

## Chapter 1 : Deterrence theory - Wikipedia

*The Reagan National Defense Forum (RNDF) brings together leaders and key stakeholders in the defense community - including, members of Congress, civilian officials and military leaders from the Defense Department and industry - to address the health of our national defense and stimulate a discussion that promotes policies that strengthen the US military in the future.*

Search Toggle display of website navigation Elephants in the Room: March 24, , 1: The key is to channel that mandate to actions that will make us safer and more prosperous. Every Republican platform for the presidency since has included language about peace through strength. Our strength is not just our military power but our non-military power “ which contributes to safety and prosperity. Given all of the above, Trump has announced cuts in the 30 percent range for foreign assistance. Likewise, there are many qualified people in positions of responsibility in the administration who must think this is an error but are being good soldiers and keeping quiet. Many are hoping that the U. Foreign assistance is an important part of peace through strength. It supports allies and undermines adversaries. For example, we have used foreign assistance to help Ukraine and Georgia in response to Russian aggression. We have used not only military assistance but targeted foreign assistance to help Colombia defeat narco-terrorists and bring them to the bargaining table. We use foreign assistance to support the governments of Jordan, Lebanon, and Egypt in a variety of ways to help them both confront radical Islamic terrorists and ameliorate the refugee crisis, the impact of which has greatly affected poorer countries in the region. We use foreign assistance to ensure that countries in Africa can defeat Boko Haram and al Shabab. We use foreign assistance to seek to defeat criminal gangs in Central America which are driving tens of thousands of people north to the U. All of these sorts of activities will be at risk because of the proposed budget. I do not believe the Trump team wants to blow up the liberal international order. My reading of his various speeches and interviews is that the administration is asking questions and seeking adjustments in burden sharing among allies and partners “ from defense to trade to the U. In the multilateral area, there are some things we need to pay for , as I have written elsewhere. This is ridiculous and cannot go on. And frankly, the multilateral development banks need a complete rethink of their roles, given the changing world we live in and that of the near future. There are certainly areas for cutting and there are areas to reallocate resources. If we took a year approach, the administration could reduce spending by as much as 15 percent by handing off responsibilities to host countries on certain specific programs, like say health assistance, without deeply hurting our influence and without doing harm to people we aim to help. As Team Trump staffs up, I am betting they will hire very qualified foreign policy and national security experts. As that happens, the rhetoric coming out of the administration on the liberal international order will evolve in constructive ways. I would also speculate that world events will change the way that Team Trump thinks about the value of foreign assistance. Just as awful to contemplate but likely, is that there will be a pandemic outbreak of some funny-named disease like Ebola or Zika. Pandemics are a permanent part of modern life because of changes in diet more animal husbandry , urbanization, and jet airplane travel. Information Agency into the State Department. The world is a different place from that of 20 years ago and our assistance needs to reflect that changed world. A top-to-bottom review would help the administration identify areas to increase spending and where to reduce or exit. Change is necessary in the foreign assistance realms and change is surely coming. But change should start from better understanding the threats, opportunities, priorities, what is working already, and how the world can better share the burden of this responsibility. He currently holds the William A.

**Chapter 2 : Ronald Reagan and Executive Power | Presidential Leadership in the Cold War**

*In foreign policy, Reagan sought to achieve "peace through strength." During his two terms he increased defense spending 35 percent, but sought to improve relations with the Soviet Union.*

Concept[ edit ] The use of military threats as a means to deter international crises and war has been a central topic of international security research for at least years. Alternative theories however have challenged the rational deterrence theory and have focused on organizational theory and cognitive psychology. The concept of deterrence can be defined as the use of threats by one party to convince another party to refrain from initiating some course of action. In international security, a policy of deterrence generally refers to threats of military retaliation directed by the leaders of one state to the leaders of another in an attempt to prevent the other state from resorting to the threat of use of military force in pursuit of its foreign policy goals. Situations of direct deterrence often occur when there is a territorial dispute between neighboring states in which major powers like the United States do not directly intervene. On the other hand, situations of extended deterrence often occur when a great power becomes involved. It is the latter that has generated the majority of interest in academic literature. Building on these two broad categories, Huth goes on to outline that deterrence policies may be implemented in response to a pressing short-term threat known as immediate deterrence or as strategy to prevent a military conflict or short term threat from arising known as general deterrence. A successful deterrence policy must be considered in not only military terms, but also in political terms. In military terms, deterrence success refers to preventing state leaders from issuing military threats and actions that escalate peacetime diplomatic and military cooperation into a crisis or militarized confrontation which threatens armed conflict and possibly war. The prevention of crises of wars however is not the only aim of deterrence. In addition, defending states must be able to resist the political and military demands of a potential attacking nation. If armed conflict is avoided at the price of diplomatic concessions to the maximum demands of the potential attacking nation under the threat of war, then it cannot be claimed that deterrence has succeeded. Furthermore, as Jentleson et al. In broad terms, a state wishing to implement a strategy of deterrence is most likely to succeed if the costs of non-compliance it can impose on, and the benefits of compliance it can offer to, another state are greater than the benefits of noncompliance and the costs of compliance. Deterrence theory holds that nuclear weapons are intended to deter other states from attacking with their nuclear weapons, through the promise of retaliation and possibly mutually assured destruction MAD. Nuclear deterrence can also be applied to an attack by conventional forces; for example, the doctrine of massive retaliation threatened to launch US nuclear weapons in response to Soviet attacks. A successful nuclear deterrent requires that a country preserve its ability to retaliate, either by responding before its own weapons are destroyed or by ensuring a second strike capability. Other countries, such as the United Kingdom and France , have only sea- and air-based nuclear weapons. Proportionality[ edit ] Jentleson et al. This is a challenge, as deterrence is, by definition, a strategy of limited means. George goes on to explain that deterrence may, but is not required to, go beyond threats to the actual use of military force; but if force is actually used, it must be limited and fall short of full-scale use or war otherwise it fails. This has been seen in the cases of Libya, Iraq, and North Korea where defending states have sought to change the leadership of a state in addition to policy changes relating primarily to their nuclear weapons programs. Reciprocity[ edit ] Secondly, Jentleson et al. The balance lies neither in offering too little too late or for too much in return, not offering too much too soon or for too little return. Coercive credibility[ edit ] Finally, coercive credibility requires that, in addition to calculations about costs and benefits of cooperation, the defending state convincingly conveys to the attacking state that non-cooperation has consequences. A defending state having a superior military capability or economic strength in itself is not enough to ensure credibility. The other important consideration outlined by Jentleson et al. The first factor is whether internal political support and regime security are better served by defiance, or if there are domestic political gains to be made from improving relations with the defending state. The second factor is an economic calculation of the costs that military force, sanctions, and other coercive instruments can impose, and the benefits that trade and other economic incentives may carry. The third factor is the role of

elites and other key domestic political figures within the attacking state. Rational deterrence theory[ edit ] The predominant approach to theorizing about deterrence has entailed the use of rational choice and game-theoretic models of decision making see game theory. Huth [7] outlines that a threat is considered credible if the defending state possesses both the military capabilities to inflict substantial costs on an attacking state in an armed conflict, and if the attacking state believes that the defending state is resolved to use its available military forces. Huth [7] goes on to explain the four key factors for consideration under rational deterrence theory being i the military balance; ii signaling and bargaining power; iii reputations for resolve; and iv interests at stake. In either case, the strategic orientation of potential attacking states is generally short term and driven by concerns about military cost and effectiveness. For successful deterrence, defending states need the military capacity to respond quickly and in strength to a range of contingencies. Signaling and bargaining power[ edit ] The central problem for a state that seeks to communicate a credible deterrent threat through diplomatic or military actions is that all defending states have an incentive to act as if they are determined to resist an attack, in the hope that the attacking state will back away from military conflict with a seemingly resolved adversary. If all defending states have such incentives, then potential attacking states may discount statements made by defending states along with any movement of military forces as merely bluffs. Costly signals are those actions and statements that clearly increase the risk of a military conflict and also increase the costs of backing down from a deterrent threat. States that are bluffing are unwilling to cross a certain threshold of threat and military action for fear of committing themselves to an armed conflict. Reputations for resolve[ edit ] There are three different arguments that have been developed in relation to the role of reputations in influencing deterrence outcomes. The second approach argues that reputations have a limited impact on deterrence outcomes because the credibility of deterrence is heavily determined by the specific configuration of military capabilities, interests at stake, and political constraints faced by a defending state in a given situation of attempted deterrence. The third approach is a middle ground between the first two approaches. It argues that potential attacking states are likely to draw reputational inferences about resolve from the past behaviour of defending states only under certain conditions. The insight is the expectation that decision makers will use only certain types of information when drawing inferences about reputations, and an attacking state updates and revises its beliefs when the unanticipated behaviour of a defending state cannot be explained by case-specific variables. The argument here is that defending states that have greater interests at stake in a dispute are more resolved to use force and be more willing to endure military losses to secure those interests. Even less well established arguments are the specific interests that are more salient to state leaders such as military interests versus economic interests. Furthermore, Huth [7] argues that both supporters and critics of rational deterrence theory agree that an unfavourable assessment of the domestic and international status quo by state leaders can undermine or severely test the success of deterrence. In a rational choice approach, if the expected utility of not using force is reduced by a declining status quo position, then deterrence failure is more likely, since the alternative option of using force becomes relatively more attractive. Nuclear weapons and deterrence[ edit ] Main articles: Nuclear strategy , Massive retaliation , Mutual assured destruction , and Flexible response In Schelling [2] is prescriptive in outlining the impact of the development of nuclear weapons in the analysis of military power and deterrence. In his analysis, before the widespread use of assured second strike capability, or immediate reprisal, in the form of SSBN submarines, Schelling argues that nuclear weapons give nations the potential to not only destroy their enemies but humanity itself without drawing immediate reprisal because of the lack of a conceivable defense system and the speed with which nuclear weapons can be deployed. Historical analysis of nuclear weapons deterrent capabilities has led modern researchers to the concept of the stability-instability paradox , whereby nuclear weapons confer large scale stability between nuclear weapon states, as in over 60 years none have engaged in large direct warfare due primarily to nuclear weapons deterrence capabilities, but instead are forced into pursuing political aims by military means in the form of comparatively smaller scale acts of instability, such as proxy wars and minor conflicts. The early stages of the Cold War were generally characterized by containment , an aggressive stance on behalf of the US especially on developing nations under its sphere of influence. This period was characterized by numerous proxy wars throughout most of the globe, particularly Africa, Asia,

Central America, and South America. A notable such conflict was the Korean War. In contrast to general opinion, George F. Kennan, who is taken to be the founder of this ideology in his Long Telegram, asserted that his ideas had been misinterpreted and that he had never advocated military intervention, merely economic support. Although all factors listed above contributed to this shift, the most important factor was probably the rough parity achieved in stockpiling nuclear weapons with the clear capability of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD). The doctrine of mutual nuclear deterrence characterized relations between the United States and the Soviet Union during this period, and present relations with Russia. Reagan attempted to justify this policy in part due to concerns of growing Soviet influence in Latin America and the new republic of Iran, established after the Iranian Revolution of 1979. Similar to the old policy of containment, the United States funded several proxy wars, including support for Saddam Hussein of Iraq during the Iran–Iraq War, support for the mujahideen in Afghanistan, who were fighting for independence from the Soviet Union, and several anti-communist movements in Latin America such as the overthrow of the Sandinista government in Nicaragua. While the army was dealing with the breakup of the Soviet Union and the spread of nuclear technology to other nations beyond the United States and Russia, the concept of deterrence took on a broader multinational dimension. The document explains that such threats must also be used to ensure that nations without nuclear technology refrain from developing nuclear weapons and that a universal ban precludes any nation from maintaining chemical or biological weapons. The current tensions with Iran and North Korea over their nuclear programs are due in part to the continuation of this policy of deterrence. Criticism [edit] Deterrence theory is criticized for its assumptions about opponent rationales. First, it is argued that suicidal or psychotic opponents may not be deterred by either forms of deterrence. An arms race is inefficient in its optimal output, as all countries involved expend resources on armaments that would not have been created if the others had not expended resources, a form of positive feedback. Fourth, escalation of perceived threat can make it easier for certain measures to be inflicted on a population by its government, such as restrictions on civil liberties, the creation of a military–industrial complex, and military expenditures resulting in higher taxes and increasing budget deficits. In recent years, many mainstream politicians, academic analysts, and retired military leaders have also criticised deterrence and advocated nuclear disarmament. Sam Nunn, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and George Shultz have all called upon governments to embrace the vision of a world free of nuclear weapons, and in three Wall Street Journal op-eds proposed an ambitious program of urgent steps to that end. The four have created the Nuclear Security Project to advance this agenda. Organisations such as Global Zero, an international non-partisan group of world leaders dedicated to achieving nuclear disarmament, have also been established. The film is a visual and historical depiction of the ideas laid forth in the Wall Street Journal op-eds and reinforces their commitment to a world without nuclear weapons and the steps that can be taken to reach that goal. The wound inflicted on unsuspecting populations he calls an "integral accident": The first deterrence, nuclear deterrence, is presently being superseded by the second deterrence:

**Chapter 3 : DVIDS - Video - Building Peace Through Strength: Caring for Wounded Warriors**

*"Peace through strength" is a phrase which suggests that military power can help preserve peace. It is quite old and has famously been used by many leaders from Roman Emperor Hadrian in the first century AD to former U.S. President Ronald Reagan in the s.*

It will be one of the greatest military build-ups in American history. Why not show the world the United States is so awesomely powerful that no one in his right mind would even think to get on its wrong side? It seems to make sense in a practical sort of way. Once people believe that, of course, they are softened up to accept unlimited military spending and the concomitant deficits and debt. Conservatives rail against even small amounts of so-called foreign aid and welfare, but they drool over monstrous sums for the armed forces and spy agencies. Progressives, by the way, are not immune to the allure of military spending. When a Pentagon budget cap was debated a few years ago, Rep. Jim Clyburn D-South Carolina , a leading progressive and a Black Caucus leader, opposed it because he feared losing jobs in his district. Military spending thus has something for nearly everybody: The conservative Keynesians like both justifications. It takes only a few minutes to see that the "peace through strength" doctrine is a racket intended by some of its advocates at least to gull the unsuspecting populace into supporting whatever the war party and the Pentagon want. You doves are the promoters of war. Gen Smedley Butler put it. At least one thick book could be written on the flaws in the doctrine. I can sum them up by invoking the law of unintended consequences and the law of perverse incentives, by which I mean the well-established public-choice problems regarding policymaking and voter interest. People may have the best intentions in supporting the PTSD, but they have absolutely no reason to believe the policy would be carried out as they envision. We must expect the worse, or as David Hume charmingly wrote , "Political writers have established it as a maxim, that, in contriving any system of government, every man ought to be supposed a knave. But that is balderdash. The government now spends more on the military than the next 12 countries combined. But that is an understatement because the Pentagon budget is far from the total amount the U. Hardly anyone appreciates that the total amount of all defense-related spending greatly exceeds the amount budgeted for the Department of Defense. Indeed, it is roughly almost twice as large. Lodged elsewhere in the budget, however, other lines identify funding that serves defense purposes just as surely as sometimes even more surely than the money allocated to the Department of Defense. Thus when George W. The story is the same today. We may reasonably ask: What we have here is a knowledge problem, which politicians and bureaucrats are likely to exploit in favor of more spending. By PTSD standards, no amount of spending is enough: As Nick Gillespie of Reason pointed out a year ago: But depleted, underfunded, undersized, unready? In a nation that has supposedly wound down two of its longest wars and where the principal threat to the homeland is a group of religious extremists who live thousands of miles away and are, lest we forget, a byproduct of our own failed occupation of the Middle East , we always need more money for defense, right? To be sure, Trump has doubled down on all the Bush-Obama wars, but those have nothing to do with the safety of Americans. Therefore the personnel could be brought home and the military budget cut.

### Chapter 4 : 20+ Bible Verses About Strength - Powerful Scripture Quotes (Updated)

*The Ronald Reagan Peace Through Strength Award recognizes the exemplary dedication and service of individuals in the defense of the United States and its people. The evening award presentation is.*

The objective of containment was to stop the Soviet Union from forcibly spreading communism beyond the territories it already ruled or dominated. But the United States would not attempt to push the Soviets out of their established spheres of control in certain regions of the world. Their goal must be the promotion of world revolution and a one world communist or socialist state. He said, "Our strategy is defensive; our aim is to protect the peace by ensuring that no adversaries ever conclude they could best us in a war of their own choosing. He suspected the Soviet Union was not as strong as it appeared to be. And he predicted its collapse if challenged competitively by America. From a formidable foundation of military and economic power, the United States would promote freedom and democracy throughout the world. President Reagan predicted that given a choice, people everywhere, even within the Soviet Union, would reject totalitarian government. Here are a few examples from that speech: What I am describing now is a plan and a hope for the long term—the march of freedom and democracy which will leave Marxism-Leninism on the ash-heap of history, as it has left other tyrannies which stifle the freedom and muzzle the self-expression of the people How did the Cold War finally end? Image created by Sue Ream. Reproduced under a Creative Commons Attribution 3. The United States supported anti-Soviet uprisings by peoples in various places around the world. For example, President Reagan provided material and moral support to the Solidarity movement in Poland. This support brought down the Soviet-backed regime after President Reagan left office and helped to inspire other anti-Soviet rebellions. The final outcome was the collapse of communism throughout Eastern and Central Europe, which brought freedom, democracy, and the end of Soviet control of this region. With American help, the people of Afghanistan forced Soviet military forces from their country in One year later, in November , the Berlin Wall—a symbol of Soviet tyranny in East Germany for nearly three decades—was torn down by the German people. This led to the peaceful reunification of Germany in and the end of communism in Eastern and Central Europe. America and its allies had prevailed in the Cold War.

**Chapter 5 : Trump vows massive military buildup for 'peace through strength' | The Times of Israel**

*Admiral Rogers participated in a panel discussion at the Reagan National Defense Forum - Building Peace Through Strength for American Security. The discussion took place on Saturday, November 15, , at p.m. PST.*

Peace is a daily, a weekly, a monthly process, gradually changing opinions, slowly eroding old barriers, quietly building new structures. Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that. Each time a man stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring, those ripples build a current that can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance. But it is also securing the space for others to contribute the best that they have and all that they are. Then he becomes your partner. Instead of sending tanks, send pens. Instead of sending soldiers, send teachers. It is immoral because it seeks to humiliate the opponent rather than win his understanding: Violence is immoral because it thrives on hatred rather than love. It destroys community and makes brotherhood impossible. It leaves society in monologue rather than dialogue. Violence ends up defeating itself. It creates bitterness in the survivors and brutality in the destroyers. We must be doctors who can cure the virus of violence. We must be soldiers of peace who can do more than preach to the choir. And we must be artists who will make the world our masterpiece. Peace means solving these differences through peaceful means; through dialogue, education, knowledge; and through humane ways. Mankind must evolve for all human conflict a method which rejects revenge, aggression, and retaliation. The foundation of such a method is love. Love is the talisman of human weal and woe – the open sesame to every soul. Life is a beauty, admire it. Life is a dream, realize it. Life is a challenge, meet it. Life is a duty, complete it. Life is a game, play it. Life is a promise, fulfill it. Life is sorrow, overcome it. Life is a song, sing it. Life is a struggle, accept it. Life is a tragedy, confront it. Life is an adventure, dare it. Life is luck, make it. Life is life, fight for it. A healing spirit more powerful than any darkness we may encounter. We sometime lose sight of this force when there is suffering, and too much pain. Then suddenly, the spirit will emerge through the lives of ordinary people who hear a call and answer in extraordinary ways. Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace, the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living, the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children. Because cynicism is a self-imposed blindness, a rejection of the world because we are afraid it will hurt us or disappoint us. It lies in the hearts and minds of all people. So let us not rest all our hopes on parchment and on paper, let us strive to build peace, a desire for peace, a willingness to work for peace in the hearts and minds of all of our people. I believe that we can. I believe the problems of human destiny are not beyond the reach of human beings. I am of the opinion that my life belongs to the whole community, and as long as I live it is my privilege to do for it whatever I can. I want to be thoroughly used up when I die, for the harder I work the more I live. I rejoice in life for its own sake. It is a sort of splendid torch which I have got hold of for the moment, and I want to make it burn as brightly as possible before handing it on to future generations. I realize the pursuit of peace is not as dramatic as the pursuit of war! But we have no more urgent task. It supersedes all other courts. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has. People must learn to hate, and if they can learn to hate, they can be taught to love, for love comes more naturally to the human heart than its opposite. We worry about ourselves, our family, our friends, our work, and our state of the world. If we allow worry to fill our hearts, sooner or later we will get sick. Whether that comes from nature or nurture, I cannot say. There were many dark moments when my faith in humanity was sorely tested, but I would not and could not give myself up to despair. That way lays defeat and death. To change something, build a new model and make the existing obsolete! It is the strength required to bring about social, political and economic change. Power at its best is love implementing the demands of justice, and justice at its best is power correcting everything that stands against love. Always remember, you have within you the strength, the patience, and the passion to reach for the stars to change the world. But laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered and manners and opinions change, with

the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors. In that space is our power to choose our response. In our response lies our growth and our freedom. You can be that generation. It is not enough to say we must not wage war. It is necessary to love peace and sacrifice for it. We must concentrate not merely on the negative expulsion of war but on the positive affirmation of peace. We must see that peace represents a sweeter music, a cosmic melody, that is far superior to the discords of war. In short, we must shift the arms race into a peace race. If we have a will " and determination " to mount such a peace offensive, we will unlock hitherto tightly sealed doors of hope and transform our imminent cosmic elegy into a psalm of creative fulfillment. Islam has 99 names for God. Japanese has 14 words for beauty. For many more beautiful Peace Quote graphics: Peace need not be impracticable, and war need not be inevitable. By defining our goal more clearly, by making it seem more manageable and less remote, we can help all peoples to see it, to draw hope from it, and to move irresistibly toward it. Kennedy Share this Quote on Facebook! Indeed, I think that people want peace so much that one of these days governments had better get out of the way and let them have it. Eisenhower Yesterday is gone and its tale told. Today new seeds are growing. You can practice any virtue erratically, but nothing consistently without courage. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force. Examine our attitude towards peace itself. Too many of us think it is impossible. Too many think it is unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable " that mankind is doomed " that we are gripped by forces we cannot control. We need not accept that view. Our problems are man-made. Therefore, they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants. No problem of human destiny is beyond human beings. And the more peace there is in us, the more peace there will also be in our troubled world. Only then will your thirst be quenched. Not to have tried is the true failure.

### Chapter 6 : "Peace Through Strength"™ Is a Racket - calendrierdelascience.com

*Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.*

### Chapter 7 : Peace & Inspiration: Great Quotes - The Peace Alliance

*BUILDING PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH REAGAN NATIONAL DEFENSE FORUM THE RONALD REAGAN PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY SIMI VALLEY, CALIFORNIA "As for the enemies of freedom, those who are potential adversaries, they will.*

### Chapter 8 : TOP 20 PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH QUOTES | A-Z Quotes

*To assert that "peace through strength" is bs is to ignore that it is a factor in maintaining peace. People certainly use the axiom to argue for empire building and military expansion, but it.*

### Chapter 9 : Formats and Editions of Building peace through strength : August 23, [calendrierdelascience.com

*Title / Author Type Language Date / Edition Publication; 1. Building peace through strength: August 23, 1.*