

the JFC with an established set of basing and logistical infrastructure enabling rapid reinforcement, improved force projection, and Global Strike operations. Overseas presence in some cases serves to extend the U.S. nuclear deterrent over both forward-based forces and regional allies, significantly increasing an adversary's perceptions of the potential costs involved in taking courses of action we seek to deter.

Contributions to Inducing Adversary Restraint: The role of overseas presence in inducing adversary restraint is primarily seen by imagining its absence. Without overseas presence, a U.S. decision to deploy major combat forces to a region in anticipation of (or in response to) adversary coercion or aggression could be seen as a more threatening American response than the alert or reinforcement of forward-based forces. Thus, overseas presence provides American national leadership a more measured, and potentially less provocative, set of deterrent options.

Allied/Coalition Military Cooperation and Integration

U.S. vital interests are increasingly intertwined with those of U.S. friends and allies. As a result, strategic deterrence can in some instances be enhanced through military cooperation and integration with allied/coalition forces. The deterrent impact of such cooperation and integration is both political and military in nature. The political impacts are primarily derived from: 1) the effects that coalition-based responses have on an adversary's perception of U.S. and allied political will, and of 2) the potentially long-lasting, harmful post-conflict political and economic effects of taking on a U.S.-led international coalition. The military impacts are derived from improvements in both U.S. and coalition capabilities to defeat adversary military operations. Allied and Coalition contributions to the joint fight are significant. For example, they can provide host nation security, fly additional sorties, supplement naval presence, provide additional maneuver forces, conduct maritime and ground mine clearing operations, to name just a few. These actions contribute significantly to force protection and overall operational success.

Contributions to Denying Benefits: Allied/coalition military cooperation and integration creates a shared political security burden and an improved ability to limit the damage an adversary can inflict. This undercuts an adversary's ability to coerce the U.S. and its allies. It also reduces the potential benefits to be reaped from a surprise attack before the U.S. is fully deployed in theater. In many cases, allied/coalition military cooperation and integration provides U.S. forces the basing and logistical support needed to accelerate reinforcement and force projection, making adversary gains less likely. In some instances, allies can provide force capabilities essential to deterrence by denying benefits that would be difficult or costly for the U.S. to match (e.g., extensive ground forces). There are even cases where focused allied/coalition military cooperation and

integration allows an ally to deter on its own through denying benefits without U.S. involvement in combat operations.

Contributions to Imposing Costs: Allied/coalition military cooperation and integration can have a tremendous impact on the adversary's perception of the political will of the U.S. and its allies. These activities increase the perceived probability that an adversary will incur costs should they take actions contrary to U.S. vital interests. Such costs include, but are not limited to: U.S. intervention itself; the loss of critical military and economic capabilities; longer-term political and economic costs associated with becoming a "pariah" state (as a result of conflict with a U.S.-led coalition); and even regime destruction at the hands of an internationally sanctioned military campaign. Most of the military impacts of allied/coalition cooperation and integration that contribute to denying benefits contribute to cost imposition efforts as well. An additional significant cost imposition impact is the potential for U.S. and allied force synergies that free up U.S. military assets to focus on imposing costs, rather than only denying benefits. An example would be allied/coalition air forces providing air defense, freeing U.S. air assets to be employed primarily in strike operations.

Contributions to Inducing Adversary Restraint: A potential impact of these activities is to convince an adversary that U.S. allies will exercise increased restraining influence over American war aims and associated military operations. However, additional contributions of allied/coalition military cooperation and integration to inducing adversary restraint are limited.

Force Projection

The capability to project U.S. military power globally and conduct effective theater-level, military operations across the domains of air, sea, land, space, and information--including the capability to win decisively in a Major Combat Operation (MCO)--is essential to strategic deterrence. Force projection capability greatly enhances the JFC's capacity to use all three "ways" of influencing an adversary's decision-making. U.S. force projection capabilities need to be responsive, sustainable, and executable in the face of anti-access strategies, WMD employment, and other means of asymmetric warfare. For strategic deterrence it is especially critical that force projection operations be executable such that we can limit the damage an adversary can inflict--on U.S. forces, allies, and potentially their own civilian populace.

Contributions to Denying Benefits: Force projection capabilities provide the means to deny a broad range of perceived benefits that adversaries might seek through aggression and coercion. These perceived benefits could include (but are not limited to): seizure and occupation of allied territory; destruction of (or damage to) key allied political, military and/or economic assets; closure or