

## Briefing Memo

The purpose of this column is to respond to reader interests in security issues and at the same time to promote a greater understanding of NIDS.

A “briefing” provides background information, among others. We hope these columns will help everyone to better understand the complex of issues involved in security affairs. Please note that the views in this column do not represent the official opinion of NIDS.

### **US National Security Strategy: War on International Terrorism and Expansion of Democracy**

Executive Director  
KONDO Shigekatsu

#### **Introduction—NSS and QDR**

On March 16, 2006, the White House announced the Bush Administration’s second release of the National Security Strategy of the United States of America (NSS). By law, the president is required to present this strategy report to Congress every year. But Congress is lenient regarding the deadline for its presentation, and the annual requirement is often missed. In the case of a new president, a report is supposed to be presented within 150 days after his inauguration. In President George Bush’s case, however, his first NSS was presented a full 20 months after the inauguration, in September 2002. Moreover, even though it is considered to be a higher-level document than the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) on military affairs, the 2002 NSS was actually presented a full year after the 2001 QDR, which itself appeared by the legal deadline. This time around, as well, the second NSS arrived one and a half months after the QDR, which had been released in February 2006 alongside the budget proposal, as newly mandated.

At a press conference held at the time of the NSS release, Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor Jack D. Crouch, who was in charge of preparing the NSS, was asked about the relationship between the two reports, and he explained that the two reports are consistent as the transformation of the Department of Defense and the military presented in the QDR reflected the arguments in the NSS. Crouch also said that, whereas the QDR was prepared from the viewpoint of national defense, the NSS, treating security issues from the broadest perspective, emphasizes development as an important component of

tackling the long War on Terror.

With major changes in national strategy not likely while under the same administration, and with the United States currently at war, the Bush Administration appears to believe that there is no problem with the QDR being presented before the NSS. In fact, the 06QDR was based on the strategic guidelines laid down in the National Defense Strategy of the United States of America that was prepared by the Department of Defense based on the 02NSS and released in March 2005.

### **Characteristics of 06NSS**

In comparing the 06NSS to the 02NSS, one characteristic is its format, which consists of a review of US strategy goals named in the 02NSS that had been achieved by the Bush Administration in the last four years, showing the state of progress in specific policy areas and then a listing of future issues, so that it appears to be a self-appraisal document for the Bush Administration on security policy.

As a result, the 06NSS uses the same chapter headings as chapters 2 through 9 of the 02NSS, describing and responding to such strategy goals as “Champion Aspirations for Human Dignity,” “Strengthen Alliances to Defeat Global Terrorism and Work to Prevent Attacks Against Us and Our Friends,” “Work with Others to Defuse Regional Conflicts,” “Prevent Our Enemies from Threatening Us, Our Allies, and Our Friends with Weapons of Mass Destruction,” “Ignite a New Era of Global Economic Growth through Free Markets and Free Trade,” “Expand the Circle of Development by Opening Societies and Building the Infrastructure of Democracy,” “Develop Agendas for Cooperative Action with the Other Main Centers of Global Power,” and “Transform America’s National Security Institutions to Meet the Challenges and Opportunities of the Twenty-First Century.”

In the 02NSS, attention focused on the assertion that the traditional conditions in international society for justification of pre-emptive strikes should be relaxed and pre-emptive action should be allowed in cases in which international terrorists are threatening to link up with weapons of mass destruction. This assertion, and the war against Iraq that was taken in some quarters to be dependent on this assertion, gave rise to criticism that the foreign relations behavior of the first Bush Administration showed disdain for international cooperation and was unilateralist. The 06NSS, while emphasizing the need for the United States to lead the world, refers to the importance of cooperation with the United Nations (UN) and other international institutions, and of partnerships with other countries, but this reference does not go so far as the 06QDR. At the end of his introductory message to the 06NSS, President George Bush states that “effective multinational efforts are essential to solve these

problems,” but asserts that this applies when the United States does its part and other countries will do theirs, and therefore that “America must continue to lead.” While the 06NSS adds a chapter on the response to globalization that was not in the 02NSS, it refers to the deepening seriousness of such non-traditional threats as infectious diseases, human trafficking and other illicit trade, and environmental destruction, and emphasizes that US leadership must be used to respond to these issues. It appears that President Bush has not been swayed from his conviction that the United States is the leader of the world.

Another characteristic of the 06NSS is the clearer and closer link that it places on the war against international terror rooted in Islamic extremism, which is treated by the Bush Administration as the single most important issue, and promotion of democracy. In his introductory message, President Bush asserts his confidence that “free nations tend toward peace, the advance of liberty will make America more secure,” adding that “we have kept on the offensive against terrorist networks, leaving our enemy weakened, but not yet defeated.” The link between the war on terror and expansion of democracy is that it is “a battle of ideas.”

Here below, I examine the 06NSS concept of promotion of democracy, which has been criticized as unilateral foreign relations behavior, and the East Asia policies of the Bush Administration.

### **Promotion of Democratization**

The 06NSS states that the war on terror has from the first been both a battle of arms and a battle of ideas (and not a battle of religions), that eventual victory in the war on terror will require overcoming the ideas of terrorism (Islamic extremism), and that the war on terror must necessarily be a long war, or a long struggle. The 06NSS analyzes why terrorism has appeared, offering such factors as political alienation, grievances that are blamed on others, sub-cultures of conspiracy and misinformation, and justification of murder, and then asserts that democracy is what can overcome these factors.

In the past, US human rights policy emphasized democratic procedures, and the tendency to position elections themselves as the standard of measurement was extremely strong. The 06NSS, however, changes this tendency and shows a recognition that certain conditions are required for the realization of “effective” democracy, and that development and economic growth are important in creating these conditions. When democracy is firmly established, terrorism can be overcome. If conditions for democracy are not in place, with Palestine being the latest example, forces distant from the democratic forces envisioned by the United States could well use elections to obtain political power for themselves. This appears to be the bitter lesson that the United States has learned from the Iraq War that it had so optimistically

entered.

In regards to economic development, utilization of “the Millennium Challenge Account” plan is called for in the 02NSS. For poor countries, however, there is concern that the qualification threshold required by the United States for democratization is set too high for recipients of economic assistance.

### **East Asia Policy**

While the 06NSS states that boosting the consensus among major powers will also boost benefits for the United States, it also asserts that there are differences of opinion with some countries regarding the pace of change, and that some countries, while giving lip service in support of free markets and effective democracy, have done virtually nothing for the expansion of freedom. On this point, the shared commitment to democracy at home in both Japan and the United States can be considered to be a firm foundation for cooperation between the two countries in the international sphere.

However, the 06NSS notes that, while there are few regions that have been as economically successful as East Asia, there have also been few regions that have had such difficulties in overcoming past feelings of suspicion. On this latter point, the 06NSS asserts that a systematic framework is needed for promoting still more growth in East Asia, and that building such a framework will require a foundation of healthy bilateral relationships between the United States and the key countries of the region.

In regard to China, the 06NSS takes the position of welcoming the rise of China as a peaceful and prosperous state, and confirms that US strategy toward China, while preparing for other possibilities, is to encourage that nation to make as strategically correct choices for its people as ever. In this context, the 06NSS expresses concern that China’s leaders promote military expansion in a non-transparent way; even while expanding trade they also try to lock up energy supplies around the world, and they support resource-rich countries without regard to misrule in these countries.

### **06NSS and Common Strategic Objectives of Japan and the United States**

At a meeting in February 2005, the Japan-US Security Consultative Committee (2+2), which consists of the two countries’ foreign and defense ministers, confirmed the two countries’ common strategic objectives. All of the above-mentioned issues, including elimination of international terrorism, promotion of democratization, development support, regional cooperation, and policies related to China, were included in these common strategic objectives. As a result, it can be said that efforts toward closer cooperation between Japan and

the United States for realization of these common strategic objectives are needed to ensure peace, security, and prosperity in the region and international society, and that Japan needs to build an active regional policy in order to respond to US interest in East Asia.

### **Bibliography**

“National Security Strategy of the United States of America (2006)”

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss/2006/>

“National Security Strategy of the United States of America (2002)”

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html>

Shigekatsu Kondo, “21-seiki ni okeru Beikoku no kokubo senryaku – Beikoku no yuetsu o sasaeru gunjiryoku no kochiku (US Defense Strategy in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century – Building Military Power in Support of US Superiority),” *Kokusai Mondai (International Affairs)*, February 2003, No.515, The Japan Institute of International Affairs

The National Institute for Defense Studies, Eiichi Katahara, and Daisaku Sakaguchi, “2006-nen QDR: Beikoku no kokubo keikaku no aoshashin (2006 QDR: A Blueprint for the US Defense Plan),” Briefing Memo, February 2006

<http://www.nids.go.jp/dissemination/briefing/2006/pdf/200602.pdf>

(Draft completed on April 28, 2006)

Please contact us at the following regarding any questions, comments or requests you may have. Please note that no part of this document may be reproduced in any form without the prior consent of NIDS.

Planning and Coordination Office, The National Institute for Defense Studies

Telephone: 03-3713-5912

Fax: 03-3713-6149

E-mail: [nidsnews@nids.go.jp](mailto:nidsnews@nids.go.jp)

Website: <http://www.nids.go.jp>