National Security Policy

...safeguarding America’s national interests from external and internal threats...

National Security Policy

- Pattern of government decisions & actions
  - intended to counter perceived threats – foreign & domestic – to America’s national interests,
  - and especially America’s vital interests
- Vital Interests the most powerful policy legitimizing values
  - Invokes survival of the state
- Security as a basic value
  - Others make little sense without security
  - Overshadowing other values
    - Liberty
    - Efficiency
    - Equity

Begs four questions:

- What are America’s national interests?
- What are America’s vital interests?
- Who determines these?
- How do we choose the appropriate actions & tradeoffs for protecting these public interests?
National Security is Government’s Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Decisions</th>
<th>Collective Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can choose, alone &amp; without interference.</td>
<td>Choices are made by the community &amp; are binding on all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Private Decisions
My choice has no consequence for your welfare.
Liberty of the Individual
Tyranny of the Majority.

Public Decisions
My choices affect your welfare.
Drift by the Minority
Liberty of the Group:
- What are American national & Vital Interests?
- Who and what threatens those interests?
- How should we cope with those threats?
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How does the community determine what is in the national interest & appropriate national security policy?

Let the People Decide
Let the Experts Decide
Let the Market Decide
Let Efficiency Decide
Let the political (elite) leadership decide
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National Security Policy is Elite Driven

- Agenda setting flows from government to the public
  - Is the typical of public policy issues?
- Deliberation in option formulation takes place out of the public arena
  - Closed networks of politicians and experts
  - Almost exclusively in executive branch
  - Small group deliberation (crisis decisions)

“Who” Frames the problem and who defines the policy choices?

- NSC
  - President
  - Vice President
  - Sec. of Defense
  - Sec. of State
  - Secretary of the Treasury
  - National Security Advisor
  - Chairman JCS
  - Director CIA
  - Others…
- NSC coordinating committees
  - Principals & deputies of the DoD, State, Treasury, White House, CIA, DOJ, NSC staff, JCS

Constraints on Deliberating National Security Policy

- Before the fact
  - Closed decisionmaking inside government
  - Secrecy, “they know best,” & public rational ignorance
- After the fact
  - Symbolics of “Patriotism” constrains debate
    - Support the President
    - Support the Troops
  - “What’s done is done” mentality
Institutional Context

Executive Control
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National Security Policy is vested in the Presidency

• Agenda setting
  – President as head of state
    • Defines national interests & threats

• Policy formulation
  – President as Chief Executive
    • Budget proposals
    • Strategy

• Implementation
  – President as "commander-in-chief"
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Other Institutional Actors defer to Presidency in times of Crisis

• Congress
  – Ret. Gen. Wesley Clark on the Congressional vote to use force against Iraq:
    • "...On balance, I probably would have voted for it...The simple truth is this: When the president of the United States comes to you and makes the linkages and taps the power of the office on you, and you're in a crisis, the balance of the judgment probably goes to the president of the United States."

• Supreme Court
  – Internment of Japanese Americans in WWII
  – Rights of those held under terrorism laws
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Non-Crisis National Security Policy

• Congress acts as a “policy editor” in National Security Policy
  – Budget authorization
  – Ratifying Treaties
  – Affirming senior appointments
• Courts defer to Executive on national security issues
  – Protection of classified information
• Public plays little direct role beyond electing the President
  – Public opinion highly susceptible to manipulation
  – Social mobilization (extraordinary circumstances)
• States (federalism) play a policy role
  – Anti-terrorism
  – National Guard (implementation)

Rational Model & National Security

Factors favoring Rational Model

• High Stakes of National Security
• Broad Consensus on Vital Interests
  – American territorial integrity
  – Preservation of American political and economic institutions
  – Safety of Americans at home and abroad
  – Stable and friendly Canada & Mexico
  – Strong & Prosperous European free market democracies
  – Access to Middle East Oil?
• President is nationally elected
Where does consensus on these vital interests come from?

- Education & socialization (patriotism)
- National Security issues move from Government agenda → public agenda
  - Problem framing
- Public deliberation?
  - Opinion polling
  - Elections?

Defense Modernization as a Case of a National Security Problem

Day-to-day policy making

- What is the issue?
  - How to re-engineer the U.S. defense posture to match the threats of the 21st Century
- What is the problem?
  - Non-traditional threats to vital interests
    - Weapons of mass destruction
    - Terrorism
  - Expansion defendable of national interests
Closer look reveals interesting anomalies

- Most imminent threats ignored, while distant threats receive priority
  - Missile Defense
    - Tens of billions of dollars for no defense against a non-existent threat
  - Iraq v. North Korea v. Al Qaeda
- Weapons systems cut by DoD restored to budget
- Force structure changes altered/stopped
- Proposed Base closings halted
- New Strategy receives no public scrutiny
- Overall DoD Budget altered
  - Budget is used to manipulate policy

Factors Competing with the Rational Model

- Consensus on national interests does not translate into consensus on how to protect those national interests
  - War v. diplomacy
  - Defense budget v. domestic spending
  - Missile Defense v. Harbor defense
  - Draft v. all volunteer force
  - Equity v. efficiency & security (civil rights & the military)
Factors Competing with the Rational Model

• Leadership Politics
  – Presidential reelection
  – Presidential psychology
  – President as head of political party
    • Missile defense

• Bureaucratic Politics
  – Within the Executive Branch
    • State Department v. Defense Department
  – Within Congress
    • Protecting prized weapons programs
    • Personal political ambitions

Factors Competing with the Rational Model

• Organizational politics
  – Military Services resist changes in structure, organization, weaponry, funding, mission, etc.
    • Army & Crusader artillery gun
    • Military resists larger role in domestic security

• Pluralist Politics
  – State & Local governments lobby to protect defense jobs & military bases
  – Weapons industries lobby for contracts
  – NGOs provide counter-analyses

• International Politics

Policy Streams Model of Decision to Build Missile Defense
The Special Case of North Korea

“Crisis”
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North Korea as a Case of a National Security Problem

- What is the issue?
  - Spread of nuclear weapons poses a danger to U.S. national & vital interests
- What is the problem?
  - “Evil” states are acquiring nuclear weapons
  - Some have relationships with terrorists
  - Others have weak command & control of these weapons
  - U.S. & allies have no defenses against these weapons
- Intelligence: North Korea is attempting to produce nuclear weapons


- Option Formulation & Decision
  1. Ignore & go to war
  2. Covert actions
  3.知识 & decision
  4. 有限军事行动
  5. 食品援助
  6. 激励及援助
  7. 国际政治经济压力
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Questions

• Does the specific strategy for dealing with the North Korean “threat” represent the most effective & appropriate actions for dealing with that threat?

Larger Questions

• If the primary threat is the imminent acquisition of nuclear weapons by “axis of evil” states, why did the U.S. attack Iraq rather than North Korea?
• If the primary threat is nuclear weapons falling into the hands of terrorists, why didn’t the U.S. focus on Pakistan’s nuclear weapons rather than Iraq or North Korea; and North Korea rather than Iraq?
  – Especially given Pakistan’s assistance to North Korea
Policy Streams Model of Decision to Confront with North Korea

Problem Stream
- Convergence Window
- North Korea A-bomb
- Middle East Instability
- Republican Presidency
- Democratic Presidency
- Republican Congress
- Middle Eastern States

Politics Stream
- Policy (Solution) Stream
- Confront “Evil” Regimes (North Korea)
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Policy Streams Model of Decision to Invade Iraq

Problem Stream
- Convergence Window
- North Korea A-bomb
- Middle East Instability
- Saddam Hussein
- Republican Presidency
- Democratic Presidency
- Republican Congress

Politics Stream
- Policy (Solution) Stream
- Confront “Evil” Regimes (Invade Iraq)
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