



INFORMATION SERIES

Issue No. 668

September 1, 2026

Beyond Strategic Sufficiency: Nuclear Posture for the Simultaneity Problem

Joseph H. Lyons

Major Joseph H. Lyons is an active-duty Air Force officer and combat-experienced B-52H instructor pilot. A career bomber aviator, he has supported the full range of global strike operations. He is currently a student in the Advanced Military Studies Program at the School of Advanced Military Studies (SAMS), Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, and holds a Doctor of Defense and Strategic Studies from Missouri State University. His research focuses on nuclear posture adaptation, strategic deterrence, and the problem of simultaneity.

The Simultaneity Problem

The 2026 National Defense Strategy identifies simultaneity as a central problem for U.S. defense strategy.¹ The nuclear posture debate now needs to catch up. The United States can no longer judge nuclear adequacy only by asking whether the current modernization program remains on track or whether the inherited triad can deter one major nuclear adversary. The more urgent question is whether the U.S. nuclear posture has enough depth to deter Russia and China simultaneously, assure allies across multiple theaters, and hedge against regional nuclear opportunism, modernization delays, and adversary growth.

This article uses concurrency as the analytical standard for addressing the simultaneity problem. Simultaneity describes the strategic environment: overlapping or opportunistically linked pressure by Russia, China, and regional nuclear actors. Concurrent deterrence describes the resulting task: deterring adversaries, assuring allies, and hedging against risk when those pressures occur at the same time. The distinction matters because posture adequacy must now be judged against simultaneous demands, not sequential or single-adversary assumptions.



INFORMATION SERIES

Issue No. 668 | September 1, 2026

Recent debate has increasingly recognized that the United States faces a two-peer nuclear challenge. Paul Amato, for example, has argued in this series that a one-war construct no longer applies to U.S. nuclear strategy, while Keith Payne has framed deterrence adequacy as an old debate in a new threat context.² The next question is narrower: once the two-peer challenge is accepted, how should policymakers judge whether a posture is adequate? The answer cannot be simply that the United States needs more nuclear forces. The better answer is that posture choices should be measured against the depth needed to deter, assure, and hedge under a concurrency standard.

The practical consequence is that simultaneity changes the meaning of adequacy. In a sequential crisis, the United States may be able to concentrate senior attention, forces, and signaling on one theater while relying on reserve capacity elsewhere. Under concurrent stress, that reserve may not exist. Russia could pressure NATO, China could coerce U.S. allies in the Indo-Pacific, and North Korea or a potential proliferator such as Iran could exploit the distraction.³ The central posture question is not whether the United States can retaliate in the abstract. It is whether the posture provides enough usable capacity and credible options when several deterrence problems arrive at once.

Defining Sufficiency

Nuclear posture debates often rely on terms that sound precise but are not self-defining. A posture may be described as credible, stable, sufficient, or adequate, but those labels do little analytic work unless they are tied to explicit requirements. Credible for what purpose? Stable against which adversaries? Sufficient under what crisis conditions? Adequate by which standard? In a two-peer nuclear environment, ambiguity about the standard becomes a strategic risk.

The 2023 Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, commonly known as the Strategic Posture Commission (SPC), provides a useful public foundation for a more explicit standard. It identified six core functional tenets for the U.S. strategic posture: assured second strike, flexible response, tailored deterrence, extended deterrence and assurance, calculated ambiguity, and hedging against risk.⁴ These six tenets should not be treated merely as broad aspirations, but as standards for judging the adequacy of a force posture for credible deterrence. They identify the major functions a credible deterrence posture must perform: survive and respond, provide flexible options, adapt deterrence to different adversaries and theaters, assure allies, preserve useful uncertainty, and hedge against surprise.

The value of the SPC tenets is not that they make deterrence mathematical. It is that they force policymakers to say which functions a posture must perform before calling it sufficient. If the tenets remain slogans, nearly any posture can claim to satisfy them. A posture that can retaliate massively may still fall short if it lacks credible theater options, assurance mechanisms, or hedge responsiveness. In a two-peer nuclear environment, sufficiency cannot mean simply



preserving a modernized version of the inherited force. It must mean satisfying identifiable deterrence and assurance requirements under concurrent stress.

Modernization Is Not Margin

The current posture debate often treats modernization as the central test of adequacy. That focus is understandable. The United States must replace aging delivery systems, recapitalize nuclear command, control, and communications (NC3), modernize the weapons enterprise, and preserve the credibility of the triad.⁵ None of that is optional. A delayed or disrupted Program of Record (POR) would weaken deterrence, narrow presidential options, and impose additional risk on allies who depend on the U.S. extended deterrent.

The distinction is not between modernization and no modernization. It is between postures that preserve a retaliatory minimum, postures that recapitalize the inherited force, and postures that add enough depth to remain credible under concurrent stress. Minimal Deterrence refers to a lean retaliatory posture centered on survivable second-strike capability while accepting reduced theater nuclear options, reduced flexible-response capacity, and limited hedge responsiveness.⁶ It may appear attractive because it promises restraint and reduced reliance on nuclear weapons, but it fails to perform the broader functions required for credible deterrence.

The unmodified POR is more serious, but still incomplete. It refers to the current modernization baseline: Columbia-class ballistic missile submarines, Sentinel intercontinental ballistic missiles, B-21 bombers, Long-Range Standoff weapons, B61 modernization, NC3 modernization, and nuclear-enterprise sustainment.⁷ These programs are indispensable because they recapitalize the inherited force and sustain the basic structure of U.S. strategic deterrence. But they largely replace legacy capabilities without significantly increasing theater nuclear depth, hedge responsiveness, or room for error in a two-peer, multipolar nuclear environment.

The modernization program is also exposed to timing risk. Sentinel transition, Columbia-class construction, bomber production, weapons-enterprise capacity, and NC3 recapitalization all move on different timelines and face different bottlenecks. GAO reporting on Sentinel, Columbia, and NNSA production challenges illustrates a simple point: modernization is not a clean line on a briefing slide.⁸ It is a long-cycle enterprise vulnerable to cost growth, schedule friction, workforce limits, infrastructure constraints, and integration risk.

This is not a criticism of modernization. It is a warning against letting modernization become a substitute for strategy. Replacing aging systems is necessary to preserve credibility, but replacement alone does not determine whether the resulting posture has enough resilience to withstand simultaneous pressure. The relevant test is not whether the United States is modernizing, but whether modernization produces a posture that can deter, assure, and hedge under simultaneity.



The Sufficiency Trap

Strategic Sufficiency occupies the useful middle ground in this debate. It rejects the inadequacy of Minimal Deterrence without assuming that every call for added depth must become a pursuit of nuclear superiority. It also moves beyond a one-for-one modernization baseline. Strategic Sufficiency is an enhanced POR: it preserves the triad and current modernization program, restores the nuclear-armed sea-launched cruise missile (SLCM-N) as a survivable theater-relevant option, raises the B-21 planning floor from the currently stated minimum of 100 aircraft toward roughly 145, and makes targeted National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) investments to improve weapons-enterprise responsiveness.⁹

That middle-ground character is politically attractive. It offers a way to strengthen deterrence without appearing to embrace open-ended expansion. But that same attractiveness can create a false sense of closure. A posture that is easier to defend politically may still be strategically brittle if it depends on smooth modernization, predictable adversary behavior, and sequential crises.

Strategic Sufficiency improves the baseline, but only as a floor rather than a destination. It avoids the most obvious failures of a minimalist posture while leaving key deterrence functions—especially theater assurance, hedge responsiveness, weapons-enterprise depth, and tolerance for delay—dependent on favorable assumptions. In practical terms, it buys time. But buying time is not the same as solving the simultaneity problem.

That is why Strategic Sufficiency should be described carefully. It is not weak, and it is not a disguised minimalist position. It would materially improve the current baseline by restoring a theater-relevant sea-based option, expanding bomber planning assumptions, and strengthening parts of the weapons enterprise. But it still reaches adequacy by a narrow route.

The central vulnerability is that Strategic Sufficiency consumes much of its available depth simply to remain adequate. It is the lower bound of viability, not a durable endpoint. Its danger is that policymakers may mistake the minimum viable correction for a solution.

Strategic Sufficiency should therefore be treated as an interim waypoint rather than the desired end state. It is a plausible first correction because it is more politically and programmatically achievable than a larger shift. But the strategic logic of simultaneity points beyond it. The desired endpoint should be a posture with enough depth to remain credible when Russia and China create overlapping demands and when regional actors or modernization delays add additional pressure.

Bolstered Deterrence

Bolstered Deterrence provides an appropriate 2035 target posture because it applies the more demanding standard of concurrent deterrence to the simultaneity problem without turning adequacy into a demand for unconstrained expansion. It would augment the POR by expanding penetrating bomber capacity toward a 288-aircraft B-21 planning benchmark, restoring SLCM-N, increasing NNSA investments, and strengthening NC3 and weapons-



INFORMATION SERIES

Issue No. 668 | September 1, 2026

generation resilience.¹⁰ It also includes planning for more visible Indo-Pacific assurance mechanisms, potentially including a Guam-based or rotational U.S. dual-capable aircraft (DCA) option for regional assurance planning.¹¹ It should be understood as a desired posture, not an immediate procurement order.

These elements are functional rather than fixed requirements in isolation. The posture should be sized and organized to perform under the conditions the United States is likely to face: simultaneous pressure from two nuclear peers, regional opportunism, modernization friction, and allied assurance demands. A two-peer environment requires more survivable capacity, more theater thickness, more assurance credibility, and more responsiveness than narrow sufficiency can provide.

The first requirement is more survivable and usable capacity. Assured second strike remains foundational, but in a two-peer environment, survivability cannot be judged only by whether some retaliatory capability remains after an attack. The question is whether enough survivable and usable capacity remains to support deterrence across multiple theaters, preserve presidential options, and prevent adversaries from believing they can exploit U.S. distraction or depletion.

Second, Bolstered Deterrence requires thicker theater nuclear options. Central strategic deterrence is indispensable, but it is not sufficient by itself to manage every form of coercion. Russia and China may seek limited, demonstrative, or theater-level nuclear pathways designed to fracture alliances or paralyze decision-making. SLCM-N, bomber and standoff capabilities, and visible theater-relevant options help narrow the gap between conventional defeat and large-scale strategic retaliation.¹² They also complicate adversary confidence that limited nuclear use or coercive signaling can remain localized and advantageous.

Third, the posture must improve Indo-Pacific assurance. NATO has a mature nuclear-sharing and consultation architecture. The Indo-Pacific does not. Japan, South Korea, Australia, and other partners assess U.S. credibility in a region where China's nuclear expansion, North Korea's advancing arsenal, and gray-zone coercion interact with conventional military pressure. Assurance in this environment requires more than occasional bomber flights. It requires consultation, planning mechanisms, credible theater-relevant options, and infrastructure that allies can understand before a crisis. A Guam-based or rotational U.S. DCA option would not recreate NATO nuclear sharing, but it would provide a more visible regional assurance mechanism under U.S. control.¹³

Fourth, Bolstered Deterrence must improve hedge and enterprise responsiveness. The relevant question is not only how many warheads exist, but how quickly the enterprise can produce, certify, upload, sustain, and adapt options if adversary growth or crisis timing demands it. That requires deeper NNSA investment, pit-production realism, warhead certification capacity, sustainment depth, and a more responsive infrastructure base.¹⁴ Bolstered Deterrence should also integrate homeland missile defense as a complementary damage-limitation layer, not as a substitute for survivable retaliatory forces.¹⁵ A brittle enterprise can undermine deterrence even if the force structure looks adequate on paper.



INFORMATION SERIES

Issue No. 668 | September 1, 2026

Fifth, Bolstered Deterrence offers better tolerance for modernization disruption and adversary growth. This may be its most important advantage over Strategic Sufficiency. A posture that barely clears the adequacy threshold can be pushed back into marginality by schedule delay, cost growth, industrial bottlenecks, or faster-than-expected adversary expansion.¹⁶ Bolstered Deterrence builds room for error. It does not assume that every U.S. program stays on schedule, every adversary grows predictably, or every crisis arrives one at a time.

What Bolstered Deterrence does not require is a posture sized to outnumber adversaries for its own sake. Its goal is not numerical superiority, but the ability to preserve credible deterrence functions when simultaneous adversary pressure erodes the slack built into one-peer planning assumptions. It is not maximalism. It is disciplined depth.

This is why 2035 matters. The Strategic Posture Commission identified the 2027–2035 period as the window in which Russia and China create the most acute two-peer challenge.¹⁷ Treating Bolstered Deterrence as the 2035 target turns the recommendation into a sequencing problem more than an immediate acquisition demand. The United States should use Strategic Sufficiency as the interim floor while planning deliberately toward a posture that has more depth in the areas simultaneous pressure stresses most.

What Should Change

Three policy implications follow.

First, the United States should treat Strategic Sufficiency as an interim waypoint, not as the endpoint of posture adequacy. It should guide near-term correction of the current baseline, but future posture planning should not stop there. The United States should use it to buy time while deliberately sequencing toward a posture with greater theater depth, hedge responsiveness, enterprise resilience, and tolerance for simultaneous pressure.

Second, future Nuclear Posture Reviews (NPRs) and posture debates should use the Strategic Posture Commission's six functional tenets as an explicit decision-support framework. The purpose would not be to reduce deterrence to a mechanical checklist. It would be to discipline claims of need and adequacy. A future NPR should not merely state that U.S. forces are credible or sufficient. It should explain how the posture performs against each tenet under a concurrency stress test involving Russia, China, and at least one regional nuclear actor.

Third, arms-control and modernization choices should be judged against the requirements of concurrent deterrence, not single-adversary assumptions. Arms control should not be rejected in principle, but future agreements should be judged by whether they preserve the depth required for two-peer deterrence rather than by whether they reproduce familiar or lower bilateral ceilings. A framework that constrains U.S. options while failing to account for China's expansion, Russia's non-strategic nuclear forces, or regional nuclear threats may preserve the appearance of restraint while worsening the actual adequacy problem.¹⁸

The same logic applies to modernization. Programmatic decisions should not be judged only by whether they replace legacy systems on schedule. They should be judged by whether



INFORMATION SERIES

Issue No. 668 | September 1, 2026

they generate survivable capacity, flexible response options, theater relevance, assurance credibility, NC3 resilience, weapons-enterprise responsiveness, and hedge capacity under simultaneous pressure. Strategic Sufficiency should serve as the near-term correction, Bolstered Deterrence should define the 2035 target, and the six SPC tenets should provide the recurring test.

Conclusion

A posture can be modern and still be too thin. It can be sufficient in a one-peer frame and fragile in a two-peer crisis. That is the central warning of the simultaneity problem. The United States should therefore stop asking only whether nuclear modernization is on track and start asking whether the resulting posture has enough depth to deter, assure, and hedge under simultaneous pressure.

The inherited posture debate is not obsolete, but it is incomplete. Assured second strike remains foundational. The triad remains essential. Modernization remains non-negotiable. But those facts do not settle the question of adequacy. In a two-peer, multipolar nuclear era, adequacy must be judged against the full set of six functions a credible posture must perform: surviving and responding to attack, providing flexible options, tailoring deterrence to different adversaries and theaters, assuring allies under stress, preserving calculated ambiguity, and hedging against risk.

Strategic Sufficiency is a serious correction, but it remains an interim floor rather than a durable endpoint. The proper policy response is disciplined depth: added capacity and resilience that create real margin where simultaneous pressure places the posture under the greatest stress. The United States should sequence through Strategic Sufficiency, but it should aim for Bolstered Deterrence as the desired 2035 posture. That posture best reflects the world the United States is entering: one in which deterrence credibility will depend not only on possessing modern forces, but on having enough depth, resilience, and room for error to employ, signal, sustain, and adapt them under simultaneous pressure.

The views in this Information Series are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as official U.S. Government policy, the official policy of the National Institute for Public Policy, or any of its sponsors.

¹ U.S. Department of Defense, *2026 National Defense Strategy of the United States of America* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, January 2026), 13–14, <https://media.defense.gov/2026/Jan/23/2003864773/-1/-1/0/2026-NATIONAL-DEFENSE-STRATEGY.PDF>; David J. Trachtenberg, “Parsing the New National Defense Strategy: Upending Bipartisan Tradition,” National Institute for Public Policy, *Information Series*, No. 655, March 30, 2026, pp. 1, 3, 5, <https://nipp.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/IS-655.pdf>.

² Paul Amato, “A ‘One-War’ Warfighting Construct No Longer Applies to U.S. Nuclear Strategy,” National Institute for Public Policy, *Information Series*, No. 632, August 6, 2025, pp. 2–3, <https://nipp.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/IS-632.pdf>; Keith B. Payne, “Critical Strategic Deterrence Questions for Today,” National



INFORMATION SERIES

Issue No. 668 | September 1, 2026

Institute for Public Policy, *Information Series*, No. 657, April 13, 2026, pp. 2–3, <https://nipp.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/04/IS-657.pdf>.

³ Office of the Director of National Intelligence, *Annual Threat Assessment of the U.S. Intelligence Community 2025* (Washington, D.C.: ODNI, March 2025), p. 4, <https://www.dni.gov/files/ODNI/documents/assessments/ATA-2025-Unclassified-Report.pdf>; U.S. Department of Defense, *Annual Report to Congress: Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 2025* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, December 2025), pp. 23, 29–30, <https://media.defense.gov/2025/Dec/23/2003849070/-1/-1/1/ANNUAL-REPORT-TO-CONGRESS-MILITARY-AND-SECURITY-DEVELOPMENTS-INVOLVING-THE-PEOPLES-REPUBLIC-OF-CHINA-2025.PDF>.

⁴ Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, *America's Strategic Posture: The Final Report of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States* (Arlington, VA: Institute for Defense Analyses, October 2023), pp. vii–viii, 24, <https://www.ida.org/-/media/feature/publications/A/Americas%20Strategic%20Posture/Strategic-Posture-Commission-Report.pdf>.

⁵ Congressional Budget Office, *Projected Costs of U.S. Nuclear Forces, 2025 to 2034* (Washington, D.C.: CBO, April 2025), pp. 1–4, 10–11, <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/61362>; U.S. Strategic Command, “War Department Continues Nuclear Modernization,” September 22, 2025, <https://www.stratcom.mil/Media/News/News-Article-View/Article/4311932/war-department-continues-nuclear-modernization/>.

⁶ Tytti Erästö, *Revisiting ‘Minimal Nuclear Deterrence’: Laying the Ground for Multilateral Nuclear Disarmament*, SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security no. 2022/6 (Stockholm: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, June 2022), pp. 1–4, <https://www.sipri.org/publications/2022/sipri-insights-peace-and-security/revisiting-minimal-nuclear-deterrence-laying-ground-multilateral-nuclear-disarmament>; Keith B. Payne, *Minimum Deterrence: Examining the Evidence* (Fairfax, VA: National Institute Press, 2013), pp. 14, 27–28, 97–99, <https://nipp.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Final-for-Distro-7.17.pdf>.

⁷ Congressional Budget Office, *Projected Costs of U.S. Nuclear Forces*, pp. 1–4, 10–11; U.S. Strategic Command, “War Department Continues Nuclear Modernization”; U.S. Air Force, “B-21 Raider,” fact sheet, updated March 21, 2025, <https://www.af.mil/About-Us/Fact-Sheets/Display/Article/2682973/b-21-raider/>; U.S. Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration, *Fiscal Year 2025 Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Energy, 2024), pp. i, v–vi, 1–5–1–7, <https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2024-10/FY2025%20Stockpile%20Stewardship%20and%20Management%20Plan.pdf>.

⁸ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *ICBM Modernization: Air Force Actions Needed to Expediently Address Critical Risks to Sentinel Transition*, GAO-25-108466 (Washington, D.C.: Government Accountability Office, 2025), pp. 1–2, <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-25-108466>; U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Columbia Class Submarine: Program Lacks Essential Schedule Insight amid Continuing Construction Challenges*, GAO-23-106292 (Washington, D.C.: Government Accountability Office, 2023), pp. 1, 14–15, <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-23-106292>; U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Nuclear Security Enterprise: Assessments of NNSA Major Projects*, GAO-26-107777 (Washington, D.C.: Government Accountability Office, February 2026), pp. 17, <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-26-107777>.

⁹ David J. Trachtenberg, “Full Steam Ahead on the SLCM-N,” National Institute for Public Policy, *Information Series*, No. 653, March 4, 2026, pp. 2–4, <https://nipp.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/IS-653.pdf>; John A. Tirpak, “STRATCOM Chief: Air Force Needs 145 B-21s and More New Strategic Systems,” *Air & Space Forces Magazine*, March 18, 2025, <https://www.airandspaceforces.com/stratcom-chief-b-21s-lrso-strategic-systems/>; U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Nuclear Security Enterprise: Assessments of NNSA Major Projects*, GAO-26-107777 (Washington, D.C.: Government Accountability Office, February 2026), pp. 17, 38, 55, <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-26-107777>.

¹⁰ Mark A. Gunzinger, Carl Rehberg, and Lukas Autenried, *Five Priorities for the Air Force's Future Combat Air Force* (Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, 2020), pp. 9–10,



INFORMATION SERIES

Issue No. 668 | September 1, 2026

<https://csbaonline.org/research/publications/five-priorities-for-the-air-forces-future-combat-air-force/publication/1>; Trachtenberg, “Full Steam Ahead on the SLCM-N,” pp. 2–4; U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Nuclear Security Enterprise*, pp. 17, 38, 55.

¹¹ Masashi Murano, “The 2023 Strategic Posture Commission Report From a Japanese Perspective,” National Institute for Public Policy, *Information Series*, No. 610, January 6, 2025, pp. 1–4, <https://nipp.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/IS-610.pdf>; Josh Chang, “Assessing a New Nuclear Theater Architecture for the Indo-Pacific,” RAND, January 15, 2025, <https://www.rand.org/pubs/commentary/2025/01/assessing-a-new-nuclear-theater-architecture-for-the.html>; Peter J. Dean, Peter K. Lee, and Kester Abbott, *Allied Extended Deterrence: Towards a Collective Framework in the Indo-Pacific* (Sydney: United States Studies Centre, May 19, 2025), pp. 19–23, <https://www.ussc.edu.au/allied-extended-deterrence-towards-a-collective-framework-in-the-indo-pacific>.

¹² Congressional Commission, *America’s Strategic Posture*, 25–28, 94–98; Trachtenberg, “Full Steam Ahead on the SLCM-N,” pp. 2–4.

¹³ Murano, “2023 Strategic Posture Commission Report From a Japanese Perspective,” pp. 1–4, 6–7; Chang, “Assessing a New Nuclear Theater Architecture”; Dean, Lee, and Abbott, *Allied Extended Deterrence*, pp. 1–2, 19–23.

¹⁴ U.S. Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration, *Fiscal Year 2025 Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan*, pp. vi, 1–5, 3–28–3–33, 4–27–4–28; U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Nuclear Security Enterprise*, pp. 17, 38, 55.

¹⁵ Robert M. Soofer, Kari Anderson, James McCue, et al., “First, We Will Defend the Homeland”: *The Case for Homeland Missile Defense* (Washington, D.C.: Atlantic Council, 2024), pp. 4, 12, 26, <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/First-We-Will-Defend-the-Homeland-2024-FINAL-1.pdf>.

¹⁶ U.S. Department of Defense, *Annual Report to Congress: Military and Security Developments Involving the People’s Republic of China 2025*, pp. 29–30; U.S. Government Accountability Office, *ICBM Modernization*, pp. 1–2; U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Columbia Class Submarine*, pp. 1, 14–15; U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Nuclear Security Enterprise*, p. 17.

¹⁷ Congressional Commission, *America’s Strategic Posture*, pp. vii–viii.

¹⁸ Greg Weaver and Amy Woolf, *Requirements for Nuclear Deterrence and Arms Control in a Two-Nuclear-Peer Environment* (Washington, D.C.: Atlantic Council and Los Alamos National Laboratory, February 2024), pp. 13–17, <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/in-depth-research-reports/report/requirements-for-nuclear-deterrence-and-arms-control-in-a-two-peer-nuclear-peer-environment/>; Congressional Commission, *America’s Strategic Posture*, pp. xiii–xv, 94–101.

The National Institute for Public Policy’s *Information Series* is a periodic publication focusing on contemporary strategic issues affecting U.S. foreign and defense policy. It is a forum for promoting critical thinking on the evolving international security environment and how the dynamic geostrategic landscape affects U.S. national security. Contributors are recognized experts in the field of national security. National Institute for Public Policy would like to thank the Sarah Scaife Foundation for the generous support that made this *Information Series* possible.

The views in this *Information Series* are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as official U.S. Government policy, the official policy of the National Institute for Public Policy, or any of its sponsors. For additional information about this publication or other publications by the National Institute Press, contact: Editor, National Institute Press, 12150 Monument Dr., Suite 125, Fairfax, VA 22033, (703) 293- 9181, www.nipp.org. For access to previous issues of the National Institute Press *Information Series*, please visit <http://www.nipp.org/national-institute-press/informationseries/>.

© National Institute Press, 2026