Testimony before the
Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs,
House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform

"Smart Power and the U.S. Strategy for Security in a Post-9/11 World"

A Statement by

Richard L. Armitage
Joseph S. Nye, Jr.

November 7, 2007
Rayburn House Office Building, Rm 2154

CENTER FOR STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, 1800 K STREET, NW, WASHINGTON, DC 20006
TELEPHONE: (202) 887-0200 FACSIMILE: (202) 775-3199 WWW.CSIS.ORG

Mr. Chairman:

We would like to thank you and your distinguished colleagues on the Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for the invitation to speak today on the subject of, "Smart Power and U.S. Strategy for Security in a Post-9/11 World."

As you know, we are co-chairs of the Commission on Smart Power, a bipartisan Commission that includes two of your colleagues in the House and two in the Senate, launched by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in late 2006 to outline a new vision for American leadership in the 21st century. The Commission released its findings earlier today. We would like to request your permission that the pre-publication copy of the Commission report be submitted into the record. It is our privilege to sit before you today to share our findings and suggest a few thoughts for shaping a new approach to U.S. strategy in the years ahead.

Preserving American Preeminence as an Agent for Good

The United States has been at war for six years now. During this time, debates over the best use of American power have tended to focus almost exclusively on fighting in Iraq and on the struggle against terrorists and violent extremism. Do we have the strategy and tools to succeed? What would constitute victory? What role should our military play? These questions have defied easy answers and divided a weary but determined nation.

The war debates will continue into 2008 and beyond. Our Commission has sought to replace the narrow lens focused on Iraq and terrorism with a broader one that looks at U.S. goals, strategies, and influence in today's world. What principles should guide U.S. foreign policy in the next administration?

Our view is that the United States must become a smarter power by investing once again in the global good—providing things that people and governments in all quarters of the world want but cannot attain in the absence of American leadership. By complementing U.S. military and economic might with greater investments in its soft power, America can build the framework it needs to tackle tough global challenges.

Specifically, the United States should focus on five critical areas:

- Alliances, partnerships, and institutions: Rebuilding the foundation to deal with global challenges;
- Global development: Developing a unified approach, starting with public health;
- Public diplomacy: Improving access to international knowledge and learning;
- Economic integration: Increasing the benefits of trade for all people;
- Technology and innovation: Addressing climate change and energy insecurity.

Investing in the global good is not charity. It is smart foreign policy. America's allies look to us for ideas and solutions, not lectures.

The goal of U.S. foreign policy should be to prolong and preserve American preeminence as an agent for good. Achieving this goal is impossible without strong and willing allies and partners who can help the United States to determine and act on priorities.

America should have higher ambitions than being popular, but foreign opinion matters to U.S. decision-making. A good reputation fosters goodwill and brings acceptance for unpopular ventures. Helping other nations and individuals achieve their aspirations is the best way to strengthen America's reputation abroad.

This approach will require a shift in how the U.S. government thinks about security. We will always have our enemies, and we cannot abandon our coercive tools. Resetting the military after six years of war is of critical importance. But bolstering American soft power makes America stronger. The U.S. government must develop the means to grow its soft power and harness the dynamism found within civil society and the private sector.

Implementing a smart power strategy will require a strategic reassessment of how the U.S. government is organized, coordinated, and budgeted. The next president and the 111th Congress should consider a number of creative solutions to maximize the administration's ability to organize for success, including the appointment of senior personnel who could reach across agencies to better align strategy and resources.

We must build on America's traditional sources of strength in a principled and realistic fashion. With new energy and direction, the United States could use its great power for even greater purposes and in the process preserve American values and interests far into the future.

Waning Influence

People and governments abroad are at some level dissatisfied with American leadership. Allies and adversaries alike openly criticize U.S. policy. One opinion poll after another has demonstrated that America's reputation, standing, and influence are at all-time lows, and possibly sinking further. This onslaught of negative reporting on how the world views America prompts three immediate questions:

1. Is it that bad? Are negative views of America as prevalent and intense in all regions of the world?

2. Does it matter? Do negative views reflect a diminished American ability to achieve its national interests and uphold its values?

3. Can it be fixed? If American influence has waned, what are the main causes of its decline, and what are the main opportunities to reverse course?

America's reputation, standing, and influence in the world matter for the security and prosperity of the United States. There is little question that America's diminished standing abroad has meant that the United States has had increased difficulty in accomplishing its goals. For foreign leaders, standing alongside U.S. policy has often appeared to be the "kiss of death." The Turkish parliament's decision to refuse to allow American troops to use its territory as a staging ground for the invasion of Iraq in 2003 had grave consequences for U.S. policy.

America may be less well regarded today than at any time in its history, but it is not too late to reverse these trends, even in the Arab and Muslim world. Doing so, however, will require a strategy that strikes a new balance between the use of hard and soft power and that integrates these elements into a smarter approach to the main challenges facing the United States and the global community.

Causes of Decline

How did the United States lose the stature and good will it had accumulated during the Cold War and in its immediate aftermath? Surely the war in Iraq—hugely unpopular during the run-up to war five years back and even more so today—is a major factor. But this is too convenient and superficial an explanation. America's deteriorating esteem started well before the war in Iraq and will not be resolved simply by ending that conflict. There are at least five significant causes of America's declining influence:

- **America's sole superpower status.** When the Cold War ended, America stood alone as the towering superpower on the world stage. Cold War allies, less dependent on U.S. assistance or security guarantees, started to resent America's unbounded dominance.

- **Reaction against globalization.** Many abroad view the United States as the main promoter of globalization, blaming America for jobs lost and what they perceive as an assault on their traditions and culture.

- **America's isolation from agreements and institutions with widespread international support.** The United States has rejected a number of recent international initiatives that were popular abroad but lacked concerted support inside the United States, giving America the reputation of being rejectionist.

- **America's response to 9/11.** Shocked, angry and frightened, America adopted methods and approaches after 9/11 that we had previously decried when used by other governments, fueling a widespread belief that we hold a double standard.

- **Perceptions of American incompetence.** Throughout the Cold War, America projected an image of vast technical competence, but recently we have projected a different image.

Taken together, these factors have produced a startling erosion of standing in the world. To be sure, America still enjoys a strong reputation in many parts of the world. People may not like America's current policies or leaders, but there is still a strong attraction to the idea of America. The United States is still seen as a land of opportunity and as the nation that must lead if there are to be solutions to global problems.

Hard and Soft Power

Power is the ability to influence the behavior of others to get a desired outcome. Historically, power has been measured by such criteria as population size and territory, natural resources, economic strength, military force, and social stability.

Hard power enables countries to wield carrots and sticks to get what they want. The Pentagon's budget for FY2008 is more than $750 billion and growing, many times more than the nearest competitor. The United States has the world's largest economy, and more than a third of the top 500 global companies are American. There is no other global power, and yet American hard power does not always translate into influence.

The effectiveness of any power resource depends first on context. Sources of strength change over time. Despite American technological advances that have made weapons more precise, they have also become more destructive, thereby increasing the political and social costs of using military force. Modern communications technology has diminished the fog of war, but also heightened and atomized political consciousness. Trends such as these have made power less tangible and coercion less effective. Machiavelli said it was safer to be feared than to be loved. Today, in the global information age, it is better to be both.

Soft power is the ability to attract people to our side without coercion. Legitimacy is central to soft power. If a people or nation believes American objectives to be legitimate, we are more likely to persuade them to follow our lead without using threats and bribes. Legitimacy can also reduce opposition—and the costs—of using hard power when the situation demands. Appealing to others' values, interests and preferences can, in certain circumstances, replace the dependence on carrots and sticks. Cooperation is always a matter of degree, and it is profoundly influenced by attraction.

This is evident in the changing nature of conflict today, including in Iraq and against al Qaeda. In traditional conflict, once the enemy is vanquished militarily, he is likely to sue for peace. But many of the organizations against which we are fighting control no territory, hold few assets, and sprout new leaders for each one that is killed. Victory in the traditional sense is elusive.

Militaries are well suited to defeating states, but they are often poor instruments to fight ideas. Today, victory depends on attracting foreign populations to our side and helping them to build capable, democratic states. Soft power is essential to winning the peace. It is easier to attract people to democracy than to coerce them to be democratic.

What Is Smart Power?

Smart power is neither hard nor soft—it is the skillful combination of both. Smart power means developing an integrated strategy, resource base, and tool kit to achieve American objectives, drawing on both hard and soft power. It is an approach that underscores the necessity of a strong military, but also invests heavily in alliances, partnerships, and institutions at all levels to expand American influence and establish the legitimacy of American action. Providing for the global good is central to this effort because it helps America reconcile its overwhelming power with the rest of the world's interests and values.

Elements of this approach exist today in U.S. foreign policy, they but lack a cohesive rationale and institutional grounding. Three main obstacles exist.

First, U.S. foreign policy has tended to over-rely on hard power because it is the most direct and visible source of American strength. The Pentagon is the best trained and best resourced arm of the federal government. By default, the military has had to step in to fill voids, even though the work would be better administered by civilian personnel. America must retain its military superiority, but in today's context, there are limits to what hard power can achieve on its own, particularly in tasks such as the reconstruction of states and societies after wars.

Second, U.S. foreign policy is still struggling to develop soft power instruments. Diplomatic tools and foreign assistance are often directed toward states, which increasingly compete for power with non-state actors within their borders. Diplomacy and foreign assistance are often underfunded and underused. These tools are neglected in part because of the difficulty of demonstrating their short-term impact on critical challenges. Civilian agencies have not been staffed or resourced for extraordinary missions.

It should come as no surprise that some of the best-funded and most appreciated soft power tools have been humanitarian operations carried out by the U.S. military such as tsunami relief in Asia and the earthquake response in Pakistan, since these operations produced results that were clear, measurable, and unassailable. Wielding soft power is especially difficult, however, because many of America's soft power resources lie outside of government in the private sector and civil society, in its bilateral alliances, or through its participation in multilateral institutions.

Third, U.S. foreign policy institutions and personnel are fractured and compartmentalized. There is little capacity for making trade-offs at the strategic level, and the various tools available to the U.S. government are spread among multiple agencies and bureaus. Coordination, where there is any, happens either at a relatively low level or else at the very highest levels of government—both typically in crisis settings that drive out long-range planning. Stovepiped institutional cultures inhibit joint action.

More thought should also be put into sequencing and integrating hard and soft power instruments, particularly in the same operating theater. Some elements of this approach are already occurring in the conduct of ongoing counterinsurgency, nation building, and counterterrorism operations—tasks that depend critically but only partially on hard power.

The United States has in its past wielded hard and soft power in concert, with each contributing a necessary component to a larger aim. We used hard power to deter the Soviet Union during the Cold War and soft power to rebuild Japan and Europe with the Marshall Plan and to establish institutions and norms that have become the core of the international system. Today's context presents a unique set of challenges, however, and requires a new way of thinking about American power.

Today's Challenges

The twenty-first century presents a number of unique foreign policy challenges for today's decisionmakers. These challenges exist at an international, transnational, and global level. They include maintaining the durability of the current international order given the rise of new powers in Asia, ensuring that vectors of prosperity do not become vectors of instability, and addressing the potential consequences of nuclear proliferation and climate change. The next administration will need a strategy that speaks to each of these challenges. Whatever specific approach it decides to take, two principles will be certain:

First, an extra dollar spent on hard power will not necessarily bring an extra dollar's worth of security. It is difficult to know how to invest wisely when there is not a budget based on a strategy that specifies trade-offs among instruments. Moreover, hard power capabilities are a necessary but insufficient guarantee of security in today's context.

Second, success and failure will turn on the ability to win new allies and strengthen old ones both in government and civil society. The key is not how many enemies the United States kills, but how many allies it grows.

States and non-state actors who improve their ability to draw in allies will gain competitive advantages in today's environment. Those who alienate potential friends will stand at greater risk. Terrorists, for instance, depend on their ability to attract support from the crowd at least as much as their ability to destroy the enemy's will to fight.

Exporting Optimism, Not Fear

Since its founding, the United States has been willing to fight for universal ideals of liberty, equality, and justice. This higher purpose, sustained by military and economic might, attracted people and governments to our side through two world wars and five decades of the Cold War. Allies accepted that American interests may not always align entirely with their own, but U.S. leadership was still critical to realizing a more peaceful and prosperous world.

There have been times, however, when America's sense of purpose has fallen out of step with the world. Since 9/11, the United States has been exporting fear and anger rather than more traditional values of hope and optimism. Suspicions of American power have run deep. Even traditional allies have questioned whether America is hiding behind the righteousness of its ideals to pursue some other motive.

At the core of the problem is that America has made the war on terror the central component of its global engagement. This is not a partisan critique, nor a Pollyannaish appraisal of the threats facing America today. The threat from terrorists with global reach and ambition is real. It is likely to be with us for decades. Thwarting their hateful intentions is of fundamental importance and must be met with the sharp tip of America's sword. On this there can be no serious debate. But excessive use of force can actually abet terrorist recruitment among local populations. We must strike a balance between the use of force against irreconcilable extremists committed to violent struggle and other means of countering terrorism if we want to maintain our legitimacy.

What is also apparent six years after September 11 is that a broader and more durable consensus is required to wage this struggle at home and abroad. The 2008 election cycle will inevitably bring forth partisan jockeying concerning which candidate and party will keep Americans most safe. This is a healthy and important debate, but one that should not preclude a bipartisan commitment to recognize and meet the global threat posed by terrorists and violent extremism. Such a commitment ought to be built upon the following four principles:

First, American leaders should stay on the offensive in countering terrorist aims abroad, but must also refuse to over-respond to their provocations. More attention ought to go toward preventing terrorists' access to weapons of mass destruction, but short of such a nightmare scenario, terrorists pose no existential threat to the United States. Their only hope—and indeed, their intended plan—is to use a sort of "jujitsu effect" in which they entice a large, powerful nation such as the United States to overreact and make choices that hurt ourselves. America must resist falling into traps that have grave strategic consequences beyond the costs of any isolated, small-scale attack, regardless of the individual and collective pain they may cause.

Second, American leaders ought to eliminate the symbols that have come to represent the image of an intolerant, abusive, unjust America. The unfairness of such a characterization does not minimize its persuasive power abroad. Closing the Guantanamo Bay detention center is an obvious starting point and should lead to a broader disassociation from torture and prisoner abuse. Guantanamo's very existence undermines America's ability to carry forth a message of principled optimism and hope. Although closing Guantanamo will be no simple matter, no legal or practical constraint is insurmountable if it became a priority of American leadership, and planning for its closure should begin well before the next president takes office.

Third, we should use our diplomatic power for positive ends. Equally important to closing Guantanamo is expending political capital to end the corrosive effect of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The United States must resume its traditional role as an effective broker for peace in the Middle East, recognizing that all parties involved in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict have a responsibility to bring about a peaceful solution. Although we cannot want peace more than the parties themselves, we cannot be indifferent to the widespread suffering that this conflict perpetuates, nor the passionate feelings that it arouses on all sides. Many have rightly made this recommendation before, and many will do so in the future until a just peace can be realized. In the Middle East and elsewhere, effective American mediation confers global legitimacy and is a vital source of its smart power.

Fourth, American leaders must provide the world with a positive vision greater than the war on terror. Americans need a shared aim to strive for, not simply a tactic to fight against. Efforts to pose counterterrorism operations as a global struggle between the forces of tyranny and the forces of freedom have not succeeded in drawing the world to our side. Freedom has always been part of the American narrative and should continue to be so, but too many in the Muslim world continue to read the war on terror as a war on Islam. Rather than unintentionally provoke a clash of civilizations, America's purpose should be to promote the elevation of civilizations and individuals.

In short, success in battling terrorism and restoring America's greatness depends on finding a new central premise for U.S. foreign policy to replace the war on terror. Taking its place should be an American commitment to providing for the global good. Such an approach derives from our principles, supports our interests, and strengthens our security.

Maintaining Allies, Winning New Partners

America is likely to remain the preponderant power in world politics after Iraq, but it will have to reengage other countries to share leadership. America's position as the lone global power is unlikely to last forever, and the United States must find ways of transforming its power into a moral consensus that ensures the willing acceptance if not active promotion of our values over time. This will require combining hard and soft power into a smart power strategy of working for the global good. America must learn to do things that others want and cannot do themselves, and to do so in a cooperative fashion.

The Commission on Smart Power selected five main areas for its recommendations on potential ingredients of a smart power strategy. It is not designed to be a comprehensive national security strategy, but a set of policies that could help the United States become smarter and more secure by reinvesting in the global good.

1. Alliances, Partnerships, and Institutions
Rebuilding the foundation to deal with global challenges

Although the United States never relied entirely on treaties and institutions during the Cold War, American leaders tended to view them as extensions of U.S. influence. They were tools that helped the United States to engage and counter the Soviets on multiple levels and in multiple theaters, diminishing the risk of overreliance on any single facet of American power. In recent years, however, an increasing number of Americans have turned away a norms-based approach to global engagement. They have come to view international law as suggestive rather than binding, alliances as outdated and dispensable, and international institutions as decrepit or hostile. Some U.S. leaders have preferred to rely on coalitions of the willing to achieve American objectives rather than on formal alliance structures or multilateral approaches that depend upon UN sanction.

In the short term, global norms and institutions allow the United States to address numerous hazards concurrently without having to build a consensus in response to every new challenge. Because of America's global interests and responsibilities, it often finds itself managing half a dozen crises simultaneously. Some of these challenges may be regional in nature and require regional institutions to address. Others may be transnational and require a multitude of state actors in concerted action over time—something only norms-based internationalism can yield. In the long run, investing in institutions and global norms works to preserve U.S. ideas, values, and interests into the future. This is particularly important if the relative weight of non-Western powers was to increase in the years ahead and America was to become less able to assert itself internationally.

The next U.S. administration will come to power with its own ideas about which aspects of the current international architecture are worth preserving. What is needed today is a clear-headed analysis of which aspects of the international system work to extend American power in pursuit of the global good, which work to dilute it, and which simply do not work. The next president should strike a new consensus at home and abroad for finding normative solutions to pragmatic challenges. Regardless of who sits in the White House, however, America must play a role in shaping the global agenda and international system. Leading will require the confidence and patience to work effectively in multilateral settings where new players seek to rally countries against us.

2. Global Development
Developing a More Unified Approach, Starting with Public Health

The U.S. commitment and approach to global development has been marked by inconsistency over the past half century. At those times when spending has been successfully justified in terms of American interests—most notably during the Marshall Plan to rebuild post-war Europe, the U.S. government has provided large amounts of aid to foreign lands. For the most part, though, U.S. development policy has lacked a coherent rationale that resonates across departments and agencies of the federal government. If the next administration wants to inspire people in other lands through our assistance, then it will need to develop a more unified approach and convince people that smart investments in development are in America's interest.

The Bush administration and others, however, have made a number of important innovations in global development in the past seven years, including the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), the five-year, $15 billion President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), and the President's Malaria Initiative (PMI). The result of these various efforts is that President Bush has tripled overall assistance levels to Africa during his tenure, which in turn has contributed to a favorable U.S. standing on the continent.

The next president will have to consider which of the Bush administration's development initiatives to sustain, which to expand, and which to take in new directions. Included in this assessment must be an appraisal of the institutional reforms undertaken in recent years. In particular, the next president will need to address three vital development issues in the brief window of opportunity that exists at the beginning of any new administration: elevating the development mission within the U.S. government; developing a more unified approach to our aid; and developing locally supported and measurable delivery systems.

3. Public Diplomacy
Improving access to international knowledge and learning

Effective public diplomacy is central to any discussions about American image and influence in the world today. The intent of public diplomacy is to communicate with the people, not the governments, of foreign countries. Governments traditionally use public diplomacy to exercise influence over individuals, groups, institutions, and public opinion abroad in support of its national objectives. Public diplomacy is broader, though, than the official activities of government. It is part-and-parcel of everything America does and says as a country and society. Every U.S. citizen serves as a diplomat, whether at home interacting with foreigners or when traveling abroad.

Recent U.S. administrations have struggled to get public diplomacy right. More than public relations, effective public diplomacy moves both people and information and helps provide insight into the policies and values of the United States. It also improves Americans' awareness and understanding of the world beyond our shores. Despite past successes during the Cold War, a number of U.S. decisionmakers dismiss public diplomacy as ineffective or as mere propaganda. Although a number of independent commissions have criticized the U.S. government for problems implementing public diplomacy, it remains a critical part of U.S. smart power.

The next administration should strengthen our resource commitment to public diplomacy and consider what institutional remedies—in addition to capable leadership—could help make U.S. government public diplomacy efforts work most effectively. Public diplomacy efforts go well beyond government efforts. An effective public diplomacy approach must include exchanges of ideas, peoples, and information through person-to-person educational and cultural exchanges, often referred to as citizen diplomacy.

4. Economic Integration
Increasing the benefits of trade for all people

International trade has been a critical ingredient to U.S. economic growth and prosperity. Over the past decade, trade has helped increase U.S. GDP by nearly 40 percent, resulting in net job creation in the United States. Approximately one-third of American jobs depend on trade. Manufacturing exports have increased 82 percent over the past decade, and one in every three U.S. acres is used to produce products or services for export. Trade also ensures that American consumers have access to affordable goods and services. It helps keep inflation in check, interest rates low, and investment levels high. In recent years, it also helped dampen the effects of recession when the U.S. economy has slowed.

The United States is inextricably tied to the global economy that we took the lead in building in the aftermath of World War II. We are also possibly the nation that benefits most from trade. Because the United States has an open economy, with tariffs and nontariff measures among the lowest in the world, further global trade liberalization through the World Trade Organization (WTO) or free trade agreements means that other nations are required to reduce their barriers to trade proportionately more than we must ourselves. Put simply, the United States is a net winner in the international trade system. This reality should not breed complacency, however. The United States must do more to prepare itself for increasing economic competition.

And yet today, whether it is the near collapse of the Doha Round of the WTO, battles in Europe over the European Constitution, failed attempts to create a Free Trade Agreement of the Americas, or delays in concluding bilateral free trade agreements, efforts to tie economies closer together continue to come under question and under fire. The answer to competition, though, should not be retrenchment but further engagement—and the United States must take the lead. Americans have never shied away from a tough fight. Rather, we have responded by honing our skills and staying on the cutting edge. It should be no different today. However, as we embrace healthy competition, we must also not forget those who lose their jobs or are displaced by globalization. Easing the burden on U.S. and foreign workers most affected by globalization is an essential part of an aggressive global trade strategy.

5. Technology and Innovation
Addressing climate change and energy insecurity

Enhancing our energy security must become more than a political catch phrase. It requires concerted action and policies aimed at reducing demand through improved efficiency, diversifying energy suppliers and fuel choices, and managing geopolitics in resource rich areas that currently account for the majority of our imports. The importance of finding creative solutions is only likely to heighten in the years ahead. Over the coming decade, world energy demand is projected to rise to unprecedented levels driven by population growth and economic development. A growing proportion of this demand growth will occur in developing countries, particularly China and India. Massive amounts of investment and infrastructure will be required to produce and deliver enough energy to meet these societies' needs.

Limitations to developing oil and gas resources, the majority of which are geographically concentrated in a handful of regions, are driving greater concern over energy security in various regions around the globe. This in turn is spurring development of new energy resources and creating incentives for a greater reliance on domestically abundant resources like coal in the United States, China, and India. This remarkable growth in demand is occurring at a time when a patchwork of carbon-constrained environments has emerged in response to increasing concern over the impact of global climate change. In response, American states and cities as well as countries around the world and a growing portion of the private sector are taking action to reduce their respective greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) while simultaneously calling for greater commitments on the part of the U.S. government and other major rising emitters like China and India. Neither the U.S. government nor industry has driven these trends, but they are both increasingly responding to them.

In the past year, there has been increasing awareness of how countries and companies view their own energy production and use, as well as their environmental footprint. Many companies are delaying investment in a variety of energy infrastructure projects, however, particularly in the power generation sector. This delay in investment in infrastructure undermines the reliability of our current energy supply. A world operating on differing sets of rules or costs associated with carbon dioxide emissions could have disruptive implications for trade, energy security, competitiveness, and economic growth. A world, however, that establishes a global consensus on the cost of carbon could breathe life into new and emerging sectors of the economy, provide new avenues for U.S. economic growth, and provide a platform for U.S. global leadership on a major issue of concern to the global economy. U.S. leadership to shape a new energy framework in a carbon-constrained world offers a unique opportunity to alter the geopolitics of energy, improve energy security, reinvigorate the spirit of innovation and entrepreneurialism, and engage disenfranchised portions of the developing world. A smart power approach to energy security and climate should focus on what Americans have long done best—innovating.

Implementing a Smart Power Strategy

There is no silver bullet for ensuring effective implementation of a smart power strategy, and the Commission on Smart Power has purposefully sought to stay away from offering sweeping recommendations on government reorganization. Moving boxes around and building new ones is not always the right answer. Even still, the next president and the next Congress ought to undertake a strategic reassessment of government structures and readiness. Which tools work and which do not? Which require massive overhaul, and which merely call for new leadership and direction? How can coordination and integration between our military and civilian tools of national power be enhanced?

The forces of disintegration in our soft and hard power tool kit are strong. It will take a dedicated effort by the next administration and Congress to overcome these challenges. In some instances, the problems call for new institutions or renewed mandates for

existing institutions. In other instances, the problem can best be addressed with leadership and accountability. Domestic politics and constituencies will also likely shape any reform process. The demands and pressures of America's domestic politics will make far more difficult the development of a sophisticated foreign policy, and investment in tools required to carry it out.

We believe reform is possible, however. We suggest that the next administration should be guided by the following five principles:

1. A smart power strategy requires that we make strategic trade-offs among competing priorities.

2. We must elevate and integrate the unique dimensions of development, diplomacy and public diplomacy into a unified whole.

3. Congress must be a partner, and develop proper authorizing and appropriating structures to support a smart power strategy.

4. We must move more discretionary authority and resources into field organizations and hold them accountable for results.

5. The government must learn to tap into and harness the vast soft power resources in the private sector and civil society.

A Smarter, More Secure America

The Commission on Smart Power sent Commissioner Rick Barton and staff around the United States to engage in a listening tour with the American people as part of this Commission's effort. We called this our "Dialogue with America." What we heard diverged from the conventional wisdom in Washington of a tired and inward-looking electorate. Instead we heard a universal desire on the part of Americans to improve their country's image in the world and tap into its vast potential for good.

We believe there is a moment of opportunity today for our political leaders to strike off on a big idea that balances a wiser internationalism with the desire for protection at home. Washington may be increasingly divided, but Americans are unified in wanting their country to be a force for good. We see the same hunger in other countries for a more balanced American approach and revitalized American interest in a broader range of issues than just terrorism. And we hear everywhere that every serious problem in the world demands U.S. involvement.

Military power is typically the bedrock of a nation's power. It is understandable that during a time of war we place primary emphasis on military might. But we have learned during the past five years that this is an inadequate basis for sustaining American power over time. America's power draws just as much from the size of its population and the

strength of its economy as from the vitality of our civic culture and the excellence of our ideas. These other attributes of power become the more important dimensions.

There is nothing weak about this approach. It is pragmatic, optimistic, and quite frankly, American. We were twice victims on 9/11. Initially we were victimized by the terrorists who flew airplanes into buildings and killed American citizens and foreigners resident in this country. But we victimized ourselves the second time by losing our national confidence and optimism. The values inherent in our Constitution, educational institutions, economic system, and role as respected leader on the world stage are too widely admired for emerging leaders abroad to turn away for good. By becoming a smarter power, we could bring them back sooner, and help build a more secure country and global community.