illusion of Control: Force and Foreign Policy in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.*

## Four Critical Nuclear Security Choices Loom for U.S.

By Terri Lodge

The next administration will face substantial choices on nuclear security issues. Its decisions will have serious implications, not just for the future of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, but for U.S. national security. Clear thinking will be needed from whoever wins in November to confront four main nuclear security challenges.

First, the next administration will face the difficult question of how to deal with the threat posed by Iran's nuclear program. This will hardly be the first time that a U.S. president has confronted this question, but the stakes are higher now than ever before. The administration will no doubt recognize that all options need to be on the table, including military force. That said, at this stage, military action would be unwise and possibly detrimental to our strategic aims. There is still enough time to resolve the nuclear standoff by nonmilitary means.

Iran is increasingly isolated through an interlocking network of international sanctions. The next administration must continue to lead and work with international community to show the Iranian leaders and the Iranian people that a decision to acquire a nuclear weapon carries unacceptable risk for their future and will not be tolerated by the international community. This may result in the need for military action to support wider stability.

Next, North Korea's nuclear program will remain an issue. Some advocate maintaining the status quo—further isolating the North, maintaining or increasing sanctions, and utilizing food aid as an incentive for North Korean reform and denuclearization. Engagement with North Korea has proven disappointing but should not be ruled out if the right circumstances should arise with a new

North Korean leadership. This will continue to be a difficult issue to resolve quickly.

A third critical nuclear issue is Pakistan's nuclear program. As the war in Afghanistan winds down, many U.S. policymakers will no doubt argue for breaking ties with Pakistan, an often frustrating ally. However, walking away from Pakistan would be a mistake. Pakistan's nuclear arsenal remains a serious threat for many reasons, from the risk of nuclear escalation with India to activity of terrorist organizations within Pakistan.



The next administration must emphasize ensuring the security and integrity of Pakistan's nuclear arsenal through practical steps such as encouraging Pakistan to adopt the IAEA Additional Protocol and to declare a no-first-use policy toward all states.

Finally, the fourth (and in some way the largest) nuclear issue will be how to move from a redundant posture into a much-needed 21st century strategy. Although the U.S. arsenal has shrunk, our nuclear force structure remains basically the same. The world has moved on, threats have changed, but the U.S. nuclear strategy is still shaped by the Cold War.

The nuclear triad – the land, sea, and air-based

delivery systems for nuclear weapons – are the perfect example of this Cold War hangover. Plans to upgrade the triad, at a cost of hundreds of billions of dollars, are moving forward. Yet the need to maintain all three platforms is still unclear. The next Administration's nuclear review should carefully examine the strategy behind maintaining redundant nuclear systems that divert resources from other key defense programs - programs that better address 21st century security threats.

Administration and Congress will have to put aside political rhetoric to work to develop policies that effectively address these critical nuclear threats.

*This piece was originally published at The Hill.*

-----  
*Terri Lodge is the Director of the Nuclear Security Program at the American Security Project.*



Updating the U.S. nuclear strategy will require that the next president work closely with congressional decision makers – a difficult task in today's partisan environment. Heated political rhetoric often gets in the way of smart policy choices, even on nuclear security issues. It is time for all sides to begin a regular dialogue with each other about post-Cold War U.S. nuclear strategy.

The next four years will be not easy. Fortunately, there are solutions to these difficult nuclear questions. In every case, the key is forging bipartisan support. Today's nuclear risks affect all of us. The next

## The Three Defense Industry Challenges for the Next President

By August Cole

The presidential candidates position themselves as offering a binary choice that will lead America in divergent directions. While the two may have very different approaches, they face the same challenges when it comes to the U.S. defense industry.

Among the myriad issues, three of the most pressing are what to do with the future of American airpower, particularly the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter; the structure of the defense industry during sequestration; and determining what the roles and boundaries are of the government's services contractors that flourished during the past decade of conflict. These are critical areas that are at the core of America's ability to project power. They are also tied to stubborn policy or operational hurdles that the White House can help overcome.

For the past decade of counterinsurgency operations Iraq and Afghanistan, the US has relied on the constant overhead presence of its military planes. Many of these aircraft originated in the Cold War; some newer aircraft are 21<sup>st</sup> Century unmanned aircraft. A similar dominance is not assured the next time U.S. forces deploy, even potentially in another low-intensity conflict. Networked air-defense systems built from technologies bought around the world are proliferating and offer potential adversaries cheaper and deadlier ways of knocking down U.S. jets.

Yet the Pentagon's big bet on keeping its airpower edge, the next-generation F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, keeps slipping further and further into the future while costs climb skyward by the hundreds of billions. Ideally, program management should never be a particular focus of the President of the United States. Yet the magnitude of the budgetary challenges

with this effort requires the kind of pressure only a president can apply. Success or failure in the F-35 program, estimated to tally up to more than \$1.4 trillion to develop, buy and operate in the coming decades, has big implications for the U.S. and its allies who plan on buying thousands of the jets.

The U.S. needs to update its fighter fleet, but spending too much is a real risk given the scale of fiscal commitment the F-35 requires. Losing the program means losing a technological link to allied air forces, particularly those of Israel, the United Kingdom and Japan.

There are three options to consider for the F-35. The first is to cancel the whole program and buy replacement versions of today's fighters. The second is to buy fewer F-35s overall or eliminate one service's version, which ruins the economy of scale the whole program is counting on. The last option, pressing ahead with more oversight of the F-35's Pentagon managers and contractors, offers an easier path. This last path, however, commits the U.S. to a way of doing business that has shifted dramatically from the initial contract award in 2001.

The choices are stark: If the Defense Department changes its mind and wants to replace old planes with newer versions of tried-and-true existing jets, a narrow window of time remains. There are not enough orders for F-16, F-15 and F-18 to keep production lines open forever, which leaves the F-35's Fort Worth, Texas line as potentially the sole manned fighter line left within a couple of decades.

This is related to another issue of great importance, both in the near-term political battle over sequestration but also vital to U.S. interests in the long term: the size and composition of the defense industry itself. This will not only affect the penultimate fate of the F-35, but everything from future vehicle and weapons manufacturing to the industry's political profile.

Right now, the industry faces a downturn and will likely get smaller, both in terms of employees and sales. Some firms are turning to a traditional move in such a situation: a merger. The almost-merger of BAE Systems and EADS was a clear signal that defense executives are positioning firms to be aggressive amid a sea-change in military spending. Regulators will need to keep on top of this and consider the long-term implications of such deals.



Whether further consolidation would pay off for governments, taxpayers or shareholders is up in the air. Given the industry's acquisition wave after the fall of the Soviet Union that created today's largest U.S. contractors such as Boeing, Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman, more tie-ups could create unwieldy firms with their main customer's worst bureaucratic traits. The Pentagon needs more choices when it comes to buying goods and services, not less. Using competition from different firms to keep costs low and accountability high is one of the best ways to do this.. Separating the design and manufacturing of weapons systems is one step.

Third, U.S. troops are out of Iraq, and so are the tens of thousands of foreign and U.S. contractors that supported them. In Afghanistan, a similar

shift will occur as American and allied forces draw down during the next administration. Yet at home, particularly inside the Beltway, there are thousands of sensitive jobs in the defense and intelligence realm that are filled by private-sector employees.

If the privatization model was battle tested after Sept. 11 during a historic call-up of contractors, the current post-conflict phase offers a moment for reconsideration. Was this massive buildup of contractors the right choice for many of the nation's most sensitive jobs? Cost-effectiveness, accountability and oversight all still need to be evaluated in this new "post-war" context. A tenet of the industry's growth was that during wartime it could match government demand and then get smaller during peacetime, saving taxpayer money. Now that intelligence spending is under fiscal pressure too, the next administration faces a choice: cause these companies to shrink for the first time or let them become part of the national-security firmament.

All of these decisions made by the next administration will shape America's military and ability to project power for decades to come. Just as important, these choices will also show the world the values and aspirations that are the foundation of America's post-Iraq and post-Afghanistan future.

-----  
*August Cole is an author and Adjunct Fellow with the American Security Project, where he researches the defense industry.*

## Moving Towards a More Secure Energy Future

*By Nicholas Cunningham*

The subject of energy has been one of the most contested and debated issues by both candidates through the 2012 election season. America's new-found abundance of oil and gas has created the perception of energy security while pushing the issue of climate change to the back burner. However, America's long-term energy challenges remain daunting – fossil fuel dependence, rising energy prices and the threat of climate change.

In order to achieve real energy security, the next administration will need to balance fossil fuel production while reducing carbon emissions and accelerating the transition to cleaner sources of energy.

Dependence on fossil fuels presents significant national security concerns for the United States – in terms of exposure to price volatility, vulnerability to the dangerous effects of climate change, and a hamstrung foreign policy. Achieving energy security will only come through developing sources of energy that are clean, safe, secure and abundant.

The United States is the largest consumer of oil in the world, burning through 18 million barrels of oil per day. Our transportation sector is entirely dependent on oil for fuel. Ensuring that oil continues to safely flow through critical chokepoints across the globe places a significant burden on the American military. The DoD's 2012 budget shows that \$85-\$106 billion in annual expenditures can be traced to our presence in the Gulf. This is the sort of spending our nation cannot afford.

However, many policymakers and analysts have grown complacent in recent years as our new-found fossil fuel abundance has created the illusion of energy security. With natural gas and oil surging to record

levels, many are eyeing “energy independence” by the end of the decade.

While new oil and gas production certainly provides some economic benefit to the United States, the long-term energy challenges for the United States remain. Becoming self-sufficient in oil production does not insulate American consumers from price volatility. It also does not stave off the rising threat of climate change.

Achieving energy security will require developing energy technologies that can break our dependence on fossil fuels.



In the transportation sector, providing alternatives to petroleum fuels would improve America's energy security. This means investing in biofuels, compressed natural gas, electric vehicles, and mass transit. The Department of Defense is leading on this issue. The Navy is seeking to source 50% of its energy needs from renewable sources by 2020, primarily through a mix of biofuels. Other services have similar goals.

In the electric power sector, solar and wind power have

made substantial progress in recent years, with the costs of production declining dramatically. In 2012, both the solar and wind industries experienced record years in terms of installed capacity. Although these achievements are promising, the transition from fossil fuels to cleaner technologies needs to be accelerated. However, renewable energy cannot do it alone.

America also needs to take greater advantage of nuclear power. As the only source of large-scale baseload power that emits zero greenhouse gas emissions or other air pollutants, nuclear power must be part of the solution to America's energy security.

There is no conceivable scenario in which the worst effects of climate change are averted without a prominent role for nuclear power. The industry has stalled, but policymakers need to provide a pathway forward for next-generation nuclear power plants.

While America needs to invest in the clean technologies of today, it also needs to make investments in critical research and development to produce new innovative technologies for the long-term.

Fusion energy holds great promise. Fusion energy is produced by forcing together two hydrogen isotopes – deuterium and tritium. These two isotopes are nearly inexhaustible. Deuterium comes from ocean water, and tritium, though limited today, will be produced from lithium as a by-product of the reaction. Fusion therefore holds the promise of complete energy independence.

Fusion is also safe and secure. Fusion reactions produce no greenhouse gases and only small amounts of waste, making fusion energy environmentally safe. Fusion power plants also hold no risk of meltdown and, as the plants use no uranium or plutonium, there are minimal risks of weapons proliferation.

The next administration faces clear choices to make this vision a reality.

The next administration will need to make choices on how to manage our new-found abundance of natural gas and oil while at the same time protecting our environment.

The next administration should consider limits on carbon emissions while making smart investment in cleaner technologies. A national renewable energy standard or a carbon price offer pathways to bolster market demand for clean energy.



Moreover, the next administration has the opportunity to plant the seeds of America's future growth by laying the groundwork for next-generation energy technologies that will break our dependence on fossil fuels. To do so, the administration must properly invest in science and innovation.

With rising global populations putting stress on energy resources, the world urgently needs cleaner sources of energy – and America can lead in the research and development necessary to get there.

-----  
*Nicholas Cunningham is a Policy Analyst for Energy and Competitiveness at the American Security Project where he researches climate change and next generation energy issues.*

## A Dangerous Blind Spot in the Intelligence Community

By Joshua Foust

In the last 24 months, unpredictable events have caught U.S. policymakers by surprise: the “Arab Spring” movement in 2011 and the September 11, 2012 attack on the U.S. outpost in Benghazi. In the wake of both surprises, many in Congress and the public have been wondering: why didn’t we see this coming?

Over the last decade of counterterrorism operations, the U.S. intelligence community (IC) has undergone a remarkable transformation. A relatively modest part of the national security community before the 9/11 attacks, by 2010 the IC had swelled to encompass nearly a million people largely focused on prosecuting the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the global counterterrorism mission.

In their landmark 2010 series, the Washington Post reported that the IC “has become so large, so unwieldy and so secretive that no one knows how much money it costs, how many people it employs, how many programs exist within it or exactly how many agencies do the same work.”<sup>19</sup>

While the sheer size of the IC is staggering – the 2013 budget for intelligence activities tops \$75 billion<sup>20</sup> – its mission is also of serious concern. Large areas of the IC have reoriented from their traditional role of collecting and analyzing a broad range of current events for policymakers toward supporting the global counterterrorism mission. News stories about this shift suggest the counterterrorism mission has become the overarching concern of the national security staff.<sup>21</sup>

This shift in focus can create blind spots that pose unique challenges for the President. If branch chiefs and the policymakers they support value “exploitable”

information over deep understanding, they might be ignoring potentially vital information that doesn’t seem immediately of interest.

Imagine an analyst finding reports of a growing discontent in a Middle Eastern country’s politics; if that does not provide immediate benefit for a decision-making process for targeting suspected terrorists, it can easily be ignored in the avalanche of targeting information.<sup>1</sup>



One reason for the IC’s shift is that counterterrorism intelligence is relatively easy to collect: much of it can be acquired remotely, through forensic financial investigation and sophisticated surveillance. Moreover, the analysis of this data also lends itself to technologically advanced analysis – the so-called “gonkulators”<sup>\*</sup> that ingest enormous amounts of data and automatically generate conclusions and targets of interest.<sup>22</sup>

The rapid adoption of complicated technological systems happened at the same time as the shift toward the expanded counterterrorism mission. Lost in the

<sup>\*</sup> This was related to the author in a not-for-attribution interview on September 15, 2012. The interviewee argued that this happened in an analysis group at an intelligence agency in late 2010 and early 2011.

shuffle was an equal focus on human intelligence (HUMINT) and local expertise.<sup>23</sup> Though vital to some missions, like the covert drone war in Pakistan,<sup>24</sup> even HUMINT has been limited by the focus on immediately exploitable information while deeper understanding of countries and conflict zones has atrophied.

But expertise is more than just collecting interviews with local people (a central tenet of HUMINT). As the scholar Manan Ahmed, a historian of Pakistan at Freie Universitat Berlin noted, “There are... satellite cameras and listening devices; drones which can hover for days; databases which can track all good Taliban and all bad Taliban. Yet who can decipher this data?”<sup>25</sup>



Developing the specific knowledge to understand why and how certain pieces of information matter – not just to a narrow counterterrorism mission but the full range of U.S. security – is difficult and time consuming. Few in the intelligence community have it, and sometimes policymakers have mistakenly relied on outsiders to fill in the gaps in their knowledge with embarrassing results.<sup>26</sup>

The next administration needs to bring the IC back to its roots. The counterterrorism mission can and should continue, but it should be placed in the context of the IC’s traditional focus on the long term prospects of regions and countries of concern. By fusing deep local knowledge with the vast technological capabilities built over the last decade, the IC can generate the knowledge it needs to inform the President about how to make smart decisions that secure America’s interests for the long term.

The next administration can bring the IC back to basics by prioritizing the kind of information it wants: by focusing less on the daily grind of counterterrorism missions and more on the social, political, and economic currents that are driving change across the Middle East and around the world.

By developing a more holistic picture of the foreign policy challenges facing the country in the next four years, smart choices can fill in the knowledge gaps and make future surprises less likely.

-----  
*Joshua Foust is the Fellow for Asymmetric Operations at the American Security Project, a correspondent for The Atlantic, a national security columnist for PBS Need to Know, and edits the blog Registan.net.*

## The Road Ahead for the American Message and the Next President

by Matthew R. Wallin

As recent events in Egypt and Libya have drawn greater attention to the role of public diplomacy in the course of America's international relations, the presidential election provides this country with an opportunity to assess the status of its communications efforts and think about the direction it wants to head.

We should take the time to seriously consider the meaning of America and how it relates to our ability to communicate overseas. While communication is important, we must also legitimately analyze the purpose of our communication and our ability to use it to help accomplish our foreign policy objectives.

Public diplomacy must be a priority for the next administration, and not allowed to fall to the sidelines. A key question for the President and for our national security apparatus is how America can better use public diplomacy to help secure our country and achieve our objectives overseas. The effective use of public diplomacy lessens the likelihood of the need to use force, and creates sustainable relationships in which differences can be resolved peacefully and challenges solved collaboratively.

Yet in the effort to improve America's public diplomacy, the next administration must understand that it must be about more than simply better telling America's story or creating messages to fill communication vacuums. It has to be geared towards actually accomplishing objectives.

It is not about creating warm fuzzy feelings about America, freedom, or democracy—but building relationships over time which give value to the American message and our founding ideals.

Part of valuing the American message will inevitably involve the need for foreigners to perceive that their opinions and concerns have value to America. If the United States is seen as communicating with foreign audiences solely for its self-interest, American messaging will fall on deaf ears. In the academic community, recognition of this issue has led to an emphasis on the need to “listen” to foreign publics in order to stave off the impression that America is



talking with its fingers in its ears.

Yet listening goes beyond merely hearing. Listening is the process of understanding foreign audiences and incorporating the information gained into strategic thinking and policy planning. Through listening, policy makers can gain a better understanding of how America's foreign policy affects the lives and opinions of those whose cooperation is necessary to achieve our strategic goals. They must move beyond simply asking, “What do we want to achieve?”

In the next administration, policymakers must not assume that more public diplomacy is necessarily better public diplomacy.

The internet and social media provide easy metrics about engagement that don't always tell the whole story of how messages are received abroad. While the State Department consistently touts its social media prowess and makes broad claims about the power of e-diplomacy, it has a hard time demonstrating tangible results from its online efforts.

Successful online communication assumes several things:

1. The target audience has internet access.
2. The target audience is literate.
3. The message disseminated is strong enough and sufficiently interesting to stand out amongst the flood of information social media users are bombarded with daily.
4. Assuming the target audience receives the message, they will actually do something with it.

In reality, none of these things can be assumed. Governments rarely exercise proficiency in online communication, and typically lag well behind the curve and capabilities of non-state actors.

It is of little consequence if the State Department operates hundreds of Twitter accounts if there isn't a significant audience, or if those accounts aren't able to gain them a better understanding of the political environments of target countries. The significance of the internet is not in the ability for governments to communicate with millions of individuals, as it has always been able to do so. The significance lies in the ability for individuals to now communicate with millions of other individuals.



When the U.S. Government fully understands this, it will much better be able to understand the role of social media in diplomacy.

Social media aside, there are far more pressing matters for the next administration to address.

The next administration must make an effort to shift PD from a reactionary posture to one that is more equipped to deal with the real-time world we live in. This does not mean merely increasing America's online presence, but rather working to build stronger people-to-people relationships beyond the scope of speeches and creating an infrastructure of trust that preempts violent reactionism.

While the future of public diplomacy may be in doubt, it is not because it is unnecessary, but because it has lacked continuity and strategic purpose for the past 20 years.

Building relationships overseas takes time, and good public diplomacy is far more complicated than a PR campaign.

-----  
*Matthew Wallin is a research analyst at the American Security Project, where he writes on public diplomacy.*

## Author Biographies

**BGen Stephen Cheney** is the Chief Executive Officer of the American Security Project (ASP). He is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy and has over 30 years experience as a Marine. His career included a wide variety of command and staff positions with the operating forces and the supporting establishment. His primary specialty was artillery, but he focused extensively on entry-level training, commanding at every echelon at both Marine Corps Recruit Depots, to include being the Commanding General at Parris Island. He served several years in Japan and has traveled extensively throughout the Middle East and Asia. Following retirement from the Marines, he became the Chief Operating Officer for Business Executives for National Security (BENS), in Washington, D.C., and most recently was President/CEO of the Marine Military Academy in Harlingen, Texas.

**Colin Geraghty** earned both his undergraduate degree and his Masters in Paris, where he lived for 11 years. Prior to joining ASP as an adjunct fellow, he interned in the U.S. Senate, as a defense analyst in the French Embassy in Washington D.C., and for UNESCO. He is also a non-resident associate with the Raoul Dandurand Chair for Strategic and Diplomatic Studies at the University of Quebec at Montreal (UQAM). As such, he has published numerous articles on Indian foreign policy, nuclear non-proliferation, counter-terrorism, and the Asia-Pacific. He has been invited on French national radio to discuss the death of Bin Laden, and to brief leading French political figures and high ranking diplomats on South Asia, the Afghan conflict and U.S. national security policy.

**Mark “Puck” Mykleby** was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps following his graduation from the United States Naval Academy in 1987. During his career as Marine fighter pilot, he served in numerous operational and staff billets and participated in combat operations in support of Operations PROVIDE PROMISE, DENY FLIGHT, SOUTHERN WATCH, and IRAQI FREEDOM. From July 2007 to July 2009, he developed strategy for US Special Operations Command and from July 2009 until April 2011 he served as a special strategic assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff developing grand strategy. Mark retired from the Marine Corps in July 2011 and has joined LRN, a company dedicated to helping organizations build ethical, values-based cultures that inspire principled performance in business and in life.

**Mary Catherine (M.C.) Andrews**, currently a resident fellow at Harvard University’s Institute of Politics. M.C. served as Special Assistant to the President and Director of the White House Office of Global Communications from 2003 to 2005. Previously, she was Director for Democracy on the White House National Security Council staff and on the NSC transition team in 2000. Before joining the White House, M.C. managed the Aspen Strategy Group, a policy program of the Aspen Institute. M.C. has observed more than 25 elections in 12 countries and written eight books on democratic development in Central and East Europe. She is originally from Gastonia, North Carolina, and has a Bachelor of Arts degree from Hollins College and a Masters in Public Administration from Harvard University.

**Christine W. McEntee** is Executive Director and Chief Executive Officer of the American Geophysical Union (AGU). She is the third Executive Director in the organization’s 92-year history. For more than 25 years, McEntee has made her mark as an association leader and innovator, building a steady record of achievement in leading large organizations through changes in governance, membership, and the fluid public policies that confront them. Her leadership has spanned the fields of aging, healthcare, architecture, and currently, geophysical science.

**Carolyn Deady** is a freelance journalist and former international producer at C-SPAN (Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network) in Washington, DC. While at C-SPAN, she was the liaison with world legislatures, obtaining coverage of parliamentary proceedings for broadcast. She also worked with television networks worldwide in getting foreign newscasts to offer the C-SPAN audience an international perspective on events affecting the United States. Ms. Deady also covered multiple parliamentary and presidential races in the field, including the British House of Commons and the Mexican Presidential race of 2000. She also field produced programming of U.S. Congressional and presidential elections.

**Dr. Seyom Brown** has held senior research and policy analysis positions at the RAND Corporation, the Brookings Institution, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs in the John F. Kennedy School of Government, and has served as a Special Assistant in the Office of International Security Affairs in the Department of Defense and a Special Assistant to the Director of Policy Planning in the Department of State.

**Terri S. Lodge** is a Washington based expert who has worked on nuclear issues for many years. Ms. Lodge started her career as a nuclear analyst for the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research. She then worked for the Director of Arms Control and Disarmament Agency on arms control negotiations. In 1991 Ms. Lodge returned to the Department of State as the Senior Congressional Advisor for Arms Control and Nonproliferation where she represented the State Department on Capitol Hill for eleven years, working on the broad range of arms control and nonproliferation issues.

**August Cole** is a writer focusing on national security issues. He is currently writing a series of novels about private military contractors involved in covert and clandestine intelligence operations for the U.S. His research centers on how operational and policy priorities, political shifts and budget cuts impact the defense industry and U.S. national security.

**Nicholas Cunningham** is a policy analyst focusing on climate change and next generation energy issues. Before joining ASP, he worked for Global Policy Group, a Washington DC-based consulting company, working on energy and environmental policy and regulation. Prior to that, he worked as an intern on clean energy policy at Third Way, a think tank in D.C. He also lived in Buenos Aires, Argentina from 2008 to 2009, where he taught English.

**Joshua Foust** is a Fellow at the American Security Project and the author of Afghanistan Journal: Selections from Registan.net. Joshua is currently researching the role of entrepreneurship in national security strategy, on the development of metrics in understanding national security policy, and on non-military implementations of foreign policy doctrine. He has written on strategic design for humanitarian interventions, decision-making in counterinsurgency, the intelligence community's place in the national security discussion, and the changing role of privacy and secrecy post-Wikileaks. His research focuses primarily on Central and South Asia. Previous to joining ASP, Joshua worked for the U.S. intelligence community, where he focused on studying the non-militant socio-cultural environment in Afghanistan at the U.S. Army Human Terrain System, then the socio-cultural dynamics of irregular warfare movements at the National Ground Intelligence Center, and later on political violence in Yemen for the Defense Intelligence Agency.

**Matthew Wallin** is a Senior Policy Analyst at the American Security Project focusing on issues of public diplomacy and strategic communication. Prior to working with ASP, he completed his Masters in Public Diplomacy at the University of Southern California. While at USC, his studies focused on the public diplomacy implications of military conflict and viral communication by non-state actors. During this time, Matthew was instrumental in assembling an internationally attended conference on Science Diplomacy, and also interned in the Office of Press Relations at the U.S. Department of State. Originally from Los Angeles, Matthew is also heavily involved in "living history," teaching the public about the lives and sacrifices made by American veterans of the Second World War.

## Endnotes

1. Sumit Ganguly, "Think Again: India's Rise," Foreign Policy, 05 July 2012, [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/07/05/think\\_again\\_india\\_s\\_rise](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/07/05/think_again_india_s_rise)
2. Esther Pan, Jayshree Bajoria, "The U.S.-India Nuclear Deal," Council on Foreign Relations, 05 November 2010, <http://www.cfr.org/india/us-india-nuclear-deal/p9663>
3. U.S. State Department, "Joint Statement on the Third U.S.-India Strategic Dialogue," 13 June 2012, <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2012/06/192267.htm>
4. Anwar Iqbal, "US making strategic bet on India," Dawn, 12 October 2011, <http://dawn.com/2011/10/12/us-making-strategic-bet-on-india/>
5. Jim Yardley, "India Passes Nuclear Deal," The New York Times, 30 August 2010, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/31/world/asia/31india.html>
6. Cary Gillam, "Americans waste, throw away nearly half their food: study," Reuters, 21 August 2012, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/08/21/us-food-waste-idUSBRE87K0WR20120821>
7. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "Obesity is common, serious, and costly," May 2012, [http://www.cdc.gov/media/matte/2012/05\\_weight\\_of\\_nation.pdf](http://www.cdc.gov/media/matte/2012/05_weight_of_nation.pdf)
8. Jim Abrams, "Livestock farmers seek pause in ethanol production," The Associated Press, 09 August 2012, <http://finance.yahoo.com/news/livestock-farmers-seek-pause-ethanol-production-065218525--finance.html>
9. Complete text of this study can be found at Project Gutenberg: <http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks02/0200301.txt>
10. University of Michigan's Global Change Program, "Land Degradation," 04 January 2010, [http://www.globalchange.umich.edu/globalchange2/current/lectures/land\\_deg/land\\_deg.html](http://www.globalchange.umich.edu/globalchange2/current/lectures/land_deg/land_deg.html)
11. See, for example, Cassandra Brooks, "No Recovery for Atlantic Cod Population," Science Magazine, 25 November 2008, <http://news.sciencemag.org/sciencenow/2008/11/25-01.html>
12. See complete report here: <http://www.rodaleinstitute.org/fst30years>
13. Nielsen, "Final Presidential Debate Draws 59.2 million Viewers," 23 October 2012, <http://blog.nielsen.com/nielsenwire/politics/final-presidential-debate-draws-59-2-million-viewers/>
14. Gregor Peter Schmitz, "People of the World, Look at Me," Der Spiegel, 25 July 2008, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Barack\\_Obama\\_presidential\\_campaign,\\_2008](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Barack_Obama_presidential_campaign,_2008)
15. Pew Global, "Global Opinion of Obama Slips, International Policies Faulted," 13 June 2012, <http://www.pewglobal.org/2012/06/13/global-opinion-of-obama-slips-international-policies-faulted/>
16. Pew Global, "Global Public Opinion in the Bush Years (2001-2008)," 118 December 2008, <http://www.pewglobal.org/2008/12/18/global-public-opinion-in-the-bush-years-2001-2008/>
17. Pew Global, "Growing Concerns in China about Inequality, Corruption," 16 October 2012, <http://www.pewglobal.org/2012/10/16/growing-concerns-in-china-about-inequality-corruption/>
18. Rosa Brooks, "The Case for Intervention," Foreign Policy, 18 October 2012, [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/18/the\\_case\\_for\\_intervention](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/18/the_case_for_intervention)
19. Dana Priest and William Arkin, "A hidden world, growing beyond control," The Washington Post, 19 July 2010, <http://projects.washingtonpost.com/top-secret-america/articles/a-hidden-world-growing-beyond-control/>
20. Budgeting for Foreign Affairs and Defense, "Intel on the Intel Budget," The Stimson Center, 01 November 2012, <http://thewillandthewallet.squarespace.com/blog/2012/11/1/intel-on-the-intel-budget.html>
21. Greg Miller, "Plan for hunting terrorists signals U.S. intends to keep adding names to kill lists," The Washington Post, 23

October 2012, [http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/plan-for-hunting-terrorists-signals-us-intends-to-keep-adding-names-to-kill-lists/2012/10/23/4789b2ae-18b3-11e2-a55c-39408fb6a4b\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/plan-for-hunting-terrorists-signals-us-intends-to-keep-adding-names-to-kill-lists/2012/10/23/4789b2ae-18b3-11e2-a55c-39408fb6a4b_story.html)

22. Mike Mount, "Security Clearance report forces Army to approve key program," CNN Security Clearance Blog, 11 October 2012, <http://security.blogs.cnn.com/2012/10/11/security-clearance-pressure-army-to-move-on-anti-ied-system-for-troops/>
23. Patrick Chisholm, "Bring back human intelligence," The Christian Science Monitor, 27 June 2002, <http://www.csmonitor.com/2002/0627/p25s01-cogn.html>
24. Ismail Khan, "Drones aided by 'human assets' on the ground," Dawn, 30 December 2010, <http://dawn.com/2010/12/30/drones-aided-by-human-assets-on-the-ground/>
25. Manan Ahmed, "Flying blind: US foreign policy's lack of expertise," The National , 04 March 2011, <http://www.thenational.ae/arts-culture/books/flying-blind-us-foreign-policys-lack-of-expertise?pageCount=0#full>
26. John Krakauer, "Three Cups of Deceit: How Greg Mortenson, Humanitarian Hero, Lost His Way," byliner.com, 18 April 2011, <http://byliner.com/originals/three-cups-of-deceit>

# Further Reading

## American Security Quarterly

[4th Edition: Oct 2012](#)

[3rd Edition: July 2012](#)

[2<sup>nd</sup> Edition: April 2012](#)

[1<sup>st</sup> Edition: January 2012](#)

### Connect to ASP

**Web:** [www.americansecurityproject.org](http://www.americansecurityproject.org)

**Twitter:** [@amsecproject](https://twitter.com/amsecproject)

**Facebook:** [www.facebook.com / americansecurityproject](http://www.facebook.com/americansecurityproject)

**Email:** [info@americansecurityproject.org](mailto:info@americansecurityproject.org)

## ASP Major Reports:

**Climate and Energy Security**

[Climate Security Report](#)

[Pay Now, Pay Later: A State-by-State Assessment of the Costs of Climate Change](#)

[America's Energy Choices: 2012 Edition](#)

**Nuclear Security Initiative**

[Critical Choices facing the Next Administration](#)

[Nuclear Security Index: Assessing Modern Nuclear Threats and the Tools to Combat Them](#)

**Asymmetric Operations**

["The War on Terror": One Year On](#)

[The Strategic Context for Lethal Drones: A framework for discussion](#)

## National Security Strategy

[The New Public Diplomacy Imperative](#)

[U.S. Strategy in Afghanistan: Five Lessons We Should Have Learned](#)

### **ASP Fact Sheets & Perspectives:**

[Fact Sheet - The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty](#)

[Fact Sheet – Moving Toward Tallinn: Drafting the Shape of Cyber Warfare](#)

[Fact Sheet - Yemen](#)

[Fact Sheet – Internal Confinement Fusion at the National Ignition Facility](#)

[Fact Sheet - U.S.C. Title 10, Title 22, and Title 50](#)

[Fact Sheet – North Korea’s Nuclear Program](#)

[Fact Sheet – A New Discourse: Climate Change in the Face of a Shifting U.S. Energy Portfolio](#)

[Fact Sheet – Contextualizing the Drones Debate](#)

[Fact Sheet – Arctic Climate and Energy](#)

[Fact Sheet – The Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program](#)

[Toward a Policy of Modular Multilateralism](#)

[Why the U.S. cannot ignore Pakistan](#)

[Enhancing the Defense Industrial Base](#)

[An Examination of the Fulbright Program](#)

[Offshore Oil Drilling in the Arctic](#)

[Counteracting Chinese Hegemony in the South China Sea](#)

[Talking with Tehran: An Overview of U.S.-Iran Nuclear Negotiations](#)

[A “Bold and Decisive” Plan for Europe](#)

## Building a New American Arsenal

The American Security Project (ASP) is a nonpartisan initiative to educate the American public about the changing nature of national security in the 21st century.

Gone are the days when a nation's strength could be measured by bombers and battleships. Security in this new era requires a New American Arsenal harnessing all of America's strengths: the force of our diplomacy; the might of our military; the vigor of our economy; and the power of our ideals.

We believe that America must lead other nations in the pursuit of our common goals and shared security. We must confront international challenges with all the tools at our disposal. We must address emerging problems before they become security crises. And to do this, we must forge a new bipartisan consensus at home.

ASP brings together prominent American leaders, current and former members of Congress, retired military officers, and former government officials. Staff direct research on a broad range of issues and engages and empowers the American public by taking its findings directly to them.

We live in a time when the threats to our security are as complex and diverse as terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, climate change, failed and failing states, disease, and pandemics. The same-old solutions and partisan bickering won't do. America needs an honest dialogue about security that is as robust as it is realistic.

ASP exists to promote that dialogue, to forge consensus, and to spur constructive action so that America meets the challenges to its security while seizing the opportunities the new century offers.



American Security Project

[www.americansecurityproject.org](http://www.americansecurityproject.org)