# The Power Politics of the Bush Doctrine: International Security and the War on Terrorism

Kathleen Totoonchie
Boston College
totoonch@bc.edu

*"America's nascent neoimperial grand strategy threatens to rend the fabric of the international community and political partnerships precisely at a time when that community and those partnerships are urgently needed. It is an approach fraught with peril and likely to fail. It is not only politically unsustainable but diplomatically harmful. And if history is a guide, it will trigger antagonism and resistance that will leave America in a more hostile and divided world."*

- G. John Ikenberry

# The Power Politics of the Bush Doctrine: International Security and the War on Terrorism

Kathleen Totoonchie *Boston College*

*In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on September eleventh 2001, President G.W. Bush has developed a new grand strategy for the United States known as the National Security Strategy. This strategy is comprised of two different kinds of components. Joseph S. Nye Jr.'s theory on soft power, the ability to secure outcomes through attraction, and hard power, the ability to secure outcomes through force and coercion, can act to reinforce each other or limit each other. This paper employs this thesis by using it as a tool to test the likely successfulness of the National Security Strategy. The findings suggest that the components of hard and soft power in the National Security Strategy act to limit, rather than reinforce each other. However, the findings also suggest that this conflict is unavoidable in the short term due to elevated perceptions of threat of attack. Therefore, foreign policy makers should consider modifying the conflicting hard power strategies in the overall grand strategy of the state.*

In February of 1991, George Bush Sr. decided toward a policy of containment in Iraq following a cease fire in the Gulf War.[1] Since then, there has been considerable debate in the US government concerning the treatment of (past) Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein. With the election of George W. Bush in the year 2000, the debate gained some ground when the administration was formed of prior advocates for removing Hussein. On the night of the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001, G.W. Bush announced that the United States will make no distinction between terrorists and those who harbor terrorists. With this, the United States experienced an internal debate concerning retaliation for the attacks on US soil.[1] Secretary of State Colin Powell apposed Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz's argument for attacking Iraq, as well as Afghanistan in order to combat states that sponsor terrorism. The administration did not invade Iraq at this point, but the possible future intervention in Iraq was clear. This is the condition of the administration that developed and changed the way the U.S. looks at the world and the War on Terrorism.

The Bush Doctrine is the name commonly given to the President's National Security Strategy of the United States (NSS), a newly developed strategy for U.S. foreign Policy. The most criticized aspect of the strategy involves the notion of preventive war. President George W. Bush is widely recognized for his pursuit of unilateral preventive war policy. Preventive war has long been a practice contrary to the norms and principles of international law. A doctrine of preventive war is seen to be aggressive and threatening in that it allows for military action on states who do not pose an imminent threat. The fear is that any nation acting under the guise of preventive war can find many reasons to justify military intervention, so long as the intervening state find the defending state to be contributing to a potential future threat. In addition, this policy is clearly more threatening if employed by a world super-power in that the capacity to intervene by force is sufficient

---

[1] FRONTLINE *The War Behind Closed Doors*. "Chronology: The Evolution of the Bush Doctrine". Timeline published online by PBS: www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/iraq/etc/cron.html viewed 10/26/2003

enough to support such a policy.  This is clearly a policy that aiming to accomplish strategy goals through the use of force.

Preventive action, however, is not new to U.S. foreign policy.  The liberal tradition of the United States has always aimed at preventing future costs to American interests.  This has been achieved through the establishment of international institutions and multi-lateral agreements.  The interesting twist to the NSS is that the policy does not abandon this tradition but, instead, combines it with the threat of force.  Using some literature on international cooperation, this paper will establish that there are two kinds of elements to Bush Administration's preventive war doctrine: "hard power" and "soft power".  Joseph S. Nye Jr. of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University defines power as "the ability to produce the outcomes you want."[2]  He further defines hard power as that which is used to produce outcomes by force or coercion and soft power as the ability to secure outcomes through attraction rather than coercion.  Nye goes on to discuss how soft power and hard power can reinforce each other and sometimes they can limit each other.  There are both soft power elements and hard power elements in the NSS.  Clearly, the goal of the NSS is for the soft and hard power elements to reinforce each other.  However, I believe that the ability to engineer a policy containing components of both hard and soft power is much more difficult that it appears to be.  Therefore, it is important to scrutinize such policies with careful analysis.  The overall question for the NSS is whether or not the power components are compatible.

In order to answer this question, let us first turn to one possible explanation for this policy shift.  What has not changed is that Saddam Hussein has frequently violated United Nations Resolutions of non-proliferation, norms of Human Rights, and threatened the lives of peoples across the globe.  What has changed, however, is the way in which the United States assesses threats of attacks, especially regarding weapons of mass destruction.  For example, the anthrax scare in the U.S. called attention to the imminent dangers of bioterrorism.  In response to this, the United States government intends to boosts its bio-warfare defense.  Similarly, the possibility of increasing international terrorism is now calculated much more deeply and broadly into the US's threat perception.  Saddam Hussein was no longer the core danger perceived by US officials.  Instead, Iraq was seen as a place where terrorist organizations could receive the resources needed to attack anywhere with weapons of mass destruction.  This changed the way the United States perceived the level of threat posed by the Hussein Regime.

To defend against a new level of threat, the United States has refocused their defense strategy across the board.  For example, the Center for Disease control issues $9 million USD in grant money to research bio-defense.[3]  Similarly, government resources are being refocused to pay particular attention to defense against other forms of terrorism in the Home Land Security policy.  New budget allocations are an indicator that the threat perception of terrorism has changed in the United States.  It can be expected that budget allocation, a source of domestic policy, is not the only action that the Bush Administration

---

[2] Joseph S. Nye Jr. "The Velvet Hegemon: How Soft Power Can Help Defeat Terrorism." *Foreign Policy*. (May-June 2003)  Published by:  The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
[3] Press Release: "CDC announces new biodefense and emerging infectious disease research grant program and training grants."  October 3, 2003 Center for Disease Control Office of Communications. http://www.cdc.gov/od/oc/media/pressrel/r031003a.htm  Viewed: 11/26/2003

will pursue in the War on Terrorism. These new threats are the cause that led to a war with Iraq as well as a revamping of foreign policy and the development of the NSS.

The next question is how the new threat perception acted to shape the NSS. The changes in US foreign policy were officially articulated in the National Security Strategy (NSS), released on September 17th, 2002. The document focuses on preventive measure that the United States will take in order to combat terrorism. Such measures include the right to preemptive military actions in states that are perceived to contain terrorist threats. Other measures include the promotion of universal values of human rights, the defusing of regional conflicts, an agenda for development, and the promotion of democracy. Although the inclusion of a preventive doctrine is more widely discussed, there are many other components worth analyzing in the NSS. Most importantly, it is important to note the sections of the NSS involving "soft power" politics, such as development and human rights agendas. These are particularly interesting because they necessarily involve international cooperation. It is my assumption that this stems from the realization that, while the United States may be able to unilaterally invade and conquer Iraq, it is not feasible that the United States eradicate poverty, human rights violations, and radical Islam single handedly. Therefore, one would expect to see increasing reliance on international cooperation in order to succeed in the "War on Terror".

In order to identify successful combinations of hard and soft power, one may turn to the lessons of history. As the second half of the twentieth century has shown, in order to engage in soft power politics, the Bush Administration must rely on such things as international credibility, legitimacy, and bargaining power to achieve the goals wanted in international security cooperation. The combination of soft and hard power has proved to be success for the United States in the post WWII era. The Marshall plan, deployed by the US contained both elements of hard and soft power. In addition, soft power was crucial to the US victory in the Cold War.[2] The Soviet Union, on the other hand, lost its attractiveness to Europe as it pursued solely hard power politics in the invasions of Hungary and Czechoslovakia. This power balancing process is adequately articulated by G. John Ikenberry in his discussion of the expanding democratic capitalist order. Ikenberry's theory is useful in understanding the sustainability and success of soft power politics in US history, and the potential future uses of a soft-power policy.

For the Bush Administration, the use of international organizations is one of the major ways in which the United States can deploy methods of soft power. G. John Ikenberry depicts the United States hegemony as a remarkably unique dominant power.[4] He attributes the durability of the American order to the increasing returns of the liberal institutions that were set in place by the United States at the end of the Second World War. Ikenberry's main argument is:

> "Over the decades, the core institutions of the western order have sunk their roots ever more deeply into the political and economic structures of the states that participate within the order. The result is that it is becoming increasingly difficult for 'alternative institutions' or 'alternative leadership' to seriously emerge.

---

[4] Ikenberry, John G. *Liberal Hegemony and the future of American postwar order*. International Order and the Future of World Politics. Pg. 123-145 Edited by T.V. Paul & John A. Hall. Cambridge University Press ©1999

American hegemony has become institutionalized and path dependent... (Page 124)"[4]

In other words, the institutions set in place after WWII, such as the financial institutions of the Bretton Woods conference and the creation of NATO, were part of a liberal grand strategy for establishing a post war order in favor of the United States by using the forces of international cooperation. The institutions, based on political reciprocity, multilateral decision making, and economic openness, are the framework for both international cooperation and US power in the post war era. These institutions were constructed with soft power, while the US relied on its previously exercised hard power in WWII as a bargaining chip to place itself at the center of the intuitional design. The utility of bargaining power, however, is secondary to the bargain itself, for it would be useless if there are no bargains to be made. Thus, the sustainability of these institutions should be a higher goal than the accumulation of bargaining power.

Ikenberry argues that the sustainability of these core institutions rests on two logics. First, the institutions lower the risk of participation for weaker states by reducing the "returns to power". This is to say that the design of these institutions provides a power distributive element that reduces the natural amount of power that would be gained by the stronger states in favor of the weaker states. Ikenberry's argument is that this provides an incentive for weaker states to participate. This is an example of soft power – the ability to achieve outcomes through attractiveness.[2] Second, institutions themselves become imbedded and thus, make it increasingly difficult for alternate strategies, institutions, or leaders to compete. According to Ikenberry, the implications of these two logics are that the American hegemonic order is relatively stable and expansive.[4] While this may not be entirely accurate, it does provide some evidence for the usefulness and success of soft power.

A similar understanding of international cooperation and the function of soft power is identified in discussion of the relative gains problem. Realists' theories of international relations believe that states operate in an anarchical system and in order to achieve their interests. Therefore, there is considerable question of how to form sustainable cooperation in an environment free from a superior power. The problem of relative gains is that it is assumes that if a state is concerned that another states is going to gain a disproportionate amount from an agreement then they will hesitate to join the agreement. To solve this problem, incentives can be provided outside this agreement to compensate. Soft power comes in to this equation as a means to minimize the perception of unequal relative gains, thereby increasing the attractiveness of the agreement.

The opposing understanding of international relations as a system of "absolute gains" would still require some practice of soft power. The theory of absolute gains assumes that states will make an agreement if they are gain any amount at all, even if the other party to the agreement gains a greater amount relative to them. Soft power can be used as a means to increase the perception of absolute gains. In other words, a state would chose to make a cooperative agreement attractive by increasing the perception of some gain to both states. In either gains case, it is clear that soft power is critical in forming agreement to facilitate international cooperation.

What has been said thus far illuminates how a state can maximize the use of soft-power. What is left to be argued is the critical necessity of cooperation in fighting security

threats such as terrorism. The increasing movement over borders created a greater demand for cooperation between states. Globalization facilitates the transfer of people, goods, and ideas across borders. With the increase of global flows of capital, border control has become increasingly difficult. The ability to control illicit trade is of concern to the war on terror due to the nature of terrorist organizations. One example of this is the ability for groups to launder money through banks of different nations. Due to the discrepancies in banking regulation between states, law enforcement has run into challenges of tracking money in states with less stringent regulations on banking. Some have even identified a relationship between terrorist groups and the western world. Loretta Napoleoni finds the degree of interdependence between terrorist organization and the western states to be astonishing. She says that, "The West is the primary consumer of narcotics and the major seller of arms – the largest revenue and expenditure items, respectively, in the balance of payments of armed organizations."[5] This is only one example of where international cooperation becomes necessary in combating terror.

Another need for cooperation stems from the importance of the ability and willingness of states to identify terrorist groups within their borders. The ability and willingness to do so will enhance the ability of the United States, and other states, to target these groups. This will most likely depend on the ability of the United States to attract moderate Muslims to ally against terrorist organizations. This is because political Islam will continue to be an important force in the Middle East. Islamic movements are closely tied to national identity and domestic politics. According to a working paper by Mustapha Kamel Al-Sayyid, Islamists (radical Muslims) are increasingly finding non-violent means to achieve their goals. However, he warns that in situations where Islamists confront occupation by a foreign force (for example, the fight of Islamist groups against the Soviet Army in Afghanistan or the fight by Hezbollah against the Israeli occupation force in southern Lebanon) Islamists benefit from the sympathy of the majority, moderate Muslim population.[6] Gaining the support of the moderate Muslim population is a critical step in the war on terror but is also very fragile and complicated. The United States must be very careful to pursue policies that decrease the projection of a threatening image of power.

A non-threatening image is also crucial in relations between the US and their allies. International cooperation proves to be particularly difficult since the United States worked outside the United Nations when declaring war in Iraq, violating a number of international norms of intervention as well as international law. Such a strategy goal would be very complicated. The NSS states that the US intends to use international organizations to promote its strategy, but will not hesitate to take unilateral action if necessary. It is questionable what impact this aggressive policy will have on cooperation. It is also questionable to what extend the decision to go to war with Iraq will impact the ability to use these institutions.

The subsequent analysis will attempt to classify the kinds of components in the NSS. This will be followed by a short discussion of any needed changes in international law that would make these goals legal and mutually expectable. If it proves to be impossible to reconcile these foreign policy changes with the current regime of international war norms,

---

[5] Loretta Napoleoni. Modern Jihad: Tracing the Dollars Behind the Terror Networks. (get proper sighting from Deese) As sited in a book review by Alan Cowell 11/9/03.
[6] Mustapha Kamel Al-Sayyid. "The Other Face of the Islamic Movement." A working paper published by the Global Policy Program of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. No. 33 (Jan 2003)

then it is not in the best interest of the United States to pursue the "hard power" politics elements of the NSS where hard-power conflicts with soft power. Instead, the Bush Administration should actively pursue a grand strategy in favor if the "soft power" elements of the NSS.

## Components of Soft Power in the National Security Strategy:

The major focus of the Bush Doctrine involves policies that practice soft power. There are actually two separate orientations of soft power elements in the NSS. The first orientation is toward **international cooperation**. The purpose of these policy goals is to gain international contributions (both material and verbal support) to the War on Terrorism. The second orientation is long term in nature because it is directed at the **causes of terrorism**. This can be viewed as preventive action because it aims at halting the conflict before it starts. I will now turn to a discussion of these three orientations.

With regard to international cooperation, one of the primary objectives of the NSS is to identify terrorism as a common enemy of all states. This, of course, is any terrorist group. As a participating state, identifying this enemy makes it politically necessary to show some support for the irradiation of this enemy. Banking on the ability of other states to identify with the threat of terrorism to the United States, the Bush Administration hopes to solicit support for international cooperation on the issue. This is the first step in ensuring international cooperation. In the introduction to the NSS, Bush writes:

> "Today, the international community has the best chance since the rise of the nation-state in the seventeenth century to build a world where great powers compete in peace instead of continually prepare for war. Today, the world's great powers find themselves on the same side – united by common dangers of terrorist violence and chaos."[7]

The Bush Administration hopes to gain additional support with its sections of the NSS on human rights and morals, also known as the intent to "champion aspiration for human dignity."[7] This action entails the United States to first clarify the goals for which they stand. It is stated that America is committed to justice, freedom, limits on the absolute power of states, respect for women, tolerance of ethnic and religious groups, and private property rights.[8] The implementation of these commitments involve; (1) criticizing states in violation of such principles (2) providing aid to those who follow them (3) working with other democracies to pressure non-democracies (4) taking special efforts to promote freedom of religion. The purpose of this section of the NSS is to make states aware, through written policy, of US goals so that they are attracted to the American mission.

In addition to announcing attractive goals such as these, the US also is taking steps toward increasing policy transparency. Newt Gingrich commented on the importance of this:

> "As the World's only superpower, largest economy, and most aggressive culture, the United States depends on the attention and interests of other peoples and nations.

---

[7] The National Security Strategy of The United States of America. September 2002
[8] National Security Strategy: page 3 (2002)

A country this large and powerful must work every day to communicate what it is doing. The world does not have to love us, but it must be able to predict us"[9]

The idea is that a transparent policy will increase predictability. This aims to allow the US to become more predictable in hopes that such predictability will increase the attractiveness of international agreements. With this, the NSS attempts to clarify the US position on international legal matters. Section five of the NSS, titled "Prevent our Enemies from Threatening Us, Our Allies, and Our Friends with Weapons of mass Destruction", explicitly states the changes anticipated by the US in war and international law. The primary change is the extension of the doctrine of preemptive war to the capabilities and objectives of a new type of adversary; terrorist organizations. Announcing this view acts to give advance notice of a radical shift in foreign policy and to create debate within the United Nations. The position of the US, as stated in the NSS, is "the greater the threat, the more compelling the case for taking anticipatory action to defend ourselves, even if uncertainty remains as to the time and place of the enemies attack."[10]

Even if the NSS is successful in gaining international cooperation, the second soft-power oriented component of the strategy addresses an underlying difficulty; annihilating the causes of terrorism. Identifying the causes of terrorism is a difficult task. Although I do not claim to have solved this task, I believe that there are the Bush Administration has identified. In order to more accurately understand the doctrine, I will discuss these causes as if they are true. This, however, is still being debated. The Bush Administration seems to have identified poor economics conditions, minority rights and weak, hostile, or oppressive regimes as the fundamental contributors to terrorism. Thus, in order to fight terrorism, the NSS has been designed to encourage certain domestic policies abroad.

With regard to the goals of strengthening states through economics, in the introduction to the NSS, President Bush writes;

"The events of September 11, 2001, taught us that weak states, like Afghanistan, can pose as great a danger to our national interest as strong states. Poverty does not make people into terrorists and murderers. Yet poverty, weak institutions, and corruption can make weak states vulnerable to terrorist networks and drug cartels within their borders."[11]

This same message is repeated in more detail in section six of the NSS. The strategy in this section is to promote economic growth through policies that promote business growth, low marginal tax rates, rules of law intolerant of corruption, strong financial systems, sound fiscal policy, investment in health and education, and the promotion of free trade. These policy initiatives clearly address the goal of strengthening the state, especially in the economic sector.

To be even more precise, the NSS states that the long term objective is to have a world in which all countries have investment-grade credit ratings that allow them access to international capital markets and invest in their future. In addition, the NSS prescribes that the US should take a more precautionary role in the International Monetary Fund in order

---

[9] Newt Gingrich. "Rogue State Department" *Foreign Policy* (July/August 2003: Published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace) p. 42-48
[10] National Security Strategy p.15 (2002)

to prevent financial crisis from occurring.  Then the NSS makes reference to the completion of the Doha round of trade negotiation in the World Trade Organization as well as expanding the Free Trade Area of the Americas.[11]  These notions of the promotion of free trade are grounded in the idea that free a strong world economy enhances our national security and advances prosperity in the world.

The strategy of promoting economic growth does indeed seem to address the goal of strengthening the state but it may not address it fully and accurately.  This also seems to be discussed in section seven of the NSS with reference to the various accounts and grants to be given to developing states.  It seems as though the United States is planning on being more cautious with their applications, however it is worth noting that free trade policies have left some sectors of society temporarily out of the process.  This could lead to the mobilizing of desperate groups.  If this is combined with leadership promoting the use of violence, then a potential terrorist group is formed.  Therefore, it might be in the best interest of the US and the war on terror to include a safety net mechanism to safeguard those sectors of society who will experience some loss during the transition to an open market state.  One safety-net feature already installed in the NSS is the strategy of securing public health and education in the developing world.  (The United States currently contributes more that twice as much money than the second highest contributor to the United Nations new global fund for HIV/AIDS.)[12]

The second goal that the US should pursue in preventing the causes of terrorism is to promote the equality of minority groups.  The commitment to this agenda may also kindle some additional legitimacy for the US from the moderate Muslim population, making it even more important.  This goal is addresses in section two of the NSS, "Champion the Aspirations of Human Dignity."  With regard to the advancement of minority groups, the NSS shows that the US position on doing this is through the advancement of liberty and freedoms of religion.  However the liberal agenda of promoting free trade and democracy does risk causing some complications if the minority groups are not assimilated into the state.  This problem is confounded when minority groups seek statehood.

The problem for stateless nations and unassimilated minority groups is that just because a state is being secured by the US in their new strategy, it could be decreasing the possibility for a nation fighting for statehood to achieve their goals.  This will increase the threat perception of the work of the United States, further isolating both the stateless nation and the moderate Muslim population (in the case where an Islamic nation seeks statehood).  As stated by Hudson Meadwell "[even if the democratic peace is possible] is all now stable?  Not necessarily.  The literature on the domestic politics of the democratic peace says little about how liberalism is secured domestically (page 262)."[13]  Taken one step further, it can be seen how not only nations may turn to conflict, but other identity groups that are left out

---

[11] National Security Strategy of the USA (2002) p. 17-20
[12] National Security Strategy of the USA (2002) p.23
[13] Meadwell, Hudson. *Stateless nations and the emerging international order*. International Order and the Future of World Politics. Pg. 262-281 Edited by T.V. Paul & John A. Hall.  Cambridge University Press ©1999

of the political process.[14]  Meadwell argues that these groups use political nationalism to seek independent political power (page 264). [13]  Furthermore, Meadwell argues (page 267) that whether the stateless nation is accommodated or non-accommodated, the democratic peace hypothesis gives no consideration to the relationship of the liberal regime to internal sovereignty.

Meadwell's work draws attention to the fact that terrorism might be the unforeseen consequence of increasing liberal institutionalism.  Therefore, it is also crucial that the NSS treat the situation of stateless nations delicately.  It is a political problem in that some stateless nations are divided by existing state borders, such as the Kurdish population in Turkey and in Iraq.  A Kurdish state would have negative political ramifications for the domestic stability of Turkey.  The change in domestic stability of an institutionalized state could result in the destabilizing of institutions.  At first glance, this would seem to be an good example of when to exercise hard power security measure.  The following section will analyze the potential for the uses of hard power.

## Components of Hard Power in the National Security Strategy:

Even if the US is successful in following the goals for fruitful soft power politicking, it is important to analyze the hard power elements of the NSS in order to determine whether they will be successful in international relations.  Recall that any use of force to achieve goals falls under the definition of 'hard power".  With regard to hard power the United States has declared war on terrorism. The war on terrorism is three fold because it concerns both national security and international relations and an added element. When it comes to war, it is always a matter of international relations and national security simply by the nature of the parties involved.  What is different about the war on terror is that some of the parties involved are not states, yet they reside within states, thereby adding a third element to the equations and making the matter even more difficult.

The ninth section of the NSS discusses the transformation in US national security. Because these terrorist groups, one of the parties to the war, are not territorial entities the traditional means of warfare do not apply.  This main mean is deterrence.  Deterrence is practiced during arms races and other conflicts as a means from preventing an attack.  The military structure of the United States is still mainly focused on conventional enemies.[15] The necessary reforms include a more flexible military with the capacity to "use force in our own defense and in the defense of other."[15]  The NSS states that the major institutions of the American military were designed in a different era to meet different requirements. Reforms include new approaches to warfare including strengthening the joint operations capacity but the main concern to the international community is the departed from a reliance on deterrence in the US military.  The NSS calls for the US to replace strategies of deterrence with preventive strikes.

States today are concerned about the NSS's doctrine of prevention and its potential to create a situation where any state, at any time, could use any perceived threat as a means for invading another nation's territorial sovereignty.  Preventive strikes are different from

---

[14] For the purpose of this paper, I will refer to these groups as stateless nations, though it may be extended to include sub-national identity groups or inter-national identity groups that are not accommodated to the system.
[15] The National Security Strategy of The USA (2003) p.29

preemptive strikes although the Bush Administration has used the word preemption in reference to both terms. The doctrine of Preemptive war is articulated in the Charter of the United Nations. Article 51 states:

> "Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of an individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. "[16]

This doctrine of self-defense has been extended to include the right to preemptive strikes if a significant and sure threat is going to be incurred. This does not cover any and all possible threats as the Bush Doctrine would have it cover. The NSS relies on the use of preventive attacks to deal with rogue states and terrorists harboring weapons of mass destruction. The doctrine of preemption does not consider the possession of weapons of mass destruction as an adequate threat warranting attack. The doctrine of prevention however, dictates that the nations (the US in particular) are justified in using force on the basis of possession. Section V of the NSS states:

> "It has taken almost a decade for us to comprehend the true nature of this new threat. Given the goals of rogue states and terrorists, The United States can no longer solely rely on a reactive posture as we have in the past. The inability to deter a potential attacker, the immediacy of today's threats, and the magnitude of potential harm that could be caused by our adversaries' choice of weapons, do not permit that option. We cannot let our enemies strike first."[17]

This NSS also recognizes international law has, in the past, allowed for self defense to be preemptive and that preemption is contingent upon there being imminent threat. Then, The NSS states that we must adapt the concept of imminent threat to include eliminating any threat if the threat is coming from a terrorist group or a rogue state. However, it falls under the Jurisdiction of the Security Council to determine threat. But the US has made it perfectly clear that they will take action without international support or agreement if necessary.

The perceived threat of international terrorism is not unique to the United States. In fact the United Nations has produced resolutions on the issues of measures to eliminate terrorism before the terrorist attacks on the U.S. The UN General Assembly has produced a Declaration on the Measures to Eliminate Terrorism. Each year, there is an annual report on the measures that are taken by each state and international organization to eliminate terrorism. In this report, states can provide extracts of national laws, verbal commitments to fighting international terrorism or official statements. In the 2003 report, the government of Cuba announced their distain for the doctrine of preventive attacks:

> Cuba condemned the fact that some States manipulated the theory of the inherent right of self-defense to justify committing terrorist acts by invoking the so-called right to preventive defense. The sole aim of such manipulation was to try to

---

[16] Charter of the United Nations: Chapter VII Article 51
[17] National Security Strategy (2002) p. 15

legitimize aggression against other States, interference in the international affairs of other Sates, and State Terrorism.[18]

The United States will continue to receive this kind of open opposition by states who view that the preventive doctrine is threatening to their national security. States like Cuba also have a history of terrorist acts against the US and the open statements of the US willingness to invade on the basis of prevention will increase the perceived threat. As was articulated earlier in this paper, threat perception is an element of international cooperation. Seeing as how collective security is one of the goals in the War on Terror, the hard power politics if preventive uses of force may limit the capacity of the soft power politics oriented toward international cooperation.

To sum up what has been said about international law, the norms of international security cooperation and the norms of war are in the process of adapting to the threats posed by international terrorism. The world's largest military power has articulated their foreign policy to include the practice of preventive use force. In addition, the US will also practice other measures of prevention. This paper has analyzed the soft and hard power elements and determined that they do not work effectively. The findings of this are that it is in the best benefit of the US to drop the hard power elements of the NSS in the interest of facilitating cooperation and enhancing the soft power strategy. The hard power strategy only reinforces the NSS as a whole if it is in the short term for the purpose of destroying imminent threats or for the purpose of increasing bargaining power. However hard power will be detrimental in the long term. This is because the US is incapable of winning the war on terror alone, and therefore, the soft power elements take precedence over the hard power elements because collective action is the highest goal and it is done in accordance with soft power.

In conclusion, the war in Iraq was undertaken without the consent of the United Nations Security Council and it seems as though the Bush Administration has chosen to focus on elements of hard politics in the war on terror. On the other hand, the National Security Strategy (NSS) emphasizes the importance of soft power political action in combating terrorism. The war on terror requires international cooperation because the US cannot fight the war alone. Thus, the ability of the US to succeed in the war on terror depends upon their ability to solicit cooperation. Because of the importance of international cooperation to the NSS, the conclusion of this paper is that the hard and soft power elements of limit each other rather than reinforce each other. This is because the international community is attempting to establish a new set of norms for collective security. By disregarding the wishes of the international community, the United States will risk high political costs by increasing the public perception that the US is a threat. As stated earlier, this limits the attractiveness of cooperating with such a state. If the US is to pursue unilateral preventive action, it should be warned of the high costs to cooperation.

---

[18] United Nations General Assembly Report to the Secretary General: Measures to eliminate international terrorism (2 July 2003) A/58/116