

## II. The Bush administration's domestic policy priorities and processes

- There are significant limitations placed on the Bush administration's agenda and ability to act. In domestic issues the President generally cannot act until Congress says so and on other (foreign policy) matters the President can act until Congress says no. Any spending of money requires congressional consent. The Democrats have a slim majority in the Senate and therefore control key committees and processes. However, it will be difficult for the Democrats to remain united as Republicans reach out (dole patronage) to more conservative Democratic representatives. Foreign policy matters very little to most representatives and their constituents, and they will vote accordingly.
- There are cleavages within the Administration; it is not a monolith. Rumsfeld, Cheney, Powell, Rice and White House staff represent different worldviews. The State Department and the Defense Department are always at odds. Rumsfeld is not a strong proponent of consultation with allies. Powell is less of a "free hand" person and knows the process and style of communication are important. The State Department and White House staff may want to nudge Bush in a more forward / progressive direction. The Bush administration lacks a notion of "enlightened self interest."

## III. Security and National Missile Defense (NMD)

- The Bush administration is preoccupied primarily with threats to *American* (not global) security. Enemies and adversaries of America do exist, though some may not want to believe it.
- The administration is skeptical about the capacity and willingness of international organizations to address and eliminate security threats. It believes its allies will abide by treaties, norms and agreements and its enemies will not. Although the administration is willing to talk to other international actors this is not to be read as a commitment to listen to them or to act on their proposals. Many of those who are publicly opposed are privately supportive of NMD. Six NATO countries support NMD.
- Although the Bush administration has a state-centric view of the world, it is also concerned about ill-defined non-state threats, like terrorism. In its opinion, technology is making it possible for the weak to punish the strong. Non-state or rogue state transcontinental arms / missile threats are particularly problematic.
- The Bush administration is more concerned with the technological challenge of dealing with missile threats than with the broader problems posed by American abrogation of existing antiballistic missile treaties.
- Who gets protected by NMD depends on what technology / missiles are used. A terminal defense is almost impossible to build; a mid-course defense is better but has geo-political fallout and probably would only defend the US and Canada. The new technology leans