



Below you will find my analysis of the United States' *National Security Strategy* as it was published a few days ago. If you have not yet read this document, do so at your own convenience either before or after reading this analysis. The original document can be found and downloaded here:

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/2025-National-Security-Strategy.pdf>

I will skip President Trump's introductory remarks (and only reserve a small comment on him at the end). Even though the President's input is leading and by the nature of his position and office, so is he the person finally responsible for it, this document was however, of course, authored by a larger team of people from the current administration – and I will treat it accordingly: as representative of the view of the U.S. government as such (i.e. not limited to the view of any one individual, incl. the President), as elected by the American people by significant majority vote.

NB: All the highlights and interpunction in the quotations are as they appear in the original document, i.e. not added by me.

This newly published U.S. National Security Strategy is a *very dense* document, covering a substantial amount of conceptual territory. In *this* analysis, I have focused on analyzing and making explicit the primary *philosophical and political principles* underlying this national security strategy document – and how these principles compare to the philosophical and political principles currently operating in Europe (and the rest of the world more broadly).

The document consists of four main parts (some of them contain subsections):

- I. Introduction – What Is American Strategy?
- II. What *Should* the United States Want?
- III. What Are America’s Available Means to Get What We Want?
- IV. The Strategy

Let’s start at part “I. Introduction – What Is American Strategy?”.

The first paragraph explains *why* America needs a strategy and introduces the manner of thinking of the authors:

“To ensure that America remains the world’s strongest, richest, most powerful, and most successful country for decades to come, our country needs a coherent, focused strategy for how we interact with the world. And to get that right, all Americans need to know what, exactly, it is we are trying to do and why.”

As an initial estimate based on merely the first paragraph, this is *not* the tone of an autocratic administration announcing *its will over the people*, instead it is an administration *directly appealing to the rational faculty of all its citizens*, which furthermore implies the *recognition of the faculty of volition* in each individual American citizen.

Next it is outlined what a “strategy” is and what its goal is (i.e. why the country needs it) – and further reveals the intellectual nature of the document and its authors:

“A “strategy” is a concrete, realistic plan that explains *the essential connection between ends and means*: it begins from an accurate assessment of what is desired *and* what tools are available, or can realistically be created, to achieve the desired outcomes.

A strategy must evaluate, sort, and prioritize. Not every country, region, issue, or cause—however worthy—can be the focus of American strategy. The purpose of foreign policy is the protection of core national interests; that is the sole focus of this strategy.”

The second paragraph is a clear and concise definition of a “strategy”. The third states the purpose of a strategy: in order to be able to evaluate, sort and prioritize, which means that it does not offer ‘ready-made’ answers, but works as a tool, a guide, in an ongoing effort of continued *thinking*.

At this point already, this early in the document, it becomes clear that this is an intellectual document, written by intellectuals, i.e. by people who are *thinking*, and more specifically: *thinking in principles*.

The rest of part I, though worth reading, will further be skipped here.

In part II. What *Should* the United States Want? section 1. *What Do We Want Overall?*, the document continues as follows:

“First and foremost, we want the continued survival and safety of the United States as an independent, sovereign republic whose government secures the God-given natural rights of its citizens and prioritizes their well-being and interests.”

This paragraph clearly states the essence of the strategy’s *goal* – and signifies that this strategy is grounded in the correct political principle of *the purpose of a nation’s government*, which is repeated again later on page 12: “The purpose of the American government is to secure the God-given natural rights of American citizens.”

The basic, fundamental *principles* that make up the framework of strategic thinking have now been made clear:

- The purpose of the government is *to secure the rights of its citizens*.
- The purpose of national security policy, and of foreign policy, is *the protection of core national interests*.
- The goal of national security strategy is *the continued survival and safety of the United States as an independent, sovereign republic whose government secures the rights of its citizens*.

NB: this particular phrasing “God-given natural rights” directly traces back to the phrasing in the *Declaration of Independence*, in which is stated: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”

The Founding Fathers held individual rights as “self-evident” and “endowed by their Creator” – both of which claims are incorrect. The concept of rights requires a long chain of proofs in order to be validated and is far from self-evident (just contemplate the fact that many nations have not even discovered the concept, most define it in completely different terms, some not at all).

The reference to a “Creator” reveals a still lingering philosophical error at the time of the Founding Fathers regarding the origin of rights, which was rooted in *John Locke’s* theory of “natural rights” – which also becomes clear from the phrasing in the security strategy “God-given natural rights”. Do rights come from God, or from nature? God is the ‘supernatural’, so anyone’s view on this matter notwithstanding, this *is* a contradiction (unless one is a Spinozist, i.e. a pantheist, meaning the philosophical view that God *is* nature). The authors of the strategy obviously still struggle with this philosophical point (and so does the United States in present times). In any case, the principle of religious freedom and of conscience protects everyone from this error. In Europe however, rights are not conceptualized as *antecedent to the state*, but as ‘created’ by the state.

Aside however from the previous note, the most important thing to note is the *level of consistency* between these basic strategic principles – and their level of alignment and consistency with the principles of the United States *as such*, i.e. as formulated primarily in the *Declaration of Independence*, the *Constitution* and the *Bill of Rights*.

Part IV. The Strategy section 1. *Principles* names and summarizes the administration’s guiding political philosophy most explicitly:

President Trump’s foreign policy is pragmatic without being “pragmatist,” realistic without being “realist,” principled without being “idealistic,” muscular without being “hawkish,” and restrained without being “dovish.” It is not grounded in traditional, political ideology. It is motivated above all by what works for America—or, in two words, “America First.”

This paragraph summarizes the U.S. administration’s *political philosophy* (which underlies and is the *basis* for this security strategy).

Part II then further consists of listing the things that represent the United States’ core, vital *national interests* – most of these I agree with fully, and they are essentially consonant with all of my other writings (compare for instance what I wrote in my very first column, to what this document states regarding Europe’s “lack of self-confidence” and the ongoing war in Ukraine). To therefore, at this point in my analysis, already plainly state *my basic stance* on this document:

Besides several details, this strategic document contains and represents what a proper nation’s political philosophy and the principles guiding its national security strategy *ought to be*. Let it be

clear *to my readers* however that, given the intellectual nature of the document and of the authors' thinking (i.e. thinking in principles, which most cannot, or refuse to do) *and* the nature of the United States' political philosophy as such (i.e. capitalism), most European or other countries' readers will likely *strongly oppose* the content of this document – as is also becoming clear from the initial recalcitrant responses which I have seen (exactly similar to Europe's response earlier, at the start of this year, when the new U.S. administration clarified its security interests specifically regarding the Panama Canal and Greenland).

In part IV. The Strategy section *1. Principles* it states another set of fundamental political principles worth highlighting (which also are directly opposed to the political philosophies currently dominating Europe, i.e. collectivism):

“Primacy of Nations – The world's fundamental political unit is and will remain the nation-state. It is natural and just that all nations put their interests first and guard their sovereignty. The world works best when nations prioritize their interests. The United States will put our own interests first and, in our relations with other nations, encourage them to prioritize their own interests as well. We stand *for* the sovereign rights of nations, *against* the sovereignty-sapping incursions of the most intrusive transnational organizations, and *for* reforming those institutions so that they assist rather than hinder individual sovereignty and further American interests.

Followed by:

“Sovereignty and Respect – The United States will unapologetically protect our own sovereignty. [...] The United States will chart our own course in the world and determine our own destiny, free of outside interference.”

Again, this is *diametrically opposed* to the collectivist philosophy and sense-of-life of the average European – and many of them will therefore protest this document on altruistic principles (be it implicitly or explicitly, subconsciously or consciously): namely on the premise that a nation *must sacrifice its own interests to that of other nations* (a direct corollary of the altruist's moral premise that an individual may not live for the sake of himself/herself, but all must sacrifice themselves for the sake of others).

Politically, *European nations are not, or no longer sovereign*: they have submitted their interests to the transnational institutes of the European Union and the United Nations many decades ago.

The next principle further makes the geopolitical stance of this U.S. administration perfectly clear:

“Balance of Power – The United States cannot allow any nation to become so dominant that it could threaten our interests. We will work with allies and partners to maintain global and regional balances of power to prevent the emergence of dominant adversaries.”

It cannot be unclear to anyone who reads this *what this means* and also: *whom this applies to specifically*, i.e. “adversaries” incl. “China”, certain nations in the “Middle East” and also any adversarial activity in the “Western Hemisphere” (e.g. narco-terrorism out of Latin America). “Russia” also, though less so. These principles are what essentially underlie and propel all of the more specific policies as they are listed and detailed in the rest of this strategic document.

As far as Europe goes: the document is highly positive and constructive towards Europe in general, however it addresses several existential problems Europe is currently facing, with which I fully agree (again, see all of my other writings). As a further consequence however of the morality of

altruism that currently dominates Europe (which is the *opposite* of the morality of rational egoism as underlying America's political philosophy), they will not want to hear any of it – and will likely instead mainly be antagonistic towards the United States' strategy and its principles as such.

Speaking as a European myself, the following passage (p.27) therefore is by far the most ominous:

“Over the long term, it is more than plausible that within a few decades at the latest, certain NATO members will become majority non-European. As such, it is an open question whether they will view their place in the world, or their alliance with the United States, in the same way as those who signed the NATO charter.”

This, is painfully *true*.

Even the U.S. itself knows its own cultural survival is also *not guaranteed*, as made clear elsewhere in the document where the phrase “is effective only if we believe in our country's inherent greatness and decency” is deemed important enough to be included. The United States can indeed *righteously* assert this sense of “greatness” and “decency”; its political history and founding principles *are* great and decent. Europe however, especially given its dominating anti-individualist, anti-capitalist philosophies, cannot and will not be able to assert the same, so given the ongoing crises in Europe, the above paragraph is all the more disconcerting.

Many Europeans' mode of thinking over the past two-hundred years has been so thoroughly shaped and stylized by the moral concepts of altruism – specifically by the *Kant-Hegel-Marx altruist/collectivist* axis in Philosophy which shaped most of Europe, which is the total opposite of the *Spinoza-Locke-Founding Fathers egoist/individualist* axis which shaped America – that they effectively can *only think on altruist premises*. Europeans generally are a state-worshipping people, who do not respect the individual, who cannot even conceive of what it means to be an individual with individual rights – and therefore they are also not able to understand (nor appreciate) the character of a nation *whose sole purpose exists in protecting those rights*.

In conceptual terms, such fallacy is known as a “frozen abstraction”. They do not know of any alternative to the doctrine of self-sacrifice that still dominates and has dominated Europe for centuries, so when such people witness another nation asserting its own moral primacy (see again the quoted U.S. principle of “Primacy of Nations”) this is *not understood* and will therefore be rejected by default (and often even rebelled against). And *this* means that *any* national security strategy document of a country upholding *its own interests* (i.e. the doctrine of “America First”), *although it is proper*, will *not be understood* by someone who can *only* think along the fallacious principle, the frozen abstraction ‘that the good means to sacrifice one's own interests to the interests of others’. (This is e.g. why in European nations “border security” is not upheld as being “the primary element of national security”, as it is stated to be, in principle, in the U.S. document.)

The same fallacy is also operating each time a European misunderstands the American President ‘doing business’ with other nations and smears this as ‘fascism’ and ‘oligarchy’, which clearly demonstrates their inability to grasp such a concept as a nation's President working to secure deals *for the benefit of all the individual citizens he represents*. When e.g. tech-industries announce trillions of dollars of investment in the U.S., this money does not go to the America's President, but towards wealth-creation in America from which *the citizenry benefits* (e.g. in the form of factories built and jobs created). *This* is what representing the national interest of your country, as a president, means and should look like. Most of Europe however has never outgrown feudalism, where the King would indeed be the beneficiary of any such deals; where a nation's citizen, including his/her material surroundings, *also are all the King's property*.

Such thing however *has never been true in America*.

From the American philosophical viewpoint, the world's fundamental political unit is the *nation-state* – and within that nation-state, the fundamental moral unit is the *individual*, with inalienable individual rights, and it is the government's sole task to protect and defend these rights.

From the current European philosophical viewpoint, the world's fundamental political unit is the *transnational institution* (e.g. the EU and the UN), i.e. *other nations*, i.e. where a moral concept such as individual rights is a contradiction and *does not formally exist* (any longer). In Europe 'society' is the fundamental moral unit within a nation-state, and individuals *may be forced and compelled to sacrifice their individual interests* (which are *real*), to 'social interests' or 'the interests of society' (which are *unreal*, i.e. which do not exist – as only individuals exist, with individual interests).

To further substantiate this point: just observe the European nations' political philosophies as currently expressed in their respective constitutions (or more broadly: of *any nation's constitution* except the United States of America) – and the *root* of this fundamental difference will become evidently clear to you, between the United States of America and the rest of the world.

Which nation in Europe will even be able to *understand*, let alone *stand up for and uphold* their citizens' individual rights?

- Portugal, where brutal religious/ethno-centric rule was the norm for centuries and dictatorship has only recently ended, merely to be replaced by socialism?
- Spain, which several centuries ago was also a racist, brutal theocratic colonizer, now socialist?
- England, another theocratic world-tyrant turned socialist, who mere decades ago caused the tragedy of Hong Kong by leaving them as defenseless prey in the face of militaristic communism?
- France, who butchered the aristocracy also only to be replaced by socialism, then oppressed all of Europe for decades, who are still oppressing several African nations (e.g. via the CFA franc)?
- The Scandinavians, who still openly glorify their savage-Viking past and now are the most horrifically consistent collectivists in Europe? (see e.g. the phenomenon of "Royal Swedish Envy")
- The Eastern-Europeans, just barely released from Soviet-communist terror, turned socialist?
- The Balkans, most of whom have been continually fighting each other in brutal tribalistic wars over petty differences in language or minute differences of tradition?
- Germany, still traumatized by the fascist Nazism of WWII, with a deeply seated psychological barrier to ever reclaiming self-esteem and national pride?
- Italy, where after being the place of the rediscovery of reason during the Renaissance, brutal fascism was also brought forth in modern times, and who is to say what they stand for now?
- The Dutch, who were the only ones *who traded instead of conquered*, the inventors of capitalism who were the model, inspiration and essential first settlers who fundamentally planted the seeds for what later was to become The United States of America, but who have since forgotten their historic, political legacy and have also turned predominantly socialist?

Philosophically, Europe is still pretty much in the same state as it was when the United States was originally founded, meaning the same ideas and principles still operate, *meaning the same (philosophical) causes why, between the 17th and 20th century, so many Europeans originally fled to America, are still in effect*: ethnic/religious violence, war and abdication of private property rights. Remember this when hearing Europeans scream at this document in moral indignation.

So far my analysis of the philosophical principles underlying the U.S. national security strategy and its comparison to the principles operating in Europe.

In conclusion: the national security strategy of the U.S. is consonant with its fundamental founding political principles as expressed in the *Declaration of Independence*, the *Constitution* and the *Bill of Rights*, operates *on the same principles* and clearly defines and formulates their expressions and consequences in the form of national strategy, geared towards the current geopolitical state of the world.

In more specific detail, the strategy addresses and tackles a wide variety of concerns and risks pertaining to the United States' core national interests. (This is not a *geopolitical* analysis, so details are out of scope.) In summa, for anyone who supports the concept of individual rights, this is exactly the kind of national security strategy you would want (demand) your country to uphold.

Lastly, America has also extended its hand to Europe (and to the world in general), by expressing its willingness to “support our allies in preserving freedom and security” and “our allies to be rich and capable” – but also that “we count among our many allies and partners dozens of wealthy, sophisticated nations that must assume primary responsibility for their regions and contribute far more to our collective defense” and “the Hague Commitment (...) which allies have endorsed and must now meet” and that “The United States will unapologetically protect our own sovereignty”.

In C. Promoting European Greatness this sentiment is stated most explicitly:

“American diplomacy should continue to stand up for genuine democracy, freedom of expression, and unapologetic celebrations of European nations' individual character and history. America encourages its political allies in Europe to promote this revival of spirit, and the growing influence of patriotic European parties indeed gives cause for great optimism.

Our goal should be to help Europe correct its current trajectory. We will need a strong Europe to help us successfully compete, and to work in concert with us to prevent any adversary from dominating Europe.

America is, understandably, sentimentally attached to the European continent— and, of course, to Britain and Ireland. The character of these countries is also strategically important because we count upon creative, capable, confident, democratic allies to establish conditions of stability and security. We want to work with aligned countries that want to restore their former greatness.”

As proper to any country who deals with other countries *by trade to mutual benefit, not by mutual self-sacrifice to mutual loss*, America's help won't be doled out 'for free', nor will it come without accountability.

It is now up to European nations (and the Western nations elsewhere in the world) to stand up, reach out and take America's extended, helpful hand and start *living up to* being an ally of the greatest country in the world, *the nation that was the final and most glorious result and achievement of the Enlightenment*, and in founding principles, the only *moral country* on Earth.

It will require a tremendous political effort and nothing less than an intellectual revolution, i.e. a *philosophical* revolution, for Europe to be able to live up to the standard America has now set with the publication of this document. But as long as the nations of Europe do not reconceptualize what *rights* properly are, i.e. freedoms of individual action, not outcomes presented as claims to others – and do not reconceptualize what the proper purpose of government entails – no “growing influence of patriotic European parties” will change anything for their respective nations' peoples, as it is *Philosophy* that essentially sets, propels and finally determines the course of any nation.

For America, with every minor flaw this nation might still possess, this strategy – combined with a people that “cherishes its past glories and its heroes” and who are “proud, happy, and optimistic that they will leave their country to the next generation better than they found it” (p.4) – will indeed allow every American to “look forward to a new golden age”.