Files\\2011 Case Study\\Primary Sources\_Policy\_Strategies\\2011-national-military-strategy - § 2 references coded [ 0.16% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.10% Coverage

they make cost/benefit calculations and are dependent on states and other stakeholders we are capable of influencing.

Reference 2 - 0.05% Coverage

Denying an aggressor the benefits of achieving its objectives
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Reference 1 - 0.06% Coverage

will carefully weigh the costs and risks of action against the costs of inaction
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Reference 1 - 0.20% Coverage

In taking this approach, the Administration will continually refine current capabilities and develop new ones that will raise the costs and reduce the benefits of conducting malicious cyber activity against the United States and its interests.

Reference 2 - 0.17% Coverage

Influence is achieved by credibly demonstrating the ability and willingness to deny benefits or impose costs to convince the adversary that restraint will result in better outcomes than will confrontation.

Reference 3 - 0.12% Coverage

Such efforts to change an adversary’s risk-benefit calculus have the potential to limit perceived options and can be pursued independent of attribution.

Reference 4 - 0.23% Coverage

The Administration will continue to promote the adoption of the Framework as a key means of improving U.S. cyber defenses and, by extension, decreasing adversaries’ perceptions of the benefits to be gained from engaging in malicious cyber activities against U.S. computers and networks.