



U.S. NAVAL WAR COLLEGE
— Est. 1884 —
NEWPORT, RHODE ISLAND

Joint Professional Military Education Phase II Senior Level Course

College of Naval Warfare and Naval Command College

NATIONAL SECURITY DECISION MAKING

February 2024 - May 2024



NSA
NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
DEPARTMENT

DEPARTMENT
OF
STATE

Table of Contents

Course Overview and Policies	05
Course Objectives	05
Learning Outcomes	05
Course Framework	06
Course Organization.....	06
Course Requirements.....	06
Grading Standards	09
Grade Appeals.....	11
Plagiarism and the use of ChatGPT and Similar Intelligence Software	11
Seminar Assignments and General Schedule.....	12
Faculty Office Hours.....	12
NSA Department Key Personnel	13
NSDM-01: Course Introduction.....	14
FPA-01: Foreign Policy Analysis for Practitioners.....	15
IS-01: International Security	16
FPA-2: Intro Case Study.....	17
IS-2: International Relations Theory I	18
FPA-3: Unitary State Perspective vs. Two-Level Games.....	19
IS-3-International Relations Theory II	20
FPA: 4: US Constitutional System.....	21
IS-4: National Interests and Dimensions of Power	22
FPA-5: Cognitive & Palace Politics Perspectives.....	23
IS-5: Deterrence Theory.....	24
FPA-6: The President & The White House.....	25
IS-6: Nuclear Deterrence.....	26
FPA-7: Organizational Process Perspective	27
IS-7: Political Economy	28
FPA-8: The National Security Bureaucracy.....	29
IS-8: Transnational Security Challenges	30
FPA-9: Bureaucratic Politics Perspective.....	31
IS-9: Causes of Conflict and Strategic Competition.....	32
FPA-10: The Interagency Process.....	33
IS-10: Strategic Restraint	34
FPA-11: Interagency Simulation.....	35
IS-11: Balance of Power Realism	36
FPA-12: Congress & National Security	37
IS-12: Liberal Internationalism.....	38
FPA-13: Judiciary and National Security	39
IS-13: Primacy.....	40
FPA-14: Political Parties & Polarization.....	41

IS-14: China in the 21 st Century	42
FPA-15: Media & Public Opinion.....	43
IS-15: National Security Strategy	44
FPA-16: Think Tanks, Interest Groups, & Lobbyists	45
IS-16: Defense Strategy and Force Planning	46
FPA-17: Defense Budget, Acquisitions, and Innovation.....	48
IS-17: Maritime Strategy	49
FPA 18: Creating Space Force.....	50
IS-18: Global Integration and Combatant Commands	51
FPA-19: Using Diplomacy	52
IS-19: Indo-Pacific.....	53
FPA-20: Using Information	54
IS-20: Europe and Russia	55
FPA-21: Using Military Force.....	56
IS-21: Greater Middle East and Central Asia.....	57
FPA-22: Using Economic Statecraft.....	58
IS-22: Africa	59
FPA-23: Future Foreign Policy Challenges.....	60
IS-23: Western Hemisphere.....	61
FPA-24: Concluding Case Study	62
IS-24: Cyber, Technology, and the Future of War	63
NSDM FX-01: Introduction, Seminar Organization, Product Development.....	64
NSDM FX-02 through FX-06: Seminar Product Development.....	65
NSDM FX-07: FX Seminar Presentation Reivew	68
NSDM FX-08: Seminar Presentation to Grading Panel	70
NSDM FX-09 FX and NSDM Conclusion Session	72

NATIONAL SECURITY DECISION MAKING (NSDM) COURSE

1. COURSE OVERVIEW AND ADMINISTRATION

The National Security Decision Making (NSDM) course is designed to challenge senior-level students to engage with the dynamic complexities of today's rapidly evolving national and international security environment. The NSDM curriculum covers an array of national security issues, giving particular emphasis to understanding U.S. decision making dynamics at the strategic level. The course is designed to broaden strategic perspectives while fostering critical thinking and analytic skills that will have lasting professional relevance by understanding the drivers of U.S. foreign policy and the role the United States plays in the world.

- a. **Course Objectives.** Our goal is to provide an educational experience that combines conceptual rigor and professional relevance in order to prepare students to be more effective participants in the decision-making environment of any major national security organization. The intended outcome of this graduate-level course is to foster the regional awareness, strategic perspectives, critical thinking, and analytic rigor that are needed by national security professionals working at the national-strategic level. Our course learning outcomes include:
 - i. Analyze the international security environment to assess the impact of international-level factors critical to developing effective grand strategies.
 - ii. Assess various influences on national security policy making and implementation.
 - iii. Communicate an executive-level assessment of the international security environment and develop national and military strategies with force structure implications to advance national interests.

- b. **Learning Outcomes.** The NSDM course supports the following Naval War College CNW program learning outcomes:
 - i. Demonstrate joint-warfighting leadership when integrating the instruments of national power across the continuum of competition.
 - ii. Create national security strategies designed for contemporary and future security environments.
 - iii. Apply the organizational and ethical concepts integral to the profession of arms to national and multinational strategic decision-making.
 - iv. Apply theory, history, doctrine, and sea power through critical, strategic thought in professional, written communication.

c. **Course Framework.** The course follows the logic of analyzing national security through two sub-courses: *International Security* (providing the international strategic context with a grand strategy focus that guides U.S. foreign policy) and *Foreign Policy Analysis* (focusing on U.S. national and organizational decision-making environments that underlie foreign policy decisions). The last two weeks of the course will be dedicated to a capstone event entitled the *Final Exercise (FX)*. Each seminar will act as a national security working group to produce and present an executive-level strategic estimate of the security environment over the next twenty years. From that estimate, the seminar will develop an outline of national and military strategies to advance and defend national interests and describe the details associated with implementing an aspect of that strategy. Additionally, the seminar will develop joint force structure implications that support their security estimate and nested strategies.

d. **Course Organization.** The NSDM course includes the following major elements:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| i. NSDM (lecture and seminar) | 1 Session |
| ii. International Security (seminars) | 24 Sessions |
| iii. Foreign Policy Analysis (seminars) | 24 Sessions |
| iv. NSDM Final Exercise (FX) (course-wide capstone) | 9 Sessions |

e. **Course Requirements**

i. *Individual Student Responsibilities.* Students are expected to prepare fully for each seminar session and to participate actively and positively in classroom discussions. An inquisitive attitude and the willingness by all students to engage constructively with peers and faculty are essential prerequisites for a successful graduate-level seminar experience.

ii. *Workload.* Every effort has been made to provide for a consistent reading and preparation workload from week-to-week throughout the trimester. NSDM is a graduate-level course that as a general rule requires approximately two hours of student preparation for every hour of class time. Accordingly, on balance over the course of each week, students should expect to have over three hours of preparation required for every 90-minute seminar period. However, a significant peak in workload unavoidably occurs toward the end of the trimester when written assignments are due. Students should take careful note of the due dates for assignments as indicated below in order to plan far in advance for effective time and workload management.

iii. *Essential and Recommended Readings.* All essential readings must be completed prior to class since they serve as a basis for informed and lively seminar discussion. Recommended readings may also be listed to provide background for those who do not possess adequate knowledge to understand the required readings.

iv. *Study Guidance.* For each session, the session page identifies the focus, objectives, guidance, and readings. Guidance questions should be used to prepare for class discussion.

v. *Formative Assignments.* These assignments give students an opportunity to assess their progress and comprehension of course material prior to completing graded assignments. The following is a listing of ungraded course requirements:

Sub-course Requirement Type		Effort
International Security	Paper Proposal	Written/Individual
International Security	Paper Draft	Written/Individual
Final Exercise Seminar Presentation	Review/Seminar	

vi. *Summative Assignments.* * An overall NSDM grade will be assigned to CNW students based on the grades earned on individual graded requirements, individual seminar preparation and contribution, and a group grade for the FX. Any collaboration between students on individual graded assignments is prohibited. All graded, written student assignments for Core courses at the Naval War College will be submitted to their respective professors electronically through Turnitin Assignments set up in each Blackboard seminar course. Students may assess their papers through the Turnitin Student Workbooks in Blackboard to benefit from Turnitin’s Similarity Report prior to final paper or exam submission. This will highlight for students any areas that may require additional citation, as appropriate. As students review the Turnitin report, it is important to note there is no percentage that means "all clear" and no percentage that means "big trouble." Papers with as low as a 10% similarity score may have serious plagiarism concerns while a 50% similarity score could be fine (an example is a large portion of an official document attached as an appendix). Turnitin requires students to go through the markup line by line to identify and correct any problems. When submitting papers for evaluation to professors through the Blackboard seminar course, students are still able to revise and resubmit the assignment up to the assignment deadline. For this reason, faculty will refrain from downloading or otherwise viewing any assignment submissions that come in through Turnitin assignments in their Blackboard seminar courses until the final deadline for submitting papers has passed. Students should refer any questions regarding Turnitin to their professors.

Assignments are time released on Blackboard in the shared course, BBCRS1.CNW.NSDM.SH, under the heading “Assignment Guidance” then under the assignment title. Professors will announce the exact time of assignment release in class.

***AN IMPORTANT NOTE ON YOUR SEMINAR PREPARATION AND CONTRIBUTION GRADE.** Your preparation for seminar by mastering the required readings and contribution to seminar discussion is a key aspect of this course. Students will therefore be assessed on the cumulative quality of their individual seminar preparation and contributions over the course of the trimester. This seminar preparation and contribution grade is based on the rounded average of contribution grades assigned in each sub-course. Student contribution is assessed by its quality. The goal is not to measure the number of times students have spoken, but how well they have demonstrated that they have prepared and understood the subject matter, enriched discussion, and contributed to a positive active learning dynamic. This caliber of commitment requires students to come prepared to take part in every seminar discussion by absorbing the readings, listening attentively, thinking critically, and offering informed comments on session topics.

Students are expected to prepare for and be thoughtfully engaged in each seminar session. The seminar is a team effort. Not contributing in seminar undercuts the learning experience for everyone

In addition to grades for individual assignments and seminar contribution, all students will receive a group grade for their seminar’s performance in the NSDM FX. This grade will be determined by a three-member faculty team and assigned to the seminar as a group.

Graded assignments, due dates, and weights assigned for the overall NSDM grade are as follows:

Sub-course	Requirement	Type/Basis of Evaluation	Due Date	Weight
Foreign Policy Analysis	Graded Exam	Individual. Ability to comprehend course topics.	22 Mar 24	10%
International Security	Analytic Research Paper	Individual. Ability to explore in-depth a dimension of strategy and theater security. This is the only research paper of the NSDM course.	08 May 24	35%
Foreign Policy Analysis	Final Exam	Individual. Ability to apply course concepts in a logical and concise way to a case study. Time-limited assignments. Read ahead and Case study analysis distributed 16 May 2023	16 May 24	25%
NSDM	Seminar Preparation and Contribution*	Individual. Preparedness and individual contributions in the seminar.	Cumulative	15%
FX	Capstone Group Presentation	Seminar. Ability of seminar to apply all three sub-course concepts and present a coherent, professional presentation reflecting the seminar’s theater strategic guidance.	30 May 24	15%

vii. *Return Dates.* Grades will be returned to students by close of business as follows:

Foreign Policy Analysis Exam	04 April 2024
International Security Analytic Research Paper	24 May 2024
Foreign Policy Analysis Final Exam	30 May 2024
NSDM Seminar Contribution	31 May 2024
NSDM FX	31 May 2024

f. **Grading Standards.** Grades for all NSDM assignments are based on the standards set forth in the *U.S. Naval War College Faculty Handbook 2019* (chapter 3, section 7), which in part states:

“Historical evidence indicates that a grade distribution of 35-45 percent As and 55-65 percent Bs and below is commonly achieved by the overall NWC student population. While variations from this norm might occur from seminar to seminar and subject to subject, it will rarely reach an overall A to B-and-below ratio of greater than or equal to an even fifty-fifty distribution.”

Rubric of common standards for numeric and associated letter grades for individual written assignments and for the group Final Exercise (FX) are as follows:

<i>Letter Grade</i>	<i>Numeric Range</i>	<i>Description</i>
A+	97-100	Work of very high quality; clearly above the average graduate level.
A	94-<97	
A-	90-<94	
B+	87-<90	Expected performance of the average graduate student.
B	84-<87	
B-	80-<84	
C+	77-<80	Below the average performance expected for graduate work.
C	74-<77	
C-	70-<74	
D+	67-<70	Well below the average performance expected for graduate work.
D	64-<67	
D-	60-<64	
F	0-<60	Unsatisfactory work.

Rubric of common standards for numeric and associated letter grades for individual seminar preparation/contribution are as follows:

Seminar preparation and contribution will be graded at the end of the trimester as a whole number on a 100-point scale. Students will receive a contribution grade as a whole number from each sub-course with the final NSDM grade comprised of a rounded average of the contribution grades from each sub-course as a whole number. The key criteria used to evaluate seminar contribution are:

- Evidence of preparation for class
- Positive impact on seminar environment
- Listening to and engaging with classmates

- Quality and originality of thought
- Clear and concise communication of relevant ideas

A+ (97-100): Contributions provide a wholly new understanding of the topic, expressed in a clear and concise manner. Demonstrates exceptional preparation for each session as reflected in the quality of contributions to discussions. Strikes an outstanding balance of “listening” and “contributing,” engaging with classmates in a way that elevates the overall level of seminar discourse.

A (94-96): Contribution is always of superior quality. Unfailingly thinks through the issue at hand before comment. Can be relied upon to be prepared for every seminar, and contributions are highlighted by insightful thought, understanding, and in part original interpretation of complex concepts. Thoughts are generally expressed clearly and concisely, and engage with contributions of others.

A- (90-93): Fully engaged in seminar discussions and commands the respect of colleagues through the insightful quality of their contribution and ability to listen to, analyze, and build upon the comments of others. Ideas are generally expressed clearly. Above the average expected of a graduate student.

B+ (87-89): A positive contributor to seminar meetings who joins in most discussions and whose contributions reflect understanding of the material. Contributes original and well-developed insights.

B (84-86): Average graduate level contribution. Involvement in discussions reflects adequate preparation for seminar with the occasional contribution of original and insightful thought, with some consideration of others’ contributions. Ideas may sometimes be difficult to follow.

B- (80-83): Contributes, but sometimes speaks out without having thought through the issue well enough to marshal logical supporting evidence, address counterarguments, or present a structurally sound position. Sometimes expresses thoughts that are off-track, not in keeping with the direction of the discussion. Minimally acceptable graduate-level preparation and participation for individual lessons.

C+ (77-79): Sometimes contributes voluntarily, though more frequently needs to be encouraged to participate in discussions. Satisfied to allow others to take the lead while showing minimal interest in course content and the views of others. Minimal preparation for seminar reflected in arguments lacking the support, structure or clarity to merit graduate credit.

C (74-76): Contribution is marginal. Occasionally attempts to put forward a plausible opinion, but the inadequate use of evidence, incoherent logical structure, and a critically unclear quality of insight is insufficient to adequately examine the issue at hand. Usually content to let others form the seminar discussions and demonstrates little preparation of the session’s materials. Alternately, the student contributes but in a manner that is dismissive of others and detracts from the overall seminar discussion.

C- (70-73): Lack of contribution to seminar discussions reflects substandard preparation for sessions. Unable to articulate a responsible opinion. Comments reduce rather than promote constructive dialogue.

D-/D/D+ (60-69): Rarely prepared or engaged. Contributions are seldom and reflect below minimum acceptable understanding of course material. Engages in frequent fact-free conversation and adds little value to seminar deliberations.

F (0-59): Student demonstrates unacceptable preparation and fails to contribute in any substantive manner. May be extremely disruptive or uncooperative or completely unprepared for seminar.

FINAL NSDM COURSE GRADE: Grades assigned for all NSDM assignments will be expressed in whole numbers and in corresponding letter grades as shown above. A final course grade will be expressed as the unrounded numerical weighted average of all graded assignments, expressed to two decimal places, along with a corresponding letter grade as follows:

<i>Letter Grade</i>	<i>Numeric Range</i>
A+	97-100
A	94-<97
A-	90-<94
B+	87-<90
B	84-<87
B-	80-<84
C+	77-<80
C	74-<77
C-	70-<74
D+	67-<70
D	64-<67
D-	60-<64
F	0-<60

g. **Grade Appeals.** After discussing feedback and grade with their assigned faculty member, a student may request a grade review from the department through the Deputy Chair. The written request must be made no later than seven calendar days from receiving the grade and detail the basis for the appeal in accordance with the grading evaluation criteria. The results of this independent grade review may result in the original grade being raised, sustained, or lowered. The student may request an additional review of the work in question, whereupon the Department Chair will review the appeal and either affirm the new grade assigned based on the independent review, or assign another grade (higher or lower), which then replaces any previous grade assigned. In exceptional circumstances, the student may make a further appeal to the Dean of Academics, whose decision will be final.

h. **Plagiarism and the use of ChatGPT and Similar Artificial Intelligence Software.** Occasional incidents of plagiarism require that we bring this matter to your attention. Plagiarism is defined in both the U.S. Naval War College Student Handbook and Faculty

Handbook as follows:

Plagiarism: Plagiarism is the use of someone else’s work without giving proper credit to the author or creator of the work. It is the act of taking ideas, writings, analysis, or the like from another and passing them off as one’s own. Whether intentional or unintentional, plagiarism is a serious violation of academic integrity and will be treated as such by the command. Plagiarism includes but is not limited to the following actions:

- The verbatim use of others’ words without both quotation marks (or block quotation) and citation
- The paraphrasing of others’ words or ideas without citation
- Any use of others’ work (other than facts that are widely accepted as common knowledge) found in books, journals, newspapers, websites, interviews, government documents, course materials, lecture notes, films, etc., without giving them credit

Authors are expected to give full credit in their written submissions when utilizing another’s words or ideas. Such utilization, with proper attribution, is not prohibited by this code. However, a substantially borrowed but attributed paper may lack the originality expected of graduate-level work; submission of such a paper may merit a low or failing grade but is not plagiarism.

Additionally, the PNWC 19 February 2023 Policy Memorandum on Permissible and Impermissible Uses of ChatGPT and other AI tools may not be used, “To produce drafts or final submissions of assignments instead of original student work. Students may not use ChatGPT or other AI tools to produce written, video, audio, or other work assigned to be developed originally and independently and submitted or presented to satisfy required coursework, regardless of whether it is graded or ungraded.” The policy memorandum also states, “Students who resort to AI-generated research and writing lose the unique opportunity the NWC provides to engage deeply with issues, reflect on and analyze information, develop compelling arguments and counterarguments, and write coherent and convincing work that expands and broadens expertise. After all, that is precisely the reason why students are enrolled at NWC, and it is their primary duty.”

i. **Seminar Assignments and General Schedule.** Each student is assigned to a seminar group representing a balanced distribution of services/agencies and functional expertise. Two faculty members are assigned to a seminar’s teaching team with each leading individual sessions for the two parallel sub-courses. Seminar, teaching team and classroom assignments are published separately.

Sub-course seminar sessions normally meet in the afternoons on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Mondays will normally be reserved for Elective classes and Fridays are normally reserved for student preparation. Individual class sessions are normally 90 minutes long (except for a few sessions covering topics that require more time). Course-wide lectures or panel discussions featuring guest speakers will occasionally occur on Fridays. These normally involve 90 minutes with all students and faculty hearing from and engaging the speaker in an auditorium setting. A course planning schedule containing meeting dates and times for all sessions is available on Blackboard. This is updated at least weekly to reflect schedule revisions.

j. **Faculty Office Hours.** Faculty members are available to assist in mastering the course material, to review progress, and for individual academic counseling as required. Faculty office hours also provide an excellent opportunity to review assigned tasks, to discuss general problems, and to provide informal curricular or instructional feedback. Faculty members are available outside of class hours, either on-line or in person, throughout the week. Because professors also teach electives and perform other activities, students are encouraged to arrange appointments beforehand whenever possible.

k. **NSA Department Key Personnel.** If you require additional support or information in conjunction with your studies, or if classroom issues arise that you do not believe are being dealt with to your satisfaction by your instructor, please contact one of the following individuals as appropriate:

NSA Department Chair

Dr. Derek Reveron
Room: C-318
Tel: 401-856-5311
Derek.Reveron@usnwc.edu

NSA Department Deputy Chair Prof.

Dana Struckman
Room: C-318
Tel: 401-856-5312
Dana.Struckman@usnwc.edu

NSA Department Academic Program Manager

Ms. Denise Murphy
Room: C-315
Tel: 401-856-5314
Denise.Murphy@usnwc.edu

NSDM International Security Sub-course Director

COL J.P. Maddaloni
Room: C-313
Tel: 401-856-5335
Email: jon.paul.maddaloni@usnwc.edu

NSDM Foreign Policy Analysis Sub-course Director

Dr. Jessica Blankshain
Room: C-308
Tel: 401-856-5325
Email: jessica.blankshain@usnwc.edu

NSDM Final Exercise (FX) Coordinator

CDR Sean Mahoney
Room: C-304
Tel: 401-856-5319
Sean.Mahoney@usnwc.edu



NSDM-01

Course Introduction

Focus

The National Security Affairs (NSA) department educates students in contemporary national security studies. This eight-credit hour course provides a broad interdisciplinary foundation by studying international security, regional studies, and foreign policy analysis so that students can navigate the national security system more effectively. The curriculum combines academic rigor with policy relevance to meet the needs of the Navy and the intent of the Joint Professional Military Education system.

National Security Decision Making (NSDM) is focused at the national-strategic level where students intensively study international security and analyze how the U.S. government makes foreign policy decisions. Through NSDM, students develop the ability to assess the international security environment, develop grand strategy, develop military strategy and force structure as well as analyze foreign policy decisions.

Objectives

- Analyze national security and the influences that lead to foreign policy decisions.
- Understand the course structure, assignments, and expectations.

Session Guidance Questions

- What are the key features of the national and international landscape that impact national security?
- What is a pressing national security challenge to the international order and the key drivers that affect how the U.S. government addresses this issue? Consider both international and domestic factors.

Essential Preparation

- Jones, James L. 2018. "Foreword: U.S. National Security for the Twenty-First Century." In *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*, by Derek S. Reveron, edited by Nikolas K. Gvosdev, Derek S. Reveron, and John A. Cloud
- Gates, Robert M. *Exercise of Power: American Failures, Successes, and a New Path Forward in the Post-Cold War World*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2020), Chapter 1 (pp. 13-57).
- Wyne, Ali, 2022. "Great-Power Competition Isn't a Foreign Policy". *The Washington Quarterly*, 45:2, 7-21.
- Hardt, Brent. "NWC Talks: What on Earth is the Liberal International Order?" YouTube video. 18:03. Nov 13, 2019.
- "The Constitution of the United States of America." n.d. National Archives.



FPA – 1

Foreign Policy Analysis for Practitioners

Focus

Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) examines various theories to explain how governments make decisions and provides an overview of the international, domestic, and bureaucratic forces that shape national security policy. U.S. governmental decision-making is the focus. This session lays out themes that will be discussed in more detail in subsequent sessions and explores the study of decision-making as a valuable way to analyze foreign policy actions. These decisions deal with a broad range of issues including going to war, negotiating a ceasefire, imposing sanctions, entering an alliance, or signing a treaty. This introductory session also explores why it is important for national security professionals—civilian and military—to understand foreign policy analysis and to think about the boundary between expert advice and policy advocacy.

Objectives

- Familiarize students with terms of art and examples of some of the more prevalent FPA models and frameworks.
- Discuss the role of civilian and military national security professionals in the policymaking process.
- Set the stage for more in-depth examination of theories and frameworks in following sessions.

Session Guidance Questions

- The textbook notes that “a [foreign policy] decision may be less about what a president or other leaders want, and more about what options are possible given political and systemic constraints.” What are some of those constraints? How might they affect the outcome of a foreign policy decision?
- Decision-makers inevitably must act with incomplete information. Foreign policy analysts face similar informational challenges. What information would be especially important in an FPA context? What information is easiest to come by, harder to come by, and nearly impossible to come by?
- How do you see your role in the policy process? Is it important for you to understand how policy is made? Why or why not?

Essential Preparation

- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain, and David A. Cooper. "Foreign Policy Analysis." In *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 14-51. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- The Debrief: Foreign Policy Analysis. U.S. Naval War College Video, Sept 2023.
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K. "Should Military Officers Study Policy Analysis?" *Joint Forces Quarterly* 76, no. 1 (2015).
- Blankshain, Jessica. "A Primer on US Civil–Military Relations for National Security Practitioners." *Wild Blue Yonder*, Air University, July 6, 2020.



IS – 1

International Security

Focus

The NSDM International Security sub-course prepares students to analyze security issues at the international level including the development of national and military strategies that advance and defend U.S. interests. The sub-course is intended to provide students with an appreciation of the international security environment overall, how the global political and economic systems work, the complex meanings of security, the sources of national power, and the relationship between the security environment and national strategy. Consequently, students will explore various grand strategies rooted in international relations theory. Because the sub-course emphasizes the importance of being able to gather information, analyze data, and produce a clear articulation of one's ideas, the graded event for this sub-course will be an analytic research paper.

Objectives

- Introduce the objectives and scope of the International Security sub-course.
- Analyze the relative position of the United States in the international system in light of recent trends.
- Understand the purpose and procedures for the research and writing of the NSDM International Security analytic research paper.

Session Guidance Questions

- What is meant by “polarity” in international politics? What type of system (unipolar, bipolar, multipolar) does the United States thrive within?
- What is grand strategy and why is it important? What is America’s grand strategy?
- What is meant by the phrase “liberal international order”? Why is such an order in America’s national interest?
- What do China and Russia want from the international system? Can their national objectives be accommodated by the current international system or must that system be modified?

Essential Preparation

- Brooks, Stephen G. and William C. Wohlforth. “The Myth of Multipolarity: American Power’s Staying Power.” *Foreign Affairs* 102, no. 3 (May/June 2023): 1:19.
- Feaver, Peter D. “Eight Myths about American Grand Strategy,” *Forging an American Grand Strategy: Security a Path Through a Complex Future*. Sheila R. Ronis (ed.), Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army War College, (2013): 37-44.
- Nitze, Paul H. “World Order from Hiroshima to Kuwait.” *Naval War College Review*, 44, no. 4, (Autumn 1991): 7-15.
- Joint Statement of the Russian Federation and the People’s Republic of China on the International Relations Entering a New Era and the Global Sustainable Development, 4 February 2022.



FPA – 2

The Cuban Missile Crisis

Focus

For thirteen days in October 1962, the United States and the Soviet Union moved to the brink of nuclear war. At the center of the conflict were Cuba-based Soviet missiles that could deliver nuclear payloads to much of the United States. In a haze of uncertainty, tensions, and often conflicting advice, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev and U.S. President John F. Kennedy sought to achieve their respective geostrategic and political objectives at the precipice of nuclear war. While often viewed as a study in presidential decision-making, an in-depth study of the crisis provides a complicated and nuanced understanding of how these governments dealt with the crisis and how nuclear war was narrowly averted. This is the first in a series of case studies that will require an increasingly sophisticated understanding and application of analytical tools, critical thinking, and the ability to clearly and concisely explain U.S. foreign policy decision-making.

Objectives

- Identify the various actors and factors that affected U.S. decision-making during the Cuban Missile Crisis.
- Examine the limitations of simple linear models of decision-making/policymaking.
- Assess how a more complete understanding of the forces operating in the policymaking arena might be useful in anticipating probable outcomes of on-going national security decisions.

Session Guidance Questions

- What key questions might an analyst want to ask to understand the events of the Cuban Missile Crisis?
- Who were the key players in U.S. decision-making during the crisis and why?
- What developments in the case were most surprising to you?
- What tools might allow an analyst to systematically examine decision-making during the Cuban Missile Crisis? How might you think about which factors were specific to the case vs. generalizable to other foreign policy decisions?
- It is easy to look at the Cuban Missile Crisis as a relic of the Cold War. Could such a crisis happen again? Would the U.S. government respond differently this time?

Essential Preparation

- Kiger, Patrick. "Key Moments in the Cuban Missile Crisis." *The History Channel*. October 12, 2023.
- Allison, Graham. "The Cuban Missile Crisis." In *Foreign Policy: Theories Actors Cases*, 3rd edition, edited by Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield, and Tim Dunne, 256-272. Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Stigler, Andrew. "The Armageddon Committee: Kennedy's Excomm and the Cuban Missile Crisis." Newport, RI: National Security Affairs Department, U.S. Naval War College, 2024.
- Blankshain, Jessica D. and Andrew L. Stigler. "Applying Method to Madness: A User's Guide to Causal Inference in Policy Analysis," *Texas National Security Review* 3, no. 3 (2020): 76-89.



IS – 2

International Relations Theory I

Focus

Why do states do what they do? The field of International Relations (IR) revolves around answering this fundamental question, and scholars have come up with various theories to explain state behavior in international politics. In the first session of a two-part class on IR theory, we will explore the two dominant IR theories in American political science: realism and liberalism (in IS-3, we will explore theories that challenge these two paradigms). Theories try to answer questions about why things happen the way they do: Such as, why do states or sub-state groups go to war? Under what circumstances do they form alliances? Under what circumstances do they join international organizations or regimes? What determines why and how countries have conflictual or cooperative relations? Different theories propose different answers to these questions. For us, the point is not to decide which theory is correct, but to collect from each theory the questions we can use to understand any situation we encounter.

Objectives

- Become familiar with the main theories of how states and other actors in the system behave.
- Examine how theory can be useful for the practitioner—specifically, how it helps the practitioner know what questions to ask.

Session Guidance Questions

- What do these theories assume about the world? What do they argue about the world? Where do they fundamentally (dis)agree? What policies would they propose in various situations? For example, what would a realist recommend as U.S. policy vis-à-vis China or Russia? How would a liberal's recommendations differ?
- How would we determine whether a situation is one in which realism or liberalism would be a better guide to policy?
- What questions do these theories suggest we need to ask to understand a given situation? What cause-effect questions would we want to answer in order to decide whose policy advice to follow?

Essential Preparation

- Mearsheimer, John J. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2001. (READ 29-54 and 413-22)
- Walt, Stephen M. "Why Alliances Endure or Collapse." *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy* 39, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 156-79.
- Keohane, Robert O. "International Institutions: Can Interdependence Work?" *Foreign Policy*, Spring 1998.
- Ikenberry, G. John. "Why American Power Endures: The U.S.-Led Order isn't in Decline." *Foreign Affairs*, 1 November 2022.



FPA – 3

Unitary State Perspective vs. Two-Level Games

Focus

This session introduces our first two analytical tools for analyzing foreign policy decision-making. The unitary state perspective conceives of countries as unitary rational actors that evaluate all possible courses of action and select optimal policies based on a common, consistent, and enduring conception of the national interest. By privileging international-level factors, the unitary state perspective treats internal decision-making and its domestic political context as an impenetrable “black box.” The two-level games framework, originally developed by Robert Putnam (1988), challenges these assumptions arguing that domestic political pressures on leaders at one level shape their ability to bargain with allies, partners, and adversaries at another level. It underscores linkages between international-level and domestic-level factors in the United States and other countries that shape foreign policy outcomes. In this session, we will gain an increased understanding of these tools by applying them to the case of international negotiations over Iran’s nuclear program.

Objectives

- Understand the merits and drawbacks of conceptualizing states as unitary actors making decisions by weighing the benefits and costs of all available alternatives and deciding through optimization.
- Comprehend how international-level factors interact with domestic-level factors to produce foreign policy outcomes under the two-level games framework.
- Apply the unitary state perspective and two-level games framework to the negotiations over Iran’s nuclear program between 2005 and 2015, as well as the present-day prospects for a new nuclear deal.

Session Guidance Questions

- Under what conditions do international and domestic political factors shape foreign policy?
- What are the sources of a state’s national interests? Do they change over time, or are any enduring?
- Why did the United States and Iran fail to reach a nuclear agreement in 2009-10, but succeeded in 2015?
- The unitary state perspective assumes states confronted with similar external circumstances will make similar choices, regardless of individual decision-makers and domestic political pressures. Would any U.S. president have signed the JCPOA in 2015/withdrawn from the agreement in 2018?
- What international-level factors or domestic-level factors shape U.S. policy toward Iran today?

Essential Preparation

- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Unitary State Perspective." In *Decision Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 52–87. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Domestic Politics." In *Decision Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 284–333. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019. (READ 284–296 ONLY)
- Brewer, Eric, and Henry Rome. "Biden’s Iran Gamble: A Risky New Strategy to Keep Iran From Going Nuclear." *Foreign Affairs*, June 9, 2023.
- Hurst, Steven. "The Iranian Nuclear Negotiations as a Two-Level Game: The Importance of Domestic Politics." *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 27, no. 3 (2016): 545–559.



IS – 3

International Relations Theory II

Focus

IS-2 introduced the two most dominant theories in United States and other Western thinking, but these are not the only two ways to think about how the world works. This session introduces the idea of critical theory - the idea that it is important to question the assumptions of theories - through two major examples, constructivism and feminism. Constructivism questions the assumption of both realism and liberalism that meaning is mostly objective and inherent in things, arguing that the meaning of, (e.g., state behavior or a new technology) is not inherent in the thing but "constructed" through arguments, beliefs, narratives, and cultural context, and thus may vary from person to person and from one time period to another. Constructivism reminds us to ask not just what we think something means, but how other people in other contexts might understand its meaning and how that matters for our strategic thinking. Feminism questions the role of assumptions about gender (and often other ideas like race, class, and nationality) in how various actors try to understand how the world works and why things happen the way they do. The purpose here is not to try to determine which of these theoretical approaches is the "right" one, but to use each of them to build a battery of questions we can ask to understand any situation we encounter.

Objectives

- Comprehend the main theories of how states and other actors in the system behave.
- Examine how theory can be useful for the practitioner - specifically how it helps the practitioner know what questions to ask.
- Assess the uses of theory for critical thinking, strategic thinking, and creative problem-solving.

Session Guidance Questions

- What do these theories assume about the world? What do they argue about the world? Where do they fundamentally agree/disagree? What questions would a constructivist raise about realist policy recommendations vis-à-vis China or Russia? What questions would a feminist raise about liberal policy recommendations?
- Why is critical theory particularly important for the strategist? Why isn't a problem-solving theory good enough?
- What questions do these theories suggest we need to ask to understand a given situation?
- Why is Feminist Theory important in International Relations?

Essential Preparation

- Cox, Robert W. "Social Forces, States, and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory" in Keohane (ed) *Neorealism and its Critics*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1986. (READ 207-213 and 223-225)
- Kroenig, Matthew. "International Relations Theory Suggests Great-Power War is Coming." *Foreign Policy*, 27 August 2022.
- McDonald, Matt. "Constructivisms" in *Security Studies: An Introduction*, 4th edition. London: Routledge, 2023. (READ Chapter 3)
- Abdulsada Ali, Inass. "Feminist Theorizing in the International Relations Discipline." *Journal of International Women's Studies* 25, no. 2 (2023): 1-8.
- Brechenmacher, Saskia. "Germany Has a New Feminist Foreign Policy: What Does it Mean in Practice?" *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, 8 March 2023.



FPA – 4

U.S. Constitutional System

Focus

The previous session examined how the domestic political systems of countries influence individual decision-makers and shape foreign policy. This session delves deeper into the specifics of the U.S. domestic system by providing a broad overview of the U.S. Constitution and its role in foreign policy. It looks at how the legal structure created by the Constitution affects foreign policy and the roles and powers of different branches of the government. It challenges students to understand how and why the Constitution creates “an invitation to struggle” over foreign policy.

Objectives

- Understand the formal institutions that comprise the U.S. government and their relationship to the U.S. Constitution.
- Analyze how the constitutional system both constrains and enables U.S. foreign policy.
- Apply your understanding of the constitutional system to a case study.

Session Guidance Questions

- What responsibilities and powers does each branch of the U.S. government have, as defined in the Constitution, and how do they affect national security decision-making?
- Why did the Framers of the Constitution divide powers among different branches, and what are the advantages, drawbacks, and legacies of this division?
- How has the Constitution been interpreted to facilitate the modern U.S. national security system? How do these dynamics affect the organizations in which you serve?
- How does the Constitution shape modern understanding of civil-military relations?
- What constitutional issues were at stake during the Iran-Contra affair?

Essential Preparation

- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. “Domestic Politics.” In *Decision Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 284–333. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019. (READ 296–312 ONLY)
- Hamilton, Alexander and James Madison. “Federalist 23” and “Federalist 51.” In *The Federalist Papers*.
- Open Letter. “To Support and Defend: Principles of Civilian Control and Best Practices of Civil-Military Relations.” *War on the Rocks*, September 6, 2022.
- Cloud, John A. and Nikolas K. Gvosdev. “A Very Slim Reed: From the Phrases of the Constitution to the Theater Security Enterprise.” In *Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise*, 25–57. Newport, RI: National Security Affairs Department, U.S. Naval War College, 2018.
- Koh, Harold H. “Recognizing the Pattern of History.” In *The National Security Constitution: Sharing Power after the Iran-Contra Affair*, 38–64. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.

Recommended Resources

- National Archives. “*The Constitution of the United States: A Transcription.*”



IS – 4

National Interests and Dimensions of Power

Focus

Grand Strategy can be described as the synchronized application of all elements of national power to advance and defend national interests during peace and war. The strategist must understand the types of power (and their limitations) and appreciate that national interests can be difficult to define or agree upon, and their endurance questionable depending on the political culture. Grand strategy archetypes are introduced that will be more robustly examined later in the course to guide thinking about power, interests, challenges, and approaches.

Objectives

- Examine the dimensions of national power and their role in shaping strategy.
- Analyze the role national interests play in strategic thinking.

Session Guidance Questions

- What are national interests and why are they important? How do vital, important, and peripheral national interests affect a nation's strategic calculus?
- Why is there so much difficulty determining and prioritizing national interests?
- When designing strategy, how can a country achieve balance with the various tools of national power?
- Does overemphasizing one tool of national power place strain on the other tools?

Essential Preparation

- Reveron, Derek S. and Nikolas K. Gvosdev. "National Interests and Grand Strategy." In *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*, edited by Derek S. Reveron, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and John A. Cloud. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. (READ 35-52)
- Sullivan, Jake. "The Sources of American Power: A Foreign Policy for a Changed World." *Foreign Affairs*, 24 October 2023.
- Kagan, Robert. "A Free World If You Can Keep It: Ukraine and American Interests." *Foreign Affairs*, January February 2023.
- Mead, Walter Russell. "America's Sticky Power," *Foreign Policy*, 29 October 2009.



FPA – 5

Cognitive and Palace Politics Perspectives

Focus

This session introduces the cognitive and palace politics perspectives for analyzing foreign policy decision-making, expanding the toolkit introduced in FPA-3. It challenges students to grasp how psychological and sociological forces influence the decision-making process. It looks at how personality traits, cognitive factors, and emotions in turn shape leaders' decisions. It also addresses how both formal and informal advisors compete for access and influence in the policymaking process.

Objectives

- Comprehend how the cognitive and palace politics perspectives relate to each other and to other analytical perspectives.
- Understand the importance of the cognitive and palace politics perspectives for analyzing foreign policy decision-making.
- Analyze when the cognitive and/or palace politics perspectives are more likely to help us understand foreign policy decision-making.

Session Guidance Questions

- How can you recognize cognitive factors and palace politics factors at work in individual decision-making processes?
- How do you differentiate between palace politics and cognitive perspectives?
- Where have you seen cognitive or palace politics factors at work in your own careers?
- How can an analyst improve their understanding of the cognitive and palace politics dynamics shaping the decision-making of other countries?
- How do these new perspectives affect your understanding of previous cases in this class like the Cuban Missile Crisis and the role the cognitive perspective plays in deterrence?

Essential Preparation

- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Cognitive Perspective." In *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 88–124. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Palace Politics Perspective." In *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 192–237. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.



IS – 5

Deterrence Theory

Focus

Deterrence is the use of threats and assurances to convince an adversary that the costs of taking an action are greater than the possible benefits. Deterrence has a long history as a strategy used by people and governments to manage and prevent conflict, but in recent years, practicing deterrence is complicated by a threat environment that has a more complex array of threats, new domains such as cyber and space, and broader range of actors. This session will examine the fundamental concepts of deterrence theory, the challenges to implementing a successful deterrent strategy, and how the theory is applied in practice.

Objectives

- Understand the basic concepts of deterrence and assess their utility in the current and future security environment.
- Examine and evaluate the usefulness of deterrence in the cyber and space domains.
- Apply deterrence theory to current security challenges.

Session Guidance Questions

- What are the basic concepts of deterrence and how does a state construct a credible deterrence commitment? What role does rationality play in deterrence calculations?
- What are the challenges for states to “extend” deterrence to protect allies?
- Do traditional concepts of deterrence apply to the domains of space and cyberspace? If not, why not? Do Canadian and U.S. deterrence strategies have the correct approach?
- What is the best way to deter a Chinese invasion of Taiwan?
- What is “integrated deterrence” and is it a useful way to think of deterrence?

Essential Preparation

- Biddle, Tami Davis. “Coercion Theory: A Basic Introduction for Practitioners,” *Texas National Security Review* 3, no. 2 (Spring 2020): 94-109.
- Schelling, Thomas C. *Arms and Influence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966. (READ 35-52)
- McInnis, Kathleen. “‘Integrated Deterrence’ Is Not So Bad,” *CSIS*, 27 October 2022.
- Sacks, David and Ivan Kanapathy. “What It Will Take to Deter China in the Taiwan Strait,” *Foreign Affairs*, 15 June 2023.
- McKeown, Ryder and Alex Wilner. “Deterrence in Space and Cyberspace,” In Juneau, Thomas, et. al., *Canadian Defense Policy in Theory and Practice*, edited by Thomas Juneau, et. al. London: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2020. (READ 399-416)



FPA – 6

The President and the White House

Focus

This session follows up on the introduction of the cognitive and palace politics perspectives by having students apply these perspectives to their understanding of the inner workings of the White House. Policymaking can rapidly change because of the wide variety of cognitive factors, personalities, informal relationships, rivalries, and other human factors in any given administration. Understanding how individuals gain access to and interact with the president can help explain decision-making outcomes. Furthermore, this session briefly introduces the structure and functions of the National Security Council, which was created to help presidents develop better policies and make better decisions. We will look at how the individual preferences of different presidents has shaped how the National Security Council functions.

Objectives

- Comprehend how the combination of the presidency as institution and president as individual shape foreign policymaking.
- Analyze how the advisors surrounding the president, particularly those in the White House, influence the decision-making process.
- Understand the difference between formal and informal power.
- Examine how the president and his advisors handled a specific foreign policy challenge in the case of 2003 Iraq.

Session Guidance Questions

- How does the institution of the presidency affect our understanding of the cognitive perspective in the context of the United States?
- How does the structure of the foreign policy decision-making processes of different administrations reflect the preferences or personality of the President?
- When is a member of the President's inner circle, regardless of formal position, engaging in palace politics? How do particular advisors compete for access and influence? Under what conditions is a given advisor more likely to succeed in influencing decision-making?
- How do the cognitive and palace politics perspectives, combined with an understanding of the George W. Bush White House, help us understand the decision-making process that led to the invasion of Iraq in 2003?

Essential Preparation

- Brattebo, Douglas M. and Tom Lansford. "The Presidency and Decision Making." In *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*, edited by Derek S. Reveron, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and John Cloud, 97–110. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- John Dickerson. "What if the Problem Isn't the President, It's the Presidency?" *The Atlantic* 321, no. 4 (2018).
- David Samuels. "The Storyteller and the President." *New York Times Magazine*, May 8, 2016.
- Stieb, Joseph. "Not Whether, but How and When: The Iraq Debate from 9/11 to the Invasion." In *The Regime Change Consensus: Iraq in American Politics, 1990–2003*, 189–247. Cambridge University Press, 2021. (READ "Bush's Case for War" 192–214 ONLY.)



IS – 6

Nuclear Deterrence

Focus

The United States was the first country to develop nuclear weapons and is the only state (so far) to have used them in war. Throughout the Cold War nuclear weapons and theories of nuclear deterrence were central to U.S. strategy and defense planning. In the years following the Cold War, both civilian and military analysts gave far less thought to nuclear weapons and nuclear deterrence as the threat of an existential nuclear conflict appeared to recede. Over the past decade, however, the nuclear question was resurfaced, not only because of increased competition with China and Russia, but also because of North Korea's advancing nuclear capabilities, and ongoing concern over a potential Iranian nuclear weapons program.

Objectives

- Examine and assess the structure of the U.S. nuclear force, the plans to modernize these weapons systems and the U.S. strategy in the 2022 Nuclear Posture Review.
- Analyze the impact of Russia's nuclear threats and Chinese nuclear modernization on deterrence.
- Understand and assess the role nuclear weapons might play in future international conflict.

Session Guidance Questions

- Should the size, composition, and capability of certain parts of the U.S. nuclear force be adjusted?
- What are the implications for norms and security should Russia decide to use nuclear weapons in Ukraine? How should the United States respond?
- What are the causes and implications of Chinese nuclear modernization for U.S. and global security? How concerned are you and how should the U.S. respond if it now has two peer nuclear adversaries?
- How does the cognitive perspective discussed in FPA come into play concerning risk and brinkmanship in deterrence?

Essential Preparation

- Kerr, Paul K. *Defense Primer: Strategic Nuclear Forces*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, 19 May 2023.
- U.S. Department of Defense. *The National Defense Strategy of the United States of America*. Washington, DC: Secretary of Defense, 2022. (READ the Nuclear Posture Review, 1-25.)
- Talmadge, Caitlin and Joshua Rovner. "The Meaning of China's Nuclear Modernization." *Journal of Strategic Studies* (May 2023): 1-33.
- Schlosser, Eric. "What If Russia Uses Nuclear Weapons in Ukraine?" *The Atlantic*, 20 June 2022.
- Pauly, Reid B.C. and Rose McDermott, "The Psychology of Nuclear Brinkmanship," In *H-Diplo-Robert Jervis International Security Studies Forum Policy Roundtable II-5*, edited by Diane Labrosse and Christopher Ball, 4 August 2023. (READ 6-13.)
- The NSA Debrief: "Contemplating the Unthinkable: Making Nuclear Deterrence Credible." U.S. Naval War College video, 2023.



FPA – 7

Organizational Process Perspective

Focus

Only a short employment with a national security agency is required to gain an appreciation for the impact of organizational processes on policy decisions. This session introduces the organizational process perspective as a lens for analyzing foreign policy decision-making. Complex foreign policy decisions as well as military operations cannot be executed without a great deal of planning and organizational specialization. However, organizational behavior can open pitfalls for the agencies involved, and potentially lead to actions that do not serve the nation's national security interests. To apply this perspective, this session examines a short case study on the misplacement of nuclear weapons in 2007 and explores the ramifications of organizational processes on the decisions that were made leading up to this event.

Objectives

- Comprehend the theoretical underpinnings of the organizational process perspective.
- Understand how the organizational process perspective relates to other analytical perspectives.
- Understand how these concepts apply to the Department of Defense and other national security agencies.
- Analyze a case where organizational behavior affected U.S. national security.

Session Guidance Questions

- How can organizational behavior shape policy outcomes?
- In what ways do organizational culture, and the respective service subcultures, impact Department of Defense activities and policies?
- What role does military advice play in policymaking? What are the sources of civil-military friction when deliberating over national security policy? What does Davidson mean when she calls interactions between policymakers and military advisors a “broken dialogue”?
- How can the events and actions of the USAF and DoD in the Minot AFB case be explained by organizational behavior? Consider both the event itself and the post-event organizational response.

Essential Preparation

- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. “Organizational Process Perspective.” In *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 125–160. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Davidson, Janine. “Civil-Military Friction and Presidential Decision Making: Explaining the Broken Dialogue.” *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 43, no. 1 (September 2023): 129–145.
- Peter Grier. “Misplaced Nukes.” *Air and Space Forces Magazine*, June 26, 2017.



IS – 7

POLITICAL ECONOMY

Focus

Economic activity within a state must provide a basic quality of life for citizens, while simultaneously providing sufficient resources to support those functions for which the state is responsible. Political economy refers to the processes by which economic activity is structured and regulated by the political unit or system. Political processes determine which values a state prioritizes. International Political Economy looks at how states interact with one another in the global system. This includes how international trade affects economies, and how the money and financial systems of different countries interact with each other, often through international institutions. This session looks at complex questions of how economic power works, how states act to counter or avoid the exercise of economic power, and the relationships between economics and politics, security, war, and strategy.

Objectives

- Understand important economic concepts and use them in analyses of power, conflict, and cooperation.
- Understand the concepts and dynamics of globalization and de-globalization, and how they relate to inter- and intra-state conflict.
- Understand how economic power is formed and used and learn to analyze its likely effects.
- Assess the relationships between political and economic systems and learn to incorporate them into strategic thinking.

Session Guidance Questions

- Since World War II, the international economic system has been dominated by the United States, and since the Cold War by a free market approach. This has been a source of disagreement and conflict. But why? What are the other ways of organizing an economy, and why might different states prefer different systems?
- How does globalization, interdependence, and the rise of global value chains affect the likelihood of militarized conflict? How do economic and military power interact?
- How does understanding economics help us appreciate connections between military and grand strategy?
- Most observers see the world as becoming more multipolar, especially in economic terms. What do you think this means, and what can/should the US strategy be going forward?

Essential Preparation

- Cohn, Lindsay P. "Introduction to Political Economy Part I: Comparative & II: International." U.S. Naval War College. 2022 (revised).
- Kennedy, Paul. *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*. New York: Random House Vintage Books, 1987. (READ 278-286)
- World Bank. "What are Global Value Chains: concepts and measurements" <https://video.ibm.com/recorded/115012697> (10min)
- Farrell, Henry, and Abraham L. Newman. "Chained to Globalization: Why It's Too Late to Decouple," *Foreign Affairs* 99, no. 1 (January/February 2020): 70-80.
- Job, Brian L. "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: the dilemmas of middle powers." *Issues & Studies* 56, no. 2 (2020): 1-24.
- Lu, Di. "Revisiting the US-China Trade Conflict." *Indian Journal of Asian Affairs* 34, no. 1/2 (2021): 115-119.



FPA – 8

The National Security Bureaucracy

Focus

This session follows up on the introduction of the organizational process perspective by applying this perspective to the inner workings of the U.S. national security bureaucracy. National security in any country is a vast enterprise. For the United States, with the largest security budget in the world, the government apparatus devoted to national security is sprawling. This session explores key bureaucratic actors in the U.S. national security enterprise, exploring their missions, structures, and cultures. Students have an opportunity to research a specific non-DoD agency and explore that agency's role in formulating national security policy.

Objectives

- Comprehend the major players in the United States national security bureaucracy.
- Analyze the similarities and differences between various departments and agencies and how this might affect their approach to national security policy.

Session Guidance Questions

- What are the major elements of the United States Government national security apparatus, and what are their roles?
- For the department or agency assigned to you by your faculty members, what is the culture of the agency? Why does the department have that organizational culture? How is it similar to or different from that of the Department of Defense in its approach to U.S. national security?
- Does the current technological and social environment suggest necessary changes to the current bureaucratic model?

Essential Preparation

- Congressional Research Service. "Defense Primer: The Department of Defense." Nov 30, 2022.
- Eaglen, Mackenzie. "Putting Combatant Commanders on a Demand Signal Diet." *War on the Rocks*, Nov 9, 2020.
- Zegart, Amy. "American Intelligence History at a Glance: From Fake Bakeries to Armed Drones." In *Spies, Lies, and Algorithms: The History and Future of American Intelligence*, 44–76. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2022. (READ "Intelligence Reform and Creation of the DNI," 70–74 ONLY)
- Burns, William J. and Linda Thomas-Greenfield. "The Transformation of Diplomacy: How to Save the State Department." *Foreign Affairs*, Nov/Dec 2020.
- Powell, Colin. "Address at the Groundbreaking Ceremony of the U.S. Diplomacy Center." September 3, 2014.
- You, with a subgroup drawn from your seminar, will be assigned an agency—Department of Justice, Treasury Department, Department of Homeland Security, or Department of Energy—for individual study by your FPA faculty member. Research this agency's mission, structure, and culture with your assigned seminar subgroup in preparation for seminar discussion.



IS – 8

Transnational Security Challenges

Focus

Hyper-connectivity has created numerous opportunities for states and non-state actors to interact but also given rise to emergent transnational and non-traditional security issues that cannot be solved solely through military force. Transnational challenges include: organized crime, trafficking, terrorism, disease, natural disasters, climate change, extreme weather events, refugees, corruption, illegal fishing, piracy, hackers, cyberspace, energy, multinational corporations. Such nonmilitary threats share three features: (1) do not always involve state actors, (2) nature of threats that cross borders, and (3) necessitate cooperation among different actors for a coordinated response. Transnational security issues can threaten the stability of the international system and test the sovereignty and resilience of each state.

Objectives

- Identify and analyze future security challenges to states and the international system.
- Recognize the differences between threats coming from states versus non-state actors.
- Evaluate how governments have responded to transnational issues and implications for global stability.
- Identify future security challenges to states and the international system.
- Assess how states prepare for and respond to transnational security challenges.

Session Guidance Questions

- What non-traditional security threats will likely shape the future of the international system and various regions? Can lessons be learned from the response to the outbreak of COVID-19?
- In what ways can the military be used to respond to transnational issues? What resilience strategies should countries develop to prepare their society in coordinating responses to non-traditional security problems?
- How does climate change and extreme weather impact the U.S. and those most vulnerable?
- What are the expenses, dangers, risks, and costs associated with non-traditional threats? What are the barriers to states effectively dealing with these issues?
- How can states, such as the United States, cooperate with adversarial states (e.g., China, Russia, etc.) in an era of strategic competition to address non-traditional security issues?

Essential Preparation

- Borghard, Erica. "A Grand Strategy Based on Resilience." *War on the Rocks*, January 4, 2021.
- Wilén, Nina. "The Military in the Time of COVID-19: Versatile, Vulnerable, and Vindicating." *PRISM* 9, no. 2 (2021): 21-33.
- Apling, Scott C., et. al. "Pivoting the Joint Force: National Security Implications of Illegal, Unregulated, and Unreported Fishing." *Joint Force Quarterly* 47, 4th Quarter (2022): 93-101.
- McQuaid, Julia, et. al. "Transnational Challenges and U.S. National Security: Defining and Prioritizing Borderless Threats," *Center for Naval Analysis*, September 2017.
- U.S. National Intelligence Council. "National Intelligence Estimate, Climate Change and International Responses Increasing Challenges to US National Security Through 2040," Washington, DC: 2021.



FPA – 09

Bureaucratic Politics Perspective

Focus

This session introduces the bureaucratic politics perspective, which conceives of decision-making as a bargaining process among senior leaders of executive departments and agencies. In contrast to the organizational process perspective's focus on habitual actors generating organizational outputs based on routines and cultures, the bureaucratic politics perspective treats organizational actors as strategic players who leverage their positions to advance their bureaucratic interests. Foreign policy decisions reflect compromises that emerge from bargaining among players in positions pursuing their own competing bureaucratic interests. This session explores the utility of the bureaucratic politics perspective in understanding foreign policy decision-making by examining the case of the Afghanistan troop surge in 2009.

Objectives

- Comprehend the core arguments and assumptions associated with the bureaucratic politics perspective.
- Analyze the benefits and drawbacks of using this analytical perspective in understanding national security decisions and foreign policy outcomes.
- Distinguish the bureaucratic politics perspective from other analytical perspectives covered in the course, particularly the organizational process and palace politics perspectives.
- Apply this perspective and evaluate its utility in explaining President Barack Obama's decision to "surge" U.S. forces in Afghanistan in December 2009.

Session Guidance Questions

- How does the bureaucratic politics perspective challenge the common assumption that countries function as unitary actors that make foreign policy decisions that are intended to optimize their national interests?
- Why does high-level bargaining among senior leaders of key national security agencies sometimes lead to a compromise outcome that was nobody's initial preference?
- This perspective assumes that the bureaucratic interests that players pursue largely conform to "Miles' Law," the idea that "where one stands is where one sits." Do the preferences of senior leaders always reflect the interests of the organizations they represent? Why or why not?
- In what ways does President Obama's decision to "surge" U.S. forces in Afghanistan reflect the tenets of the bureaucratic politics perspective? In what ways does it differ?

Essential Preparation

- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Bureaucratic Politics Perspective." In *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 162–191. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Marsh, Kevin. "Obama's Surge: A Bureaucratic Politics Analysis of the Decision to Order a Troop Surge in the Afghanistan War." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 10, no. 3 (2014): 265–288.



IS – 9

Causes of Conflict and Strategic Competition

Focus

This session focuses the major sources of conflict in the international system that range from classic geopolitics to more non-traditional challenges that extend beyond state borders. The session wrestles with the issue of strategic over-reach and whether U.S. strategy can adequately address today's complex security environment. The 2022 National Security Strategy prioritizes "maintaining an enduring competitive edge over the PRC while constraining a still profoundly dangerous Russia." Accordingly, this session examines the challenges of strategic competition and great power rivalry from a variety of perspectives.

Objectives

- Understand the primary causes of conflict in the international system and how their differing origins and types lead to different approaches to mitigate the risk of conflict.
- Identify and analyze key areas of strategic competition and great power rivalry.
- Understand the influence of geopolitics on U.S. strategy.

Session Guidance Questions

- You examined the major theories of international relations in IS-2 and IS-3. How do those theories inform the readings for this session?
- Do imbalances in power relations among states create conflict?
- What have been the main features of U.S. strategy towards China and Russia? Has the strategy been successful? What changes are necessary going forward?
- Does the mindset of strategic competition assume that conflict is inevitable?
- How do developing countries view strategic competition between the United States and Russia and China?

Essential Preparation

- Amonson, Kyle. "Causes of War: A Theory Analysis." *Small Wars Journal*, 17 March 2018.
- Brands, Hal. "The Overstretched Superpower: Does America Have More Rivals Than It Can Handle?" *Foreign Affairs*, 18 January 2022.
- Scheinmann, Gabriel. "4 Ways U.S. Support for Ukraine Helps Defend Taiwan." *Foreign Policy*, 24 May 2023.
- Rao, Nirupama. "The Upside of Rivalry: India's Great-Power Opportunity." *Foreign Affairs* 102, no. 3 (May/June 2023): 17-23.
- Adamson, Fiona B. "The Changing Geography of Global Security." In *The Oxford Handbook of International Security*, edited by Alexandra Gheciu and William C. Wohlforth. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. (READ 319-329)



FPA – 10

The Interagency Process

Focus

This session follows up on previous sessions' introductions of various analytical perspectives, particularly bureaucratic politics, by applying these perspectives to the interagency process. According to the Joint Staff's Guide for Interagency Doctrine, "the purpose of the interagency process is to advance the President's policy priorities and, more generally, to serve the national interest by ensuring all USG departments and agencies, and perspectives contribute to achieving these priorities, and participate in formulating and implementing policy." This session introduces the actors and institutions designed to facilitate interagency coordination at all levels of the U.S. government in formulating and implementing foreign policy.

Objectives

- Analyze the factors that drive the interagency process in coordinating, formulating, and executing policy.
- Understand the players and procedures—both formal and informal—that shape the interagency process.
- Examine the role of the National Security Council and the NSC staff in the interagency process.
- Apply course concepts to understand how the interagency process shaped the Clinton administration's decisions during the 1995–96 Taiwan Strait Crisis.

Session Guidance Questions

- What is the purpose of the interagency process? What tensions exist within the system?
- Who are the principal players in the interagency process? What is the role of the National Security Council and its various committees? What is the role of the NSC staff in fulfilling these responsibilities?
- Does interagency coordination and implementation only take place in Washington? What role do interagency country teams play in shaping regional and theater-level policy formulation?
- How did the interagency process shape the 1995–96 Taiwan Strait Crisis? What role, if any, did domestic politics in Washington, Beijing, and Taipei play during the crisis?

Essential Preparation

- Marcella, Gabriel. "National Security and the Interagency Process." In *U.S. Army War College Guide to National Security Policy and Strategy*, 239–260. Carlisle: Strategic Studies Institute, Army War College, 2014.
- Chollet, Derek, "The National Security Council: Is it Effective or Is it Broken?" In *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*, edited by Derek S. Reveron, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and John Cloud, 111–121. New York: NY: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Biden, Joseph R. "Memorandum on Renewing the National Security Council System." National Security Memorandum-2 (NSM-02), The White House, February 4, 2021.
- Jervis, Robert. "Why Intelligence and Policymakers Clash." *Political Science Quarterly* 125, 2 (2010):185–204.
- Gunness, Kristen, and Phillip C. Saunders. "Averting Escalation and Avoiding War: Lessons from the 1995–1996 Taiwan Strait Crisis." *China Strategic Perspectives* No. 17, Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs, Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University, 2022. (READ 8–45 ONLY.)



IS – 10

Strategic Restraint

Focus

Strategic restraint, the first of the grand strategies we will consider, has deep roots in American history linked to George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Quincy Adams, and Dwight D. Eisenhower. It is also known by other names, including “neo-isolationism,” “independence,” and “strategic disengagement.” Advocates of strategic restraint define security threats and national interests narrowly, arguing that the United States need not play an active, let alone dominant role, in international affairs beyond those of foreign trade. They hold that U.S. security is not affected by the vast majority of problems that occur beyond U.S. borders. Given the overall position of the United States today, the country is relatively safe from external attack. Indeed, disengagement advocates say it is U.S. involvement that often causes anger directed against the United States, so that a less active foreign policy would actually generate fewer threats and win more goodwill abroad.

Objectives

- Analyze the relative position of the United States in the international system and the role grand strategy plays in securing interests.
- Evaluate the utility of strategic restraint to advance and defend national interests.

Session Guidance Questions

- Although the "Come Home America" article was written over 20 years ago, do you believe its primary arguments are still relevant today?
- Given the contemporary security environment that include a return to geopolitics and "great power competition," is this a feasible grand strategy for the United States?
- What would a grand strategy of strategic restraint mean for U.S. influence within the international system? How would global competitors and rivals respond to this grand strategy? Should we care?
- Would other nations provide more for their own security if the United States adopted a less activist foreign policy? What is the risk to U.S. national interests if they don't?
- How does strategic restraint affect the military instrument of power? What does the joint force missions, capabilities, and force structure look like under a strategic restraint grand strategy?

Essential Preparation

- Posen, Barry R. and Andrew L. Ross. “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy.” *International Security* 21, no. 3 (1996): 5–53. (READ 5-16)
- Gholz, Eugene, Daryl G. Press, Harvey M. Sapolsky, “Come Home, America: The Strategy of Restraint in the Face of Temptation,” *International Security* 2, no. 4 (Spring 1997): 5-17.
- Swaine, Michael and Andrew Bacevich. “A Restraint Approach to U.S.-China Relations: Reversing the Slide Toward Crisis and Conflict.” Quincy Paper No. 11, April 2023. (READ 3-16 and Appendix: The Taiwan Challenge 57-66)
- McMaster, H.R. "The Retrenchment Syndrome: A Response to 'Come Home, America?'" *Foreign Affairs*, 1 June 2020.



FPA – 11

Interagency Simulation

Focus

In this fictional scenario, it is May 24, 2024. James Walker, the President of the United States of America, is in the White House. He has recently learned that part of the island of Lorica—a Pacific possession of Venezuela that lies between the coast of California and Hawaii—has been leased by the People’s Republic of China for use as an air and naval base. He has asked the North Pacific Interagency Working Group, part of the National Security Council, to generate policy recommendations within hours. You are a representative of an Executive Branch agency on the NPIWG, tasked with considering the national security interests of the United States as well as your agency’s insights and priorities. After consulting the background materials on Lorica and recent updates, work with the interagency working group to supply the president with urgently needed policy advice.

Objectives

- Comprehend both the background of the Lorica issue and the current crisis.
- Understand your agency’s perspective and be prepared to present relevant concerns.
- Be prepared to engage with interagency interlocutors.

Session Guidance Questions

- How do agency representatives think about their bureaucratic interests in the context of the national interest?
- How do agency representatives interpret senior guidance, especially when faced with conflicting guidance?
- As a representative of your agency, which policy option do you recommend and why?

Essential Preparation

- Stigler, Andrew. “Student Guide – Interagency Simulation Exercise.” Naval War College reading, 2023.
- Instructions from National Security Council Senior Director (NWC video on Blackboard).
- Agency Guidance. (Specific to assigned role, video distributed by faculty).
- Background reading: “Lorica, a Gentle Giant.”
- Background reading: “U.S. Policy Regarding Lorica Since 1999.”
- Background reading: “Hypersonic Weapons: Overview, Country Programs, & Implications.”
- Background reading: “Map of Lorica.”
- Crisis reading: “President Xi Statement on China-Venezuela Cooperation.”
- Crisis reading: “House Votes to Condemn.”
- Crisis: “State Cable EMB Beijing.”
- Crisis reading: “Map of PRC Airbase Lorica.”



IS – 11

Balance of Power Realism

Focus

This session examines the realist-based grand strategies of offshore balancing, selective engagement, and managed competition (which is a contemporary hybrid of the first two). These strategies are driven by realist logic but arrive at different answers to the question of optimum U.S. political involvement and military intervention in key areas of the world. The central difference is how – and from where – the United States employs its military power and in the value of key alliances.

Objectives

- Identify, analyze, and evaluate the components of offshore balancing, selective engagement and managed competition include underlying assumptions, key concepts, objectives, risks, and force requirements.
- Evaluate the utility (or drawbacks) of these approaches to defend US national interests in the current and emerging international security environment.
- Assess the role of alliances in grand strategy.

Session Guidance Questions

- What are the key assumptions underlying these strategies? What are the key differences between them?
- How do the required military capabilities of offshore balancing differ from those of selective engagement?
- How important are alliances to a balance of power or offshore balancing grand strategy? What are the factors that enable alliances to persist or to fail?
- What are the strengths, weaknesses, and trade-offs of these strategies in the context of the contemporary and emerging global security environment?
- These strategies are primarily focused on states and great power competition, to what extent are they useful (or not) for addressing non-state and transnational challenges?

Essential Preparation

- Posen, Barry R. and Andrew L. Ross. “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy.” *International Security* 21, no. 3 (1996): 5–53. (READ 17-23)
- Mearsheimer, John J. and Stephen M. Walt. 2016. “The Case for Offshore Balancing.” *Foreign Affairs* 95, no. 4 (July-August 2016): 70-83.
- Holmes, James. “Off-shore Balancing Isn’t a Strategy. It’s Only and Attitude Towards Strategy.” *The National Interest*, 5 September 2021.
- Jones, C. “Selective Engagement: A Strategy to Address a Rising China.” *Journal of Indo-Pacific Affairs*, 2 August 2021.
- Beebe, George. “Managed Competition: A U.S. Grand Strategy for a Multipolar World.” *Quincy Brief*, no. 30 (2022): 2-14.



FPA – 12

Congress & National Security

Focus

As lawmakers in a rule-of-law society, Congress plays a fundamental role in national security decision-making, although its influence tends to wax and wane with respect to the Executive Branch. How and why does Congress impact U.S. foreign and national security policy today, and how has its role changed over time? What powers, authorities, and influence does Congress wield, and in what issues and areas is Congress less involved and why? This session will delve into the practical aspects of legislating and its impacts and influence on U.S. national security policy.

Objectives

- Comprehend the lawmaking process, its relationship with policy, and the role of the Legislative Branch of government in U.S. foreign and national security policy decision-making.
- Examine how Congress' interest and involvement in defense issues affects policymaking.
- Understand Congressional perspectives on decisions involving national security and foreign policy.

Session Guidance Questions

- When does Congress get involved in matters of foreign policy and national security? When it does, what powers, tools, and authorities does Congress have to direct or influence policy?
- Where in Congress is power and influence located, how is it manifested and demonstrated, and how do these powers affect legislation?
- Why did passage of Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act (MJIIIPA) legislation take many years to pass into law, and how and why did the Executive Branch resist this change?

Essential Preparation

- Serafino, Nina M. and Eleni G. Ekmektsioglou. "Congress and National Security." In *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*, edited by Derek S. Reveron, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and John A. Cloud, 151–182. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- The Debrief: "Legislative Affairs." U.S. Naval War College video, 2023.
- Sununu, The Honorable John E. (former Senator, R-NH). "Congress' Influence in Foreign Policy: For Better or Worse." Panel, The Woodrow Wilson Center, Washington D.C., October 17, 2011. (WATCH 12:12–29:43.)
- Donnelly, John M. "Gillibrand Calls New NDAA a Huge Milestone in Military Justice." *Roll Call*, December 7, 2022.
- Norris, LTC Peter. "Timeline of MJIIIPA's history and passage." *Congress and Its Relationship with the Military Case Reader* (U.S. Naval War College, updated 2023.)



IS – 12

Liberal Internationalism

Focus

The key idea of liberal internationalism is that world politics does not have to consist of zero-sum relationships; instead, economic trade, collective security, and transnational problem-solving can offer win-win outcomes. International institutions, rules, and norms facilitate the cooperation needed to achieve international peace and prosperity. Liberal internationalism recognizes that regime type matters; democracies are more open to trade and cooperation than authoritarian governments. Important international institutions such as the United Nations, NATO, and World Bank were, in a sense, significantly shaped by the United States. Therefore, liberal internationalists argue that the United States benefits from a strategy of multinational cooperation.

Objectives

- Understand the theoretical and practical aspects of liberal internationalism.
- Understand the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and costs of liberal internationalism.
- Assess the roles of various tools of national power in a liberal internationalist foreign policy.

Session Guidance Questions

- Why has the United States promoted international institutions? What role does international security cooperation play in U.S. grand strategy?
- Some argued that COVID-19 had the potential to bring an end to the liberal international order. Others argued that the pandemic reignited its positive aspects. Which do you think happened?
- How might China's growing global influence impact the liberal international order? How does China benefit from the current order? Is China seeking to create an order of its own design?
- How might Russia's foreign policy impact the liberal international order?

Essential Preparation

- Posen, Barry R. and Andrew L. Ross. "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy." *International Security* 21, no. 3 (1996): 5–53. (READ 23-32)
- Greitens, Sheena C. Surveillance, security, and liberal democracy in the post-COVID world. *International Organization* 74 (2020): E169-E190.
- Sung-han, Kim and Sanghoon Kim. "China's contestation of the liberal international order." *The Pacific Review*, 2022.
- Way, Lucan. "The Rebirth of the Liberal World Order?" *Journal of Democracy* (April 2022): 5-17.



FPA – 13

The Judiciary and National Security

Focus

This session explores the U.S. judiciary, the third co-equal branch of the U.S. government, as it relates to national security. The Supreme Court adjudicates constitutional questions surrounding foreign policy and national security, many of which involve the role of the military. The courts have been asked to weigh in on both disputes between the executive and legislative branches and the more general tension between maintaining security and safeguarding individual liberties. Importantly, both decisions and non-decisions by the judiciary have consequences on the scope of executive and legislative power, and the role of the military and national security establishment in executing U.S. foreign policy. In the absence of judicial opinions, the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel can shape policy through its written opinions.

Objectives

- Discuss the role of the judiciary as a key player in adjudicating foreign policy decisions.
- Understand the role of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel in providing legal advice to the executive branch.
- Analyze judicial deference to the military.

Session Guidance Questions

- What is the role of the judiciary relative to the executive and legislative branches in foreign policy decision-making? How do judicial rulings (or lack of rulings) shape foreign policy?
- How does the Office of Legal Counsel shape foreign policy? How do its opinions relate to judicial decisions and legal precedent?
- When does the judiciary defer to the military? Does it accord similar deference to other parts of the executive branch?

Essential Preparation

- Breyer, Stephen. "Silence: Cicero and His 'Political Questions' Counterpart." In *The Court and the World: American Law and the New Global Realities*, 15–24. New York: Vintage Books, 2016.
- Case Reader, selected case summaries from oyez.org
- Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel. "Memorandum for Attorneys of the Office Re: Best Practices for OLC Legal Advice and Written Opinions," July 16, 2010.
- Barbash, Fred. "Justice Department opinions take on the force of law — but are not, in fact, the law." *The Washington Post*, May 31, 2019.
- Liptak, Adam. "Supreme Court Rules for Navy in Sonar Case." *New York Times*, 12 Nov 12, 2008.



IS – 13

Primacy

Focus

Primacy is the most activist grand strategy and should seem familiar because the United States has pursued this grand strategy, more or less, since the end of the second World War. It is similar to liberal internationalism in that it seeks to create or maintain a rules-based liberal world order. However, unlike liberal internationalism, with its preference for multilateralism and institutionally-based consultations, primacy does not hesitate to favor preponderant military power applied in a unilateral manner. In this context, the hegemon is the most powerful state actor that has the will and privilege—by virtue of its preponderant power—to pursue primacy as it wishes. Primacy is the most budget-intensive grand strategy in the immediate future because it presumes that investments made up front, especially in unmatched defense capabilities, will foster a more sustainable peace in the long-term.

Objectives

- Understand primacy and how it differs from previously introduced grand strategies.
- Understand and comprehend the advantages and challenges posed by a primacy grand strategy.
- Examine the concept of polarity in international relations, including how a bipolar system differs from a unipolar or multipolar system.
- Assess the concepts of hegemonic stability theory and hegemonic war and apply these to contemporary examples.

Session Guidance Questions

- What distinguishes primacy from previous grand strategies that you have studied?
- What are some key advantages and disadvantages of primacy?
- What type of force structure is appropriate for a primacy grand strategy?
- What do concepts such as hegemonic stability theory and hegemonic war mean? Why are these examples relevant to the contemporary context?

Essential Preparation

- Posen, Barry R. and Andrew L. Ross. “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy.” *International Security* 21, no. 3 (1996): 5–53. (READ 1-9 and 32-44)
- Brooks, Stephen G., G. John Ikenberry, and William C. Wohlforth. “Don’t Come Home, America: The Case Against Retrenchment.” *International Security* 37, no. 3 (Winter 2012-13): 7-51.
- Jackson, Van. “The Problem with Primacy, America’s Dangerous Quest to Dominate the Pacific.” *Foreign Affairs*, 16 January 2023.
- Herrera, Geoffrey. “Hegemonic Stability Theory,” in Josel Krieger (ed), *The Oxford Companion to International Relations*, Oxford University Press (2014): 1-5.
- Gilpin, Robert. “The Theory of Hegemonic War.” *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18, no. 4 (Spring 1988): 591-613.



FPA – 14

Political Parties and Polarization

Focus

The modern two-party system, combined with separated powers across institutions, has important consequences for American foreign and national security policy. This session explores whether recent trends in divided government, partisan polarization, and factional realignment within political parties are reshaping fundamental debates over the future of U.S. grand strategy and foreign policy. It also examines incentives to politicize the military, and the potential consequences for U.S. civil-military relations.

Objectives

- Analyze the influence of the modern two-party system over American foreign and national security policy.
- Understand how rules, norms, procedures, and customs conferring authority on majority and minority parties influence Congress's role in funding, overseeing, and making American foreign and defense policy.
- Discuss the consequences of polarization and the extent to which realigning factions within political parties are shaping debates about U.S. foreign policy.
- Discuss the potential causes and consequences of military politicization.

Session Guidance Questions

- What are modern American political parties, and how do they shape and constrain national security decision-making?
- What is political polarization? Is it a new phenomenon? What challenges does it pose for foreign policy?
- What counts as "politicizing" the military? Who drives politicization, and what are its possible consequences?

Essential Preparation

- Wolbrecht, Christina. "Permeable Parties: Groups and the Organization of the American Party System." In *More than Red and Blue: Political Parties and American Democracy*, edited by APSA Presidential Task Force on Political Parties, 52–64. July 2023.
- Schultz, Kenneth. "Perils of Polarization for U.S. Foreign Policy." *Washington Quarterly*, 40:4 (2017), 7–28.
- Myrick, Rachel. "America is Back – But for How Long? Political Polarization and the End of U.S. Credibility." *Foreign Affairs*, June 14, 2021.
- Tama, Jordan. "The Surprising Bipartisanship of U.S. Foreign Policy." *Foreign Affairs*, July 6, 2023.
- Brooks, Risa. "The Right Wing's Loyalty Test for the U.S. Military." *Foreign Affairs*, November 22, 2022.



IS – 14

China in the 21st Century

Focus

This session will consider the different facets of China's development and what the implications are for China itself, for the U.S.-PRC bilateral relationship, the Indo-Pacific region, and the international system. We examine in depth twenty-first century China, its growth and characteristics, and its evolving relationship with the United States.

Objectives

- Examine the present state of China: its economic growth, its military strength, its global standing, and implications for the United States.
- Grasp the overall picture of China's economic engagement with the world.
- Assess China's possible range and flexibility of national security objectives.
- Evaluate the ongoing debate over how the United States should engage with China, drawing on various international relations theories and their assumptions.

Session Guidance Questions

- What can IR theories tell us about China's rise, America's reaction, and the two countries' bilateral relationship?
- What have been the implications of China's growth and standing in the international system, as well as its relationship with the United States?
- What does China want? A world in which it has displaced the United States as the most powerful country? Mere hegemony in the Asia-Pacific? What evidence would you want to see to attempt to determine China's intentions? What do you think the relationship between ambitions and capabilities will be in China?
- What is the nature of China's economic engagement with the world? How does the Belt and Road Initiative fit or not fit in with China's other international economic activities?

Essential Preparation

- Zweig, David. "China's Political Economy." In *Politics in China: An Introduction*, 3rd ed., edited by William A. Joseph. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019. (READ 293-307 and 310-14.)
- Wong, Audrye. "China's Economic Statecraft under Xi Jinping." *The Brookings Institution*. 22 January 2019.
- Weiss, Jessica Chen. "A World Safe for Autocracy: China's Rise and the Future of Global Politics." *Foreign Affairs* 98, no. 4 (July/August 2019): 92-108.
- Wang Jisi. "The Plot against China? How Beijing Sees the New Washington Consensus." *Foreign Affairs* 100, no. 4 (July/August 2021): 48-52, 54.
- Shirk, Susan L. *Overreach: How China Derailed Its Peaceful Rise*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2023. (READ 207-40 and 369-79.)
- The NSA Debrief: "The China Challenge." U.S. Naval War College video, 2024.



FPA – 15

Media & Public Opinion

Focus

Mass media and public opinion are important influences on the policymaking process, but they can also influence each other and be influenced by policy elites. The relationship among these entities can be contentious: How much do (and should) elected leaders follow the opinions of those they represent? How should the relationship between the military and the media be characterized? How does the fragmentation of news and the rise of social media affect the spread of information and misinformation to the public? In this session you will explore some of these debates and consider the roles of the media and public opinion as an influence on the policymaking process.

Objectives

- Comprehend the role of the media in national and theater security decision processes.
- Discuss the impact of media coverage and disinformation/misinformation on national security policy.
- Analyze the role of public opinion in democratic policymaking and civil-military relations.

Session Guidance Questions

- Do the U.S. military and American news media outlets have an adversarial relationship?
- How do fragmentation of news sources, social media, and disinformation affect foreign policymaking? What new challenge for national security might “truth decay” pose?
- How do senior leaders use the media to advance policy and political goals?
- Why is the U.S. military so trusted vs. other institutions? What are the implications of that trust?

Essential Preparation

- Porch, Douglas. “No Bad Stories: The American Media-Military Relationship.” *Naval War College Review* 55, no. 1 (2002): 85–107.
- Weisberg, Jacob. “Bad News: Can Democracy Survive If the Media Fail?” *Foreign Affairs*, August 12, 2019.
- Williams, Heather J. and Caitlin McCulloch. “Truth Decay and National Security: Intersections, Insights, and Questions for Future Research.” Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2023.
- Margulies, Max, and Jessica Blankshain. “Specific Sources of Trust in Generals: Individual-Level Trust in the U.S. Military.” *Daedalus* (Cambridge, Mass.) 151, no. 4 (2022): 254–75.

Recommended Resources

- Smeltz, Dina, et. al. “Pivot to Europe: US Public Opinion in a Time of War.” Chicago: Chicago Council on Global Affairs, 2022
- Sanders, Linley. “Where Americans get their news and who they trust for information.” YouGov.com, 2022.
- Keeter, Scott. “Public Opinion Polling Basics.” Philadelphia PA: Pew Research Center, n.d.



IS – 15

National Security Strategy

Focus

Congress mandates the Executive Branch submit several strategy documents that serve many purposes. They are designed to create internal coherence on foreign and defense policy within the Executive Branch and provide a basis for Congress to fund defense priorities. The President's National Security Strategy (NSS) outlines the administration's strategic vision and approximate grand strategy, detailing major security concerns and how the administration plans to use the instruments of national power to address them. Reconsider the course's earlier discussions on power, interests, challenges, and strategic approaches.

Objectives

- Comprehend the purpose of national strategic guidance documents and how current strategies define U.S. security concerns and efforts to address them.
- Examine the coordination among the ends, ways, and means of the NSS.
- Analyze how well the NSS lays out key national priorities.
- Evaluate how well the NSS serves modern defense planning needs.

Session Guidance Questions

- What different purposes do national strategy documents serve? How do they function as a strategic communications tool for various domestic and international audiences? How well does the executive branch follow the strategic guidance laid out in these documents? What utility do they provide to Congress?
- What are national interests and why are they important? How does the NSS define the primary (vital) national interests of the United States and what concepts does it include to address them? How well does the NSS capture what we know of this administration's strategic vision?
- Some argue the NSS has failed to map out strategy and became no more than a rhetorical exercise. Does the NSS serve any useful purpose? How does the unclassified nature of the NSS impact its thoroughness and effectiveness? Should the NSS be abolished?
- How well does United States articulate its grand strategy in the NSS? Are the guiding strategic documents effective in spelling out the long-term competition challenges facing the United States? How effective are the U.S. ends, ways, and means as expressed in the NSS as compared to China's discussed in the previous class?

Essential Preparation

- U.S. President. *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*. Washington, DC: White House, 2022.
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie. "It's Time to Get Honest About the Biden Doctrine," *New York Times*, 12 Nov. 2021.
- Kennan, George F. "The Inauguration of Organized Political Warfare," 30 April 1948.
- Chin, John J., Kiron Skinner, and Clay Yoo. "Understanding National Security Strategies Through Time." *Texas National Security Review* 6, no. 4 (2023).
- Smarter Strategies for the Twenty-First Century – Interview with H.R. McMaster, *Orbis* 65, no.2 (2021): 207-213.



FPA – 16

Think Tanks, Interest Groups & Lobbying

Focus

In addition to creating the framework for institutions of government, the U.S. Constitution's guarantees of individual rights of speech, assembly, and petition have enabled the emergence of an array of non-governmental organizations that influence foreign and national security policy. This session examines how the concerns and ideas promoted by actors such as think tanks, interest groups, lobbyists, and other non-governmental organizations engage with law- and policymakers in organized attempts to influence U.S. legislation and policymaking.

Objectives

- Identify the missions, roles, cultures, processes, and other organizational characteristics of think tanks, interest groups, lobbyists, and other groups interested in influencing policy and legislative decisions in the defense and national security realms.
- Comprehend the potential influence of think tanks, interest groups, lobbyists, and other non-state actors in U.S. policymaking. Consider ways these institutions may be changing and distinctions between domestic and foreign influence seekers.
- Understand and assess distinctions in types of power and influence and their impact on policy decisions.

Session Guidance Questions

- Non-governmental organizations tend to be less hierarchical and more horizontally distributed than government agencies. Why, and what implications are there for how non-governmental organizations function, particularly when engaging government counterparts?
- What is a think tank, and what different types of think tanks exist? How do think tanks achieve influence in policymaking? Why do policymakers draw on think tank expertise, and how can one judge or measure think tank outputs?
- Why are interest groups formed? What mechanisms do they use to express their policy interests, expertise, and recommended policy changes? What makes some interest groups more influential than others?
- How and to what extent can think tanks, interest groups, and lobbyists influence policy or legislative decision-making processes? How and why do foreign governments seek to influence U.S. foreign policy?

Essential Preparation

- Cloud, John A. and Nikolas Gvosdev. "Deploying Influence and Expertise: Think Tanks, Interest Groups and Lobbyists in the Theater Security Enterprise." In *Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise*, 97–123. Newport, RI: National Security Affairs Department, U.S. Naval War College, 2018.
- Abelson, Donald E. "Old World, New World: The Evolution and Influence of Foreign Affairs Think Tanks." *International Affairs* 90, no. 1 (2014): 125–142.
- Tidwell, Alan. "Differing Approaches to Congressional Outreach: Comparing Australia and New Zealand." *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 72, no. 5 (2018): 403–417.
- Drezner, Daniel. "The Ideas Industry," Video: Talks at Google (7-37 minutes.)



IS – 16

Defense Strategy and Force Planning

Focus

The National Security, Defense, and Military Strategies provide strategic guidance for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) who uses this guidance to execute his six primary functions identified in Section 153 of Title 10, U.S. Code. The Joint Strategic Planning System (JSPS) is the primary method by which the CJCS fulfills these responsibilities. This lesson focuses on the NDS and NMS, as well as on two subcomponents of the Joint Strategic Planning System (JSPS) that are specifically involved in force planning and capabilities requirements development: Joint Force Development and Design (JFDD) and the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS), as well as the role of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) in the requirements development process.

Objectives

- Identify and analyze major directions of current U.S. defense strategic direction.
- Understand the general process through which strategic guidance provided in the NSS, NDS, and NMS is used to inform and drive the JFDD process.
- Understand the mission of the JROC and the general process through which joint requirements and capabilities are identified and developed using the JCIDS.

Session Guidance Questions

- How will the joint force of the next twenty years differ from the joint force of the previous twenty years?
- The Brands and Montgomery article discusses the DoD's shift from a two-war strategic planning standard to a one-war standard. What are the main arguments for and against this shift?
- How does JFDD integrate with the JCIDS process? Why are joint concepts important? What are the three JCIDS process lanes and when are they used? What is the role of the JROC?
- USMC Force Design 2030 represents an effort to apply force design and capabilities development processes. What is your assessment of FD 2030?

Essential Preparation

- U.S. Department of Defense. *The National Defense Strategy of the United States of America*. Washington, DC: Secretary of Defense, 2022. (READ III-IV, 1-23.)
- U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *The National Military Strategy of the United States of America: Strategic Discipline*. Washington, DC: CJCS, 2022.
- Milley, Mark A. "Strategic Inflection Point: The Most Historically Significant and Fundamental Change in the Character of War is Happening Now – While the Future is Clouded in Mist and Uncertainty." *Joint Force Quarterly* 110 (3rd Quarter 2023): 6-15.
- Brands, Hal and Evan Braden Montgomery. "One War is Not Enough: Strategy and Force Planning for Great Power Competition." *Texas National Security Review* 3, no. 2 (Spring 2020): 81-92.
- U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Implementing Joint Force Development and Design*. CJCS Instruction 3030.01A. Washington, DC: CJCS, 3 October 2022. (READ A1-A8.)



IS – 16

Defense Strategy and Force Planning

- U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Charter of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council and Implementation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System*. CJCS Instruction 5123.01I. Washington, DC: CJCS, 30 October 2021. (READ A1-A7.)
- U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Manual for the Operation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System*. JCIDS Manual. Washington, DC: Joint Staff J-8, 30 October 2021. (READ A1-A4.)

CASE STUDY READINGS

- U.S. Marine Corps. *Force Design 2030*. Washington, DC: Headquarters U.S. Marine Corps, 2020.
- U.S. Marine Corps. *Force Design 2030 Annual Update*. Washington, DC: Headquarters U.S. Marine Corps, 2021. (OPTIONAL)
- U.S. Marine Corps. *Force Design 2030 Annual Update*. Washington, DC: Headquarters U.S. Marine Corps, 2022. (OPTIONAL)
- U.S. Marine Corps. *Force Design 2030 Annual Update*. Washington, DC: Headquarters U.S. Marine Corps, 2023.
- U.S. Marine Corps. *A Concept for Stand-In Forces*. Washington, DC: Headquarters U.S. Marine Corps, 2021. (READ the Forward by General Berger and 1-5.)



FPA – 17

Defense Budget, Acquisitions, and Innovation

Focus

This session examines the friction and challenges within the defense budgeting process and the myriad of influences on force design policy decisions. Specifically, this session will explore the defense budget's complex organizational processes, the tensions between executive branch functions and congressional oversight, and the critical importance of innovation in defense planning. This session will illuminate the numerous challenges associated with the current defense budgeting process, known as the Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution (PPBE) system, the nature of the military industrial complex, and their impacts on foreign policy in an era of strategic competition.

Objectives

- Discuss the current executive and legislative processes that drive the defense budget.
- Examine the challenges that the budget process poses to acquisitions and long-term force design.
- Consider the critical areas of innovation that are driving geo-strategic competition and the structural barriers to gain a competitive advantage in the international system.
- Analyze potential budget-reform efforts and policy options available to senior decision-makers.

Session Guidance Questions

- In what ways do the defense budget and acquisition processes influence national security policy?
- What specific challenges does the current budgeting system pose to defense innovation?
- How does congressional oversight affect defense strategy and force design?
- What possible solutions are available to mitigate and overcome current barriers within U.S. defense acquisition processes?

Essential Preparation

- Brose, Christian. "Bureaucracy Does its Thing." In *The Kill Chain: Defending America in the Future of High Tech Warfare*, 206–224. New York: Hachette Books, 2020
- O'Hanlon, Michael E. "Defense Budgeting and Resource Allocation." In *Defense 101: Understanding the Military of Today and Tomorrow*. Ithaca [New York]: Cornell University Press, 2021. (READ Chapter Introduction, "The Big Picture: Broad Definitions and Processes", "Breakdowns of the US Department of Defense Budget", "The Acquisitions Budget", and "Conclusion: Defense Budgeting and Grand Strategy" ONLY.)
- Commission on Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution Reform. *Interim Report*. 2023. (READ Sections III–V ONLY.)
- Sapien, Joaquin. "The Inside Story of How the Navy Spent Billions on the "Little Crappy Ship." *ProPublica*, September 7, 2023.
- Lipton, Eric. "Faced With Evolving Threats, U.S. Navy Struggles to Change." *The New York Times*, September 4, 2023.



IS – 17

Maritime Strategy

Focus

The global maritime commons -- oceans and littorals -- provide everything from convenient transportation routes to primary food sources to billion-dollar tourism and recreational industries to underwater hiding places for nuclear arsenals. This session will consider the current maritime security environment, including traditional military threats the U.S. Navy might confront, as well as a broader range of challenges to "good order at sea." Students should think about strategies to respond to those challenges, at the level of U.S. defense policy, theater strategies and plans, and the interests and capabilities of other maritime nations.

Objectives

- Analyze principal traditional and non-traditional maritime security challenges.
- Analyze U.S. maritime strategy and examine its suitability to the maritime security environment.
- Assess future and emerging challenges in the maritime realm.

Session Guidance Questions

- What are the principal maritime interests of the United States? What are some current challenges facing maritime strategists? How are those challenges different from those confronting maritime strategists five or ten years ago? How does the U.S. maritime strategy nest with the NSS, NDS, and NMS?
- What organizations and entities have a "piece of the maritime interest pie?"
- As the challenges of the 21st century become more defined, senior maritime leaders emphasize the need to cooperate and integrate their capabilities and operations in order to deal with revisionist powers and rising near peer powers. Can such preparation by committee truly succeed? How seriously would you expect U.S. allies and potential enemies to view this proposal?

Essential Preparation

- Hattendorf, John B. "What is a Maritime Strategy?" *Soundings*, no. 1 (October 2013): 1-10.
- U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Marine Corps, and U.S. Navy. *Advantage at Sea: Prevailing with Integrated All-Domain Naval Power*. Washington, DC: Multiple Headquarters, 2020.
- O'Rourke, Ronald. *China Naval Modernization: Implications for U.S. Navy Capabilities—Background and Issues for Congress*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service. 15 May 2023 (READ 1-10 and 41-53.)
- Dougherty, Christopher. "Gradually And Then Suddenly: Explaining the Navy's Strategic Bankruptcy." *War on the Rocks*, 30 June 2021.
- U.S. Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. *Report to Congress on the Annual Long-Range Plan for Construction of Naval Vessels for Fiscal Year 2023*. Washington, DC: CNO, April 2022. (READ A4-A8.)



FPA – 18

Creating the U.S. Space Force

Focus

In the 2020 National Defense Authorization Act, a new U.S. military service was created for only the second time since the founding days of the country. In this session, we apply previous lessons on organizational process and bureaucratic politics and the roles of Congress and the president in national security policymaking to understand why the option of a new service was chosen, how Congressional interests and oversight shaped the new Space Force, and the likely bureaucratic and political implications of a separate organization responsible for the space domain.

Objectives

- Discuss the strategic and organizational reasons for creating the U.S. Space Force (USSF).
- Identify the role and interests of Congress and other stakeholders in legislating the Space Force.
- Assess strengths and weaknesses of USSF how they reflect the political process that created it.

Session Guidance Questions

- Why might space have been "neglected" bureaucratically before Space Force was created?
- What factors in the security environment and in the domestic policy environment led to Space Force? Would there be a Space Force if Donald Trump had not been President?
- How did Congress shape the Space Force? What issues interested the House and Senate?
- What organizational and political challenges do you see for USSF? Have space problems been fixed?
- What challenges does the U.S. face as it increasingly relies on private actors to provide capabilities?

Essential Preparation

- Chaplain, Christina. "Defense Space Acquisitions: Too Early to Determine If Recent Changes Will Resolve Persistent Fragmentation in Management and Oversight." Washington DC: Government Accountability Office, 2016.
- Center for Strategic and International Studies. "Commanding Space: The Story Behind the Space Force." Washington DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies. April 11, 2019.
- Burbach, David. "Creating the U.S. Space Force – Case Study." Newport, RI: National Security Affairs Department, U.S. Naval War College, 2023.
- Farley, Robert. "Space Force: Ahead of Its Time, or Dreadfully Premature?" *Policy Analysis* no. 904. Cato Institute, Washington, D.C., December 1, 2020.
- Farrow, Ronan. "Elon Musk's Shadow Rule: How the U.S. Government Came to Rely on The Tech Billionaire and is Now Struggling to Rein Him In." *New Yorker*, 21 August 2023. (READ until paragraph that begins "One summer evening in the 1980's..." ONLY)

Recommended Resources

- Bingen, Kari, et. al. U.S. Space Force Primer. Washington DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies. December 22, 2022.
- U.S. Space Force. Space Capstone Publication: Spacepower, Doctrine for Space Forces. Washington DC: Headquarters U.S. Space Force. June 2020.



IS – 18

Global Integration and Combatant Commands

Focus

This session provides an overview of the Unified Command Plan, the Combatant Commands, and their role in developing theater strategy. The concept of Global Integration allows students to consider the Department of Defense's approach to address transregional challenges in multiple domains within the contemporary security environment. One Department of Defense (DoD) process that exemplifies the challenges presented today is Global Force Management (GFM). Combatant Command requirements exceed force provider capabilities and capacities. Understanding GFM is key to identifying global risk to warfighting readiness and assessments that support building a more responsive and lethal force.

Objectives

- Understand the origins, roles and responsibilities of Combatant Commands in the Unified Command Plan
- Understand how combatant commands develop theater strategy and their contributions to concept development and identifying required capabilities for the Joint Force
- Understand the importance of Global Integration and its impact on the Combatant Commands and Oceanic regions
- Comprehend the GFM processes (directed readiness, assignment, allocation, apportionment, and assessment), stakeholders, importance to strategic guidance and policies

Session Guidance Questions

- Why did the United States create geographics combatant commands? Is the current structure still effective? What changes would you suggest?
- What are the most effective ways for CCDRs to work together? Role for the Joint Staff?
- How does the combatant command affect DoD capability requirements and global force management?
- How would you apply risk analysis to current operations, campaigns, and future potential conflicts, knowing there are Service readiness issues, finite Joint force structure, and modernization timeline implications?

Essential Preparation

- Conway, Tim. Information Paper, Subject: Global Force Management. Office of the J-35. Suffolk, VA, 2023.
- Dunford, Joseph F. 2018. "The Character of War and Strategic Landscape Have Changed." *Joint Force Quarterly* : JFQ, no. 89.
- Feickert, Andrew. The Unified Command Plan and Combatant Commands: Background and Issues for Congress. CRS Report No. R42077. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, 2013. (Scan 1-10, Read 52-58.)
- Lee, Caitlin. "The U.S. Military's Force-Management Tug-of-War," *War on the Rocks*, 23 Mar 2022.
- Reveron, Derek S, James L Cook, and Ross M Coffey. 2022. "Competing Regionally: Developing Theater Strategy." *Joint Force Quarterly* : JFQ, no. 104 (January.)
- Joint Chiefs of Staff. Doctrine for the Armed Forces of the United States. JP 5-0. Washington, DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2020. (Scan Appendix D.)
- U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Joint Planning and Execution Overview and Policy Framework*. CJCS Guide 3130. Washington, D.C. CJCS, 12 Apr 2023. (Scan Enclosure A.)
- U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Joint Risk Analysis Methodology*. CJCS Manual 3105.01A. Washington, D.C. CJCS, 12 Oct 2021. (Read Enclosure A, B, and C.)
- The NSA Debrief: "Global Integration for an Interconnected Security Environment." U.S. Naval War College video, 2023.



FPA – 19

Using Diplomacy

Focus

Diplomacy is the lifeblood of security, handling many thousands of international issues on a daily basis. The conflicts and wars that are avoided through diplomacy do not make headlines, while wars themselves certainly do. And while armistices and peace agreements are events of note, the countless daily diplomatic interactions that strengthen relationships and fortify deterrence tend to pass without remark. In this session we will identify and analyze the key players, processes, and dynamics involved in using diplomacy as an instrument of power.

Objectives

- Understand the nature and conduct of diplomacy.
- Explore the various actors involved in using diplomacy, and how they might approach diplomacy differently.
- Analyze the potential advantages of diplomatic interaction, as well as the challenges and obstacles that can thwart diplomatic initiatives.

Session Guidance Questions

- How does the process for planning and conducting diplomacy compare to the process for planning and conducting a military operation? How are these different tools/resources, relative to one another?
- How do different parts of the U.S. government view diplomacy differently?
- How do sub-national and non-governmental actors influence the conduct of diplomacy?
- How and when do Congress and the U.S. public weigh in on the conduct of diplomacy?

Essential Preparation

- Hutchings, Robert. "American Diplomacy and the End of the Cold War in Europe." In *Foreign Policy Breakthroughs: Cases in Successful Diplomacy*, edited by Robert Hutchings and Jeremi Suri, 148-172. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- "The Debrief: Perspectives on Diplomacy." U.S. Naval War College video.
- Burns, William J. "Age of Terror: The Inversion of Force and Diplomacy." In *The Back Channel: A Memoir of American Diplomacy and the Case for Its Renewal*, 147–199. New York: Random House, 2019.
- Murray, Shoon and Anthony Quainton. "Combatant Commanders, Ambassadorial Authority, and the Conduct of Diplomacy." In *Mission Creep: The Militarization of Foreign Policy?*, edited by Gordon Adams and Shoon Murray, 166–191. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2014.
- Bednar, Jenna and Mariano-Florentino Cuéllar. "Federalism and Foreign Policy: The Role of States." *Council on Foreign Relations*, Nov 10, 2022. (WATCH 0:00–20:55 ONLY.)



IS – 19

Indo-Pacific

Focus

The Indo-Pacific region is one of the most dynamic in the world where the United States has important economic and security interests. While assessments of the region's future continue to be guardedly optimistic, many serious challenges remain. A number of issues raise questions regarding the future of peace and stability in the region including North Korea's nuclear and ballistic missile ambitions, a plethora of island disputes, and concern for Taiwan as potential flashpoints for conflict. With the growth of economic and military power in the Indo-Pacific and the U.S. focus on this region, it is essential that national security professionals have a clear and detailed understanding of the region's security dynamics.

Objectives

- Identify and assess United States and regional interests in the Asia-Pacific region.
- Identify and analyze threats, challenges, and opportunities for the United States and other countries in the Asia-Pacific region.

Session Guidance Questions

- What does it mean to have a “free and open Indo-Pacific”? What is your assessment of the U.S regional strategy (strengths and weaknesses)?
- How is Japan's strategy evolving in light of emerging security challenges in Northeast Asia?
- What dangers does a nuclear-capable North Korea pose for the region? How should South Korea respond?
- What is the future of the U.S.-India partnership and what national interests do the two countries have in common? Looking to the future, what are the limits and opportunities in this relationship?
- How should the United States assess the growing geopolitical importance of the Pacific Island region?
- How will U.S.-China competition likely manifest in this region?

Essential Preparation

- Blinken, Antony J. “A Free and Open Indo-Pacific.” Speech at Universitas Indonesia, 14 December 2021.
- Matsuda, Takuya. “Japan's Emerging Security Strategy.” *Washington Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (Spring 2023): 85-102.
- Kim, Min-hyung. “Is Non-Nuclearization Sustainable? Explaining South Korea's Strategic Choices.” *Washington Quarterly* 46, no. 2 (Summer 2023): 127-140.
- Markey, Daniel. “India as It Is: Washington and New Delhi Share Interests, Not Values.” *Foreign Affairs*, 16 June 2023.
- Yu Lei and Sophia Sui. “China-Pacific Island Countries Strategic Partnership: China's Strategy to Reshape the Regional Order.” *East Asia* 39, no. 1 (March 2022): 81-96.
- The NSA Debrief: “Korea.” U.S. Naval War College video, 2023.



FPA – 20

Using Information

Focus

In this session we will identify and analyze the key players, processes, and dynamics involved in using the information instrument of power. We will focus particularly on concepts of strategic narrative, public diplomacy, the collection and processing of intelligence, and how emerging tech and private sector actors have affected the strategic use of information. This session builds on your understanding of the executive branch and the domestic political system and encourages forward-looking application of FPA course concepts.

Objectives

- Understand the importance of strategic narratives and how “shaping the narrative” is a form of power.
- Define public diplomacy and analyze who conducts it and how.
- Evaluate how emerging tech and non-government actors can shape the intelligence process.
- Assess the United States government’s use of information through a case study.

Session Guidance Questions

- What are the fora for U.S. national security decision-makers to coordinate on strategic messaging? What obstacles does such coordination face?
- What are the challenges and opportunities for the U.S. government to use information in our networked world? Both as intelligence and as messaging or narrative?
- Does the U.S. government’s use of information differ from that of authoritarian governments? How? Why?

Essential Preparation

- Simpson, Emile. “Strategic Narrative.” In *War from The Ground Up: Twenty First Century Combat as Politics*, 179–206. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013. (READ 179-193 ONLY)
- USC Center on Public Diplomacy. “What is Public Diplomacy.”
- Lecheler, Sophie, and Jana Laura Egelhofer. “Disinformation, Misinformation, and Fake News: Understanding the Supply Side.” In *Knowledge Resistance in High-Choice Information Environments*, edited by Jesper Strömbäck, Åsa Wikforss, Kathrin Glüer, Torun Lindholm and Henrik Oscarsson, 69–87. New York: Routledge, 2022.
- Office of the Director of National Intelligence. *Behind the Scenes of the President’s Daily Brief*, posted July 26, 2023.
- Zegart, Amy. “Open Secrets: Ukraine and the Next Intelligence Revolution.” *Foreign Affairs*, September 20, 2022.
- Marrin, Stephen. “Why Strategic Intelligence Analysis Has Limited Influence on American Foreign Policy.” *Intelligence and National Security* 32, no. 6 (2017): 725–42.
- Brauhnler, Walter. “Intelligence and Information in Ukraine, A USNWC Case Study on How 2014 Differed From 2022” Newport, RI: National Security Affairs Department, U.S. Naval War College, 2023.



IS – 20

Europe and Russia

Focus

The goal of this session is to provide an overview of the Euro-Atlantic basin and the dynamics of European security and the trans-Atlantic relationship. It will also examine the challenge Russia poses to the Euro-Atlantic community.

Objectives

- Understand and assess the importance of the trans-Atlantic relationship to U.S. national security.
- Identify and analyze the principal challenges and issues facing the Euro-Atlantic community.
- Understand the Russian strategic outlook and points of contention with U.S. preferences.
- Assess trends in the trans-Atlantic oceanic region and their likely impact on U.S. interests.

Session Guidance Questions

- What role can the United States play in European security, both within the NATO alliance as well as through other means? How important is European security to U.S. security?
- What contributions do Europe and the United States both make to European and global security? Has the balance and focus of contributions shifted over time? How does Russia's war in Ukraine change this?
- How do you assess the full range of threats to security in the European theater? How do divergences in threat perception between European states and across the Atlantic complicate joint approaches?
- How far should the Euro-Atlantic zone expand? How committed are current EU and NATO members to continue to enlarge? How much of this is a driver for deteriorating conditions with Russia?
- To what extent is the U.S.-Russia relationship driven by developments in Europe? Can the United States reach accommodation with Russia in other parts of the world if tensions in Europe are unresolved?
- What are Russia's strategic objectives? How do they impact U.S. preferences? Are Russia and the United States destined to be strategic competitors?

Essential Preparation

- Mattox, Gale A. "The Transatlantic Security Landscape in Europe," *Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*, 2018.
- *NATO 2022 Strategic Concept*, Adopted by Heads of State and Government at the NATO Summit in Madrid 29 June 2022.
- Shea, Jamie, Piret Pernik, Dorthe Bach Nyemann, Juliette Bird, Vincenzo Coppola, and Lucie Beraud-Sudreau, *EU-NATO Cooperation: A Secure Vision for Europe, Friends of Europe*, 3 June 2019. (READ Introduction, Cyber Security, Burden Sharing, and Hybrid Threats.)
- Kuleba, Dmytro. "Why NATO Must Admit Ukraine," *Foreign Affairs*, 25 April 2023.
- Fisher, Sabine, Nadine Godehardt, André Härtel, Hanns Günther Hilpert, Margarete Klein, Janis Kluge, Claudia Major, Nicolai von Ondarza, Marco Overhaus, Christian Schaller, and Johannes Thimm. "Russian Attack on Ukraine: A Turning Point for Euro-Atlantic Security," *SWP*, 3 March 2022.
- Stoner, Kathryn, and Michael McFaul. "Who Lost Russia (This Time)? Vladimir Putin." *The Washington Quarterly* 38, no. 2 (2015): 167-187.
- Putin, Vladimir. *Speech delivered at the Munich Security Conference*, 10 February 2007.
- *The New York Times*, "Twenty Years of Putin Playing the West in 3 Minutes." 24 May 2022. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pCCTf17ZiIs> (3min.)



FPA – 21

Using Military Force

Focus

This session discusses the authorities, powers, and influences that underpin a decision to use military force. The U.S. Congress has not invoked its constitutional power to formally declare war since the Second World War, yet U.S. forces have engaged in hundreds of military operations and combat situations since then, while U.S. leaders have threatened to use military force in many more instances. The readings discuss a wide range of tools that the executive and legislative branches of the U.S. government have available when deciding to use military force (or not), providing case studies of how these decisions have been made in the past.

Objectives

- Comprehend the tools available to executive and legislative branches when deciding to use military force.
- Understand what powers and authorities the president has to use—or threaten to use—military force and the role of Congress in these decisions.
- Analyze how the U.S. Constitution, foreign policy process, strategy, and other factors affect contemporary decisions to use military force.

Session Guidance Questions

- What range of powers and authorities are available to the U.S. president in deciding to use military force? How have these powers and authorities changed—or been interpreted differently—over time and why?
- Relating back to FPA and IS sessions on the Constitution, Cuban Missile Crisis, Congress, Diplomacy, Deterrence, and more, what role has Congress played (or not) in use of force decisions and why?
- How does the War Powers Resolution impact presidential use of force decisions today? What other constraints exist against using military force?
- Presidents have at times declared a “red line” as a warning to U.S. adversaries. What is the nature of a red line, and how does it affect decisions to use military force? What role do the president and broader executive branch play in declaring a red line, and what, if any, role does Congress play?

Essential Preparation

- Elsea, Jennifer K. “Defense Primer: Legal Authorities for the Use of Military Force.” *In Focus*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, Updated December 14, 2022.
- Waxman, Matthew C. “The Power to Threaten War.” *The Yale Law Journal* 123, no. 6 (2014): 1626-1691. (READ 1635–1653 and 1658–1662 ONLY.)
- Chollet, Derek. “Obama’s Red Line Revisited.” *Politico Magazine*, July 19, 2016.
- Ackerman, Bruce and Oona Hathaway. “Limited War and the Constitution: Iraq and the Crisis of Presidential Legality.” *Michigan Law Review* 109 no. 4 (2011): 448–476.



IS – 21

Greater Middle East and Central Asia

Focus

While the National Defense Strategy prioritizes the Indo-Pacific and China as the pacing challenge, the Middle East continues to occupy a central role in U.S. foreign policy. U.S. national interests focus on energy security, access to critical minerals and rare earths, civil war spillage, refugee flows, and political instability. Historical challenges include: Israeli-Palestinian tensions, 1980 Carter Doctrine, Global War on Terror, 2011 Arab Awakening, Iranian and Saudi proxy battles for influence, persistence of the Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict, and growing Chinese and Russian economic and military activities. Such issues mean the United States is still focused on promoting stability in the Greater Middle East and Central Asia to ensure trade flows, combating violent non-state actors and extremism, and nuclear nonproliferation.

Objectives

- Identify and analyze U.S. geopolitical interests in the Greater Middle East and Central Asia.
- Understand and describe the threats, challenges, and opportunities facing the United States and its allies and partners relative to strategic competitors (e.g., China, Russia, Turkey, etc.) in the region.
- Comprehend what alternatives exist for U.S. planning for current and future operations in the region.
- Analyze the complex relationships between neighboring countries and the interplay of various state (e.g., China, Russia, etc.) and non-state actors (e.g., violent extremist organizations, etc.).
- Evaluate the rationale for the United States conducting security assistance and cooperation to influence the region.

Session Guidance Questions

- Why is the region of the Greater Middle East and Central Asia strategically important? Are there alternative ways of competing in the region?
- What issues threaten the region currently and for the future? What should be prioritized by the West?
- How will U.S. strategic engagement or disengagement in the region shape stability, relations, and security?
- What forms of military and economic assistance are effective in the region? Are there alternative approaches to improving regional security and stability in the Greater Middle East and Central Asia?
- What are the implications of strategic competitors (e.g., China, Russia, Turkey, etc.) gaining influence across the Greater Middle East and Central Asia? How can the United States better compete for influence to counter these actions?

Essential Preparation

- Scheinmann, Gabriel. "The Map that Ruined the Middle East." *The Tower*, July 2013.
- Katulis, Brian, et. al. "2022 Trends and Drivers to Watch in the Middle East." *Middle East Institute*, 18 January 2022.
- Springborg, Robert, et. al. "Security Assistance in the Middle East: A Three Dimensional Chessboard." *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* (2020). (READ 1-31)
- Muratalieva, Nargiza. "Central Asia 2022: Forecasts, Trends, and Risks." *Central Asian Bureau for Analytical Reporting*, 1 July 2022.
- Šćepanović, Janko. "The Sheriff and the Banker? Russia and China in Central Asia." *War on the Rocks*, 13 June 2022.



FPA – 22

Using Economic Statecraft

Focus

Economic policy is a critical component of foreign policy, as discussed previously in International Security. Using the tools of economic statecraft is a complex, interdisciplinary effort involving executive and legislative branches of government, a variety of monetary and financial institutions with global reach, and the private sector. This session examines the agents of foreign policy economic power and the range of foreign policy tools available, including coercive tools such as quotas, tariffs, sanctions, and export controls, along with positive incentives such as trade, security assistance, and economic development.

Objectives

- Identify and differentiate the multiple actors involved in economic statecraft.
- Distinguish the primary tools of economic statecraft and analyze them in both coercive and friendly scenarios.
- Explore the role of the interagency in using economic tools to advance foreign policy goals.
- Consider the challenges and trade-offs the United States faces when confronted with the dilemma of protecting national security while also maintaining economic and technological advantages.

Session Guidance Questions

- What is the purpose of economic statecraft, which actors and processes are involved, and are the obstacles and limitations?
- What tradeoffs do policymakers consider when using economic tools to advance national security goals?
- How does the United States use economic “carrots” such as trade, loans, and economic assistance?
- How does the two-level games framework help us understand recent use of economic tools, from cooperation with emerging markets to sanctions against Russia?

Essential Preparation

- Cloud, John A. and Gvosdev, Nikolas K. “How U.S. Economic Policymaking is Distinct from its National Security Counterpart.” In *A Policy Analysis Reader*. Newport, RI: National Security Affairs Department, U.S. Naval War College, 2018. [Revised 2023.]
- Rosenberg, Elizabeth, Peter Harrell, Paula J. Dobriansky and Adam Szubin. “America’s Use of Coercive Economic Statecraft: A Report from Select Members of CNAS Task Force on the Future of U.S. Coercive Economic Statecraft.” Center for a New American Security, December 2020.
- Chivvis, Christopher and Kapstein, Ethan B. “U.S. Strategy and Economic Statecraft: Understanding the Tradeoffs.” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, April 28, 2022.
- Knapper, Marc E. “Building Resilient Supply Chains: Enhancing Cooperation with India, Vietnam, and Other Emerging Markets.” Center for Strategic and International Studies, July 19, 2022. (WATCH 4:15–19:00).
- Saravalle, Edoardo. “Why Congress Should Stay Out of U.S. Sanctions Policy on Russia.” *Just Security*, March 21, 2022.
- Waldman, Benjamin I. and Elizabeth Goitein. “The Russia Sanctions – How They Work and What Congress Needs to Know.” *Just Security*, March 31, 2022.



IS – 22

Africa

Focus

Countries in Africa have long been an afterthought from the perspective of strategic thinkers in Washington DC. African countries are usually overlooked, dealt with only in crisis (although often still overlooked then), and addressed in ways that are inconsistent and having more to do with bureaucratic interest and selective U.S. constituencies who care strongly about one issue or another. This haphazard approach is short sighted for many reasons, including the fact that over the next twenty years African youth will account for a large portion of the net labor-force growth in the world and many of the minerals necessary for the world economy are found in Africa. In addition, while the United States might place a low priority on African affairs, other countries do not. This session is designed to introduce students to some of the key strategic issues and debates concerning the region.

Objectives

- Analyze the global and regional factors that shape the regional security environment.
- Assess the threats and opportunities for U.S. interests and strategy presented by the regional security environment.

Session Guidance Questions

- What are U.S. interests in Africa? What are the most important strategic challenges, threats and opportunities to U.S. interests in Africa?
- From the perspective of African leaders, what are their most pressing priorities and where is this consistent with or in opposition to U.S. priorities?
- To what extent does great power competition impact African countries? How do the activities of China and Russia have an impact on the relationship between the United States and African countries?
- How do important global issues (such as climate change, migration), regional issues (such as terrorism, maritime security) and domestic issues (such as military coups) impact security in the region?

Essential Preparation

- Wilkins, Sam. "Does America Need an Africa Strategy?" *War on the Rocks*, 2 April 2020.
- Goldstone, Jack A. and John F. May. "The Global Economy's Future Depends on Africa." *Foreign Affairs*, 18 May 2023.
- Schrader, Matt and J. Michael Cole. "China Hasn't Given Up on the Belt and Road: Beijing's Development Aid Plan Is Less Flashy—but No Less Ambitious." *Foreign Affairs*, 7 February 2023.
- Singh, Naunihal. "The Myth of Coup Contagion," *Journal of Democracy*, October 2022.
- Kardon, Isaac. "Episode 6: Maritime Competition in African Waters." *Sea Power Podcast* 6 (2023). <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/seapower/6/>
- The NSA Debrief: "Africa." U.S. Naval War College video, 2023.



FPA – 23

Future Foreign Policy Challenges: The Taiwan Question

Focus

This session exercises students' policy analysis skills as applied to a future-oriented national security decision-making challenge. The objective of this session is to determine analytically what actors, factors, dynamics, powers, and influences in the policymaking ecosystem are likely to affect a future policy decision, providing insights into how U.S. policy might be decided in such a circumstance. Having a detailed understanding of the U.S. foreign policymaking apparatus and dynamics will provide students with strategic foresight essential to the military and national security professional.

Objectives

- Comprehend and analyze the range of policy actors, factors, dynamics, and influences that could affect U.S. policy regarding a critical national security concern.
- Apply FPA concepts and tools to determine the art of the possible in a hypothetical future-oriented policymaking situation.

Session Guidance Questions

- The fictional (but realistic) scenario involves a surprise invasion by the People's Republic of China (PRC) of Taiwan-administered islands (Quemoy and Matsu) that lie just offshore from the PRC mainland. Faculty will provide additional details on this scenario prior to or during class (no additional research is needed). What, if anything, would the U.S. government be likely to do in response?
- The required readings provide insights into how U.S., PRC, and Taiwanese officials reacted to past crises, particularly related to the three Taiwan Straits Crises (1954–55, 1958, and 1995–6). How did myriad domestic and international dynamics and pressures affect policymakers? How has Beijing perceived and responded to past crises involving the United States?
- Students will also find earlier session readings relevant, particularly the FPA-10 readings on the 1995–96 Taiwan Straits Crisis and IS material on Indo-Pacific regional matters and current U.S. strategies. Finally, sessions on China in the 21st Century and Asia- and China-focused sessions from the Strategy and Policy (or Strategy and War) course should also prove useful context.

Essential Preparation

- U.S. Department of State, Office of the Historian. "The Taiwan Straits Crises: 1954–55 and 1958." In *Milestones: 1953–60*. Washington, DC: Foreign Service Institute, U.S. Department of State.
- Mann, Jim. "Crisis Over Taiwan," In *About Face: A History of America's Curious Relationship with China from Nixon to Clinton*, 315–348. First edition, New York: Alfred Knopf, 1999.
- Wu, Xinbo. "Managing Crisis and Sustaining Peace Between China and the United States." Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace (2008.) (READ 7–10; 23–37 ONLY.)
- "Introduction." In *US-Taiwan Relations in a New Era: Responding to a More Assertive China*. Independent Task Force Report No. 81 (New York, NY: Council on Foreign Relation, June 2023.)
- Chien, Amy Chiang, John Liu and Paul Mozur. "Fight or Surrender: Taiwan's Generational Divide on China's Threats." *The New York Times*, August 5, 2022.



IS – 23

Western Hemisphere

Focus

The Western Hemisphere is one of the most important and influential parts of the world with respect to global security and economic development. Countries of the region, particularly in the Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), have experienced U.S. military interventions creating a challenging environment for U.S. foreign policy. U.S. policymakers must accept the new “diplomatic competitiveness” as a more sophisticated Latin America increasingly engages partners such as China, India, Russia, and Iran. The challenge for the current U.S. administration is to implement policies that both respect the growing economic and political independence of Latin America and protect the U.S. homeland from regional insecurity.

Objectives

- Identify and analyze how major political, economic, and geopolitical trends affect the security of countries in Latin America, the Caribbean, and the Western Hemisphere in general.
- Identify and assess United States and regional interests in the Western Hemisphere.
- Identify key threats, challenges, and opportunities to the United States and other Western Hemisphere nations.

Session Guidance Questions

- What are the U.S. interests in the Western Hemisphere? How should the United States prioritize this region?
- How should the United States respond to transnational security challenges such as criminal cartels, migration, trade, climate change, and economic issues to increase regional stability?
- How do you assess great power competition in the Western Hemisphere? What strategies and elements of national power should the United States utilize to counter China? Is China’s influence overstated?
- How does LAC’s colonial history shape contemporary regional, political, and cultural characteristics?

Essential Preparation

- U.S. Congress. U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, Report to Congress. 107th Cong. 1st Sess, HR Rep, Ch 2, Sect 2, *China’s Influence in Latin America and the Caribbean*, (2021): 69-102.
- Kline, Harvey F., and Christine J. Wade. *Latin American Politics and Development*. Taylor and Francis, 2022. [READ Part I - 1. The Context of Latin American Politics, 2. A Brief History of Latin America, and 6. Latin America and the United States.]
- Vanherck, Glen. “NORAD and USNORTHCOM Strategy: Executive Summary.” March 2021. (READ 1-16.)



FPA – 24

The Afghanistan Withdrawal

Focus

This session will allow students to demonstrate comprehension of the material presented in the Foreign Policy Analysis sub-course in preparation for the final exam. Students will use course concepts and materials, as well as the case study information provided, to analyze the Biden Administration's April 2021 decision to withdraw all forces from Afghanistan by September 11, 2021.

Objectives

- Demonstrate the ability to synthesize FPA concepts and theories presented throughout the course.
- Demonstrate the ability to assess and evaluate which influences and actors were the most critical in the case study provided.

Session Guidance Questions

- What were the most important factors that led to the April decision to withdraw all forces and, what factors influenced the decision to stay the course as conditions on the ground deteriorated?
- Can you apply and distinguish between the analytical perspectives in this case study analysis?
- What were the national interests at stake? What options were available/considered?
- What were the major organizations involved and what were their interests? Who won and who "lost?"
- What was the role of Congress? The Intelligence Community? Did civil-military Relations, public opinion, the media, or other factors play a role?
- Your instructor will provide additional guidance on how your seminar will discuss the case in class.

Essential Preparation

- McVay, Daniel, Theo Milonopoulos, and Andrew Stigler. "Departure Time: The American Exit from Afghanistan." U.S. Naval War College, January 2023.
- The Doha Agreement. "Agreement for Bringing Peace to Afghanistan." Signed in Doha, Qatar, February 29, 2020.
- Biden, Joseph. "Excerpts from four White House statements." April 2021–August 2021.
- Sanger, David, E. "Biden's Decision Prioritizes Nation-Building at Home, Not in Kabul." *The New York Times*, April 14, 2021.
- Cooper, Helene, Eric Schmitt and David E. Sanger. "Debating Exit, Biden Rejected Generals' Views." *The New York Times*, April 18, 2021.
- Gordon, Michael, Gordon Lubold, Vivian Salama and Jessica Donati. "Inside Biden's Afghanistan Withdrawal Plan: Warnings, Doubts but Little Change." *The Wall Street Journal*, September 5, 2021.



IS – 24

Cyber, Technology and the Future of War

Focus

The Future Warfighting Symposium and the previous 23 International Security sessions analyzed the international security environment and assessed the utility of various grand strategies to advance and defend U.S. national interests. This final session examines questions regarding the future of conflict, war, and emerging technologies. IS-24 is designed to help students think about the future of warfare (including the role of cyber) and its operational and strategic implications. The Final Exercise (FX) is future oriented, and this lesson will place your seminar in the right frame of mind encouraging strategically-minded thinking for the FX.

Objectives

- Think about what the future of warfare and strategic competition may entail.
- Assess potential implications for the future security environment, grand strategy, design concepts, and force planning.

Session Guidance Questions

- How will changes in the international system, technology, and the environment influence warfare and strategic competition?
- How and with what will future wars be fought?
- Where are wars most likely to occur and over what?
- Who is the United States most likely to fight should it go to war?
- Based on your answers, be able to discuss what you think are the main strategic implications.

Essential Preparation

- Cohen, Raphael S., Nathan Chandler, Shira Efron, Bryan Frederick, Eugeniu Han, Kurt Klein, Forrest E. Morgan, Ashley L. Rhoades, Howard J. Shatz, and Yuliya Shokh, Peering into the Crystal Ball: Holistically Assessing the Future of Warfare. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2020. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB10073.html.
- Emerging or Evolving Dynamics (International Level), *The Future of the Battlefield*, Washington, DC: National Intelligence Council, 2021.
- Johnson, James. "Artificial Intelligence: A Threat to Strategic Stability." *Strategic Studies Quarterly* 14, no. 1 (June 2021): 16-39.
- Shultz, D. "Weaponizing the Past to Control the Present: Russia's Cognitive Temporal Warfare." *NATO Defence College Policy Brief*, 12 September 2023. (READ 1-10.)
- O'Brien, Phillips. "The War that Defied Expectations, What Ukraine Revealed About Military Power." *Foreign Affairs*, 27 July 2023.



NSDM FX-01

The Final Exercise Introduction

Focus

The Final Exercise (FX) is the NSDM capstone event where students must demonstrate that they understand and can apply concepts from the International Security and Foreign Policy Analysis sub-courses. Each seminar will play the role of a NSC strategic planning working group tasked with conducting a global strategic assessment, developing outlines of a National Security Strategy and National Military Strategy, developing four strategic concepts, and crafting a vision of a future joint force that will advance and defend U.S. national interests over the next 20 years.

Objectives

- Demonstrate understanding of a wide range of NSDM course concepts through this capstone exercise.

Session Guidance

- Your working group is assigned to produce and present a global strategic estimate of the future security environment over the near (0-5 years), medium (5-15 years), and long (15-20 years) term, and outline of a National Security Strategy, an outline of a National Military Strategy, four strategic concepts (at least one of which must be DoD-focused) necessary to advance the strategies, and a vision of the required future joint force. Finally, the seminar must choose one aspect of their NSS or NMS, one strategic concept, or an aspect of their required future joint force, and describe in detail how the initiative would be executed or accomplished.
- The output will be a brief between 40 and 45 minutes in length, including the six elements outlined above, followed by a 30-min Q&A period. Seminars will designate at least two briefers. All students are expected to participate in the Q&A.
- The teaching team will be available as consultants but will not lead the seminar's efforts. Seminars must do a rehearsal of their brief with their teaching team no later than the Seminar Presentation Review (FX-07).
- For presentation grading, seminars will be organized in groups and will present their briefings to a common faculty grading panel. Time and location of the final presentation, and grading panel members, will be provided by the FX Director during product development.
- For presentation grading, time and location of the final presentation and grading panel members will be provided by the National Security Affairs Department during product development.
- The grading panel will evaluate the seminar's ability to clearly communicate their strategic proposal in oral and visual forms in accordance with the Final Exercise presentation review rubric provided in the FX-07 syllabus page and the grading criteria provided in the FX-08 syllabus page. Because the NSDM Final Exercise is designed as a team-based exercise, each seminar receives one grade that applies to all seminar members.

Essential Preparation

- Greer, Jim, "The Weaker Foe," *Strategy Bridge*, March 7, 2017.
- Flournoy, Michele. 2021. "America's Military Risks Losing Its Edge: How to Transform the Pentagon for a Competitive Era." *Foreign Affairs* 100, No. 3 (May/June): 76-91.



NSDM FX-02 through FX-06

Seminar Product Development

Focus

Throughout this course, students have learned concepts, skills, and substantive information about the global security environment. Armed with this knowledge, the seminar will work as a team to produce a global strategic assessment over the next twenty years, develop an outline of a national security strategy to manage threats and risks and pursue U.S. interests, develop an outline national military strategy, devise four strategic concepts, and develop a vision of a future joint force that supports the proposed strategy. This exercise is designed for the seminar to work collaboratively to develop these deliverables.

Objectives

- Create a 40–45-minute oral and visual presentation that outlines the seminar’s global strategic estimate, outline NSS and NMS, three operating concepts, a vision of the required future joint force, and an implementation case.
-

Session Guidance

- Global Strategic Estimate:
 - The seminar is not bound by current strategic documents and should determine its own national priorities and preferences. The seminar should understand the security environment and consider contributions of all instruments of national power. The seminar should evaluate the major trends that may challenge the U.S. government's ability to advance and defend those interests over the near (0-5 years), medium (5-15 years), and long (15-20 years) term. Consider what is happening in terms of demographics, economics, politics, the environment, etc.
 - Where might U.S. interests align with those of other actors, and where might there be tension?
 - Consider both the likelihood and the severity of various potentially negative global or regional events/trends.
- Outline National Security Strategy:
 - Having determined which trends and actors the United States would like to influence, the seminar will develop an outline of a national security strategy.
 - What is the seminar's vision or desired strategic condition (Ends) for the world in each time period? The purpose for the near, medium, and long-term analysis lenses is to encourage the seminar to think about threat not just in terms of likelihood and severity, but urgency and order of occurrence.
 - Describe and discuss concepts and activities the U.S. government could employ (Ways) required to achieve the seminar’s strategic objectives. These should be general descriptions – detail will be provided later in the presentation.
 - Which other actors will the United States need to influence to arrive at this end-state? What forms of leverage might the United States have over these actors? How can the United States exert that leverage at the least cost/risk?
- Outline National Military Strategy:



NSDM FX-02 through FX-06

Seminar Product Development

- The seminar will formulate an outline for a National Military Strategy (NMS) that broadly describes how the military instrument of power will be utilized to advance and defend the national interests outlined in their National Security Strategy.
- The seminar should be sure to consider inherent risks contained within the proposed military strategic approach. De-risking and offsetting should be considered and discussed given the need to balance and conduct “ruthless prioritization” when it comes to campaigning and development of the future force.
- 4 Strategic Concepts (at least one DoD focused):
 - Describe four strategic concepts the seminar believes the U.S. government needs to carry out its strategy.
 - At least one of these must be a military joint force operating concept; the others may be whole-of-government in nature. Be sure to identify the lead agency and key stakeholders within each concept.
 - Review Professor Jim Cook’s article, “The Importance of Joint Concepts for the Planner” for historical examples of Joint Force operating concepts.
- Vision of Future Joint Force:
 - Develop a conceptual Joint Force that supports the NSS and NMS and can achieve the strategic objectives assigned to the military. Here, you should describe broad strategic and operational force characteristics required to support the NSS/NMS/operating concepts. As an example, review the March 7, 2022 CRS Reports on USMC Force Design for 2030 and apply that type of thought process to the Joint Force. Be sure to address issues of divestment and investment (which platforms would you eliminate? Which capabilities would you seek?), modernization (where would you focus R&D? Which types of platforms need a next-generation upgrade and why?), organization (is the U.S. military organized well to deal with future threats?), and any other aspect of force planning that you think supports your NSS/NMS/operating concepts.
 - You should focus on the strategic appropriateness of your proposed force, but you must be aware of the political and budgetary feasibility issues it would entail. Furthermore, you should consider the risks, obstacles, and tradeoffs over the near, medium, and long term associated with realizing your future force concept. You should expect your grading panel to ask you policy-relevant questions about how you would justify your proposed force concept to, e.g., members of Congress. The seminar must be able to persuade the grading panel that they have considered likely obstacles to their plan and have a reasonable argument that their plan is both necessary and feasible. This is likely to include a discussion of what trade-offs the seminar might propose to get their recommended force concept.
- Implementation Case:
 - Identify one of the more challenging or ambitious aspects of the seminar’s ideas that would require the supporting efforts of a senior leader to facilitate its successful implementation. This can be an element of the NSS or NMS, one of the strategic concepts, or an element of the future joint force vision.



NSDM FX-02 through FX-06

Seminar Product Development

- Based on the issue, the seminar will identify the senior leader charged with its implementation (for example, President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, CJCS, Service Chief, or Combatant Commander).
- Identify the relevant stakeholders (for example, Secretary of Defense, CJCS, Service Chiefs, Secretary of State, Congress, special interest groups, or foreign governments) that may oppose or support the initiative. What are their interests?
- Address the full range of influences and obstacles associated with the implementation of the seminar's challenging or ambitious idea or innovation. The seminar must consider the influence of domestic politics and international relations (for example, organizational resistance, existing legislation or policies, industry sectors, media interest, lobbyists, or international norms).
- Provide specific recommendations that explain how the senior leader could convince the relevant stakeholders to support the initiative's implementation. The recommendations should include a plan to overcome any identified opposition or obstacles, while directly addressing the stakeholders' interests (for example, the benefits of the initiative for the stakeholders).
- Depending on the complexity of the initiative, the seminar's recommendations could include an implementation timeline or key milestones that describe specific actions that the senior leader would take to obtain necessary support.

Essential Preparation

- James Cook. "The Importance of Joint Concepts for the Planner," *Joint Force Quarterly*, Issue 99, 4th Quarter 2020, pp. 95-100.



NSDM FX-07

Seminar Presentation Review

Focus

This session provides a dedicated time for the seminar to present their FX Presentation to their faculty consultant team for feedback.

Objectives

- Conduct a rehearsal of the seminar's FX presentation and receive feedback from the faculty consultant team.
- Complete "FX Main Themes" questionnaire.

Session Guidance

- This session concludes the preparation phase for the NSDM Final Exercise. The seminar should be prepared to present the briefing in a format and manner which closely resembles the final product that will be graded.
- The seminar may choose, in consultation with the faculty teaching team, to conduct this rehearsal prior to the date FX-07 is scheduled on the NSDM calendar.
- No later than this session's scheduled date, the seminar will complete NSDM FX product development by making desired changes to the presentation. After the final changes are made, and no later than 1600 on this session's scheduled date, seminars must electronically submit their presentation/brief to the FX Director and Deputy-Director. This submission is NOT a read ahead for the grading panels. Seminars should brief their grading panels with the expectation that no read-ahead was provided. Seminars are not allowed to make changes to their presentation slides after submitting their briefs to the FX Director. However, seminars are authorized to practice their briefs until their scheduled presentation and may edit or adjust the verbal portion as desired.
 - FX Director: CDR Sean Mahoney, sean.mahoney@usnwc.edu
 - FX Deputy Director: LtCol Dan McVay, daniel.mcvay@usnwc.edu
- The "FX Main Themes" questionnaire will be made available at the conclusion of FX-07. Each seminar will complete an online questionnaire to catalogue the main themes of their FX products by FX-09. The questionnaire link will be delivered via Blackboard.

Essential Preparation

- There are no required readings for this session.



NSDM FX-07

Seminar Presentation Review

Presentation Review Checklist

CONTENT	<p>Meets FX requirements</p> <p>Demonstrates clear understanding of NSDM course concepts</p> <p>Strategic estimate, NSS, NMS, operating concepts, future force concept, and implementation case are aligned, consistent and mutually supporting</p> <p>Innovative</p> <p>Seminar makes a strong case for feasibility</p>
STRUCTURE	<p>Material logically presented</p> <p>Distinctly describes the six required elements</p> <p>Key concepts evident</p> <p>Strong concluding position</p>
SUPPORT	<p>Credibility of material</p> <p>Assumptions validated</p> <p>Relevance to theme</p> <p>Verbal / visual presentation synergy</p>
STYLE	<p>Persuasively presented</p> <p>Professional, engaging</p> <p>Pace, tempo, delivery clarity</p> <p>Audience contact</p>
MISC	<p>Responds well to questions</p> <p>Managed discussion</p> <p>Considered strategic surprises (i.e., low-probability, high-impact events)</p> <p>Seminar participation in Q&A</p>



NSDM FX-08

Seminar Presentation To Grading Panel

Focus

The seminar will deliver their FX presentation to an assigned faculty grading panel. A distinguished visitor with senior national government experience may also attend the brief. The DV will participate in the Q&A and feedback but will not be involved in the grading process.

Objectives

- Effectively deliver a 40–45-minute presentation which covers the seminar’s global strategic estimate, outline NSS and NMS, four strategic concepts, and an implementation case.
- Effectively answer questions asked by the faculty panel for 30 minutes in clear, articulate, and complete manner.

Session Guidance

- The faculty teaching team will provide additional guidance on the conduct of FX-08 including the specific time and location for the seminar presentation. The seminar must bring four black and white copies of the presentation (two slides per page) for use by the panel. The FX is a team effort; it is expected that all seminar members will participate during the presentation or Q&A period.
- The grading panel will deliberate and evaluate each seminar’s ability to clearly communicate their strategic proposal in oral and visual forms in accordance with the Final Exercise evaluation rubric provided in the FX-07 syllabus page and the grading criteria provided in this syllabus page. Because the NSDM Final Exercise is designed as a team-based exercise, each seminar receives one grade that applies to all seminar members. Assessment results and grade feedback will be delivered to each seminar individually after all groups have presented. Specific presentation and grade delivery schedule times will be promulgated by the FX Director prior to this session.
- Evaluation Considerations:
 - Is the global strategic estimate, national and military strategies, strategic concepts, future joint force vision, and implementation case in alignment and do they reflect consistent analysis? Does the presentation consider geography, culture, class, ethnicity, and religion when appropriate? Does the presentation deliver a broad overview of the significant military, economic, political, environmental, and social issues that the seminar thinks should concern the U.S.? Is the information presented in a clear, logical and organized way?
 - Does the brief clearly articulate national priorities including the relative importance of the various instruments of national power in addressing the future operating environment? Do the NSS, NMS, and operating concepts address the issues identified in the global strategic estimate?
 - Does the seminar link their vision of the future joint force to the security assessment, strategies, and concepts? To what extent does the future joint force vision support the strategies? To what extent does the future joint force vision reflect the (military) operating concepts and necessary force attributes?
 - To what extent does the seminar's presentation provide innovative, well-argued and imaginative approaches to meet security environment challenges anticipated in the next twenty years?



NSDM FX-08

Seminar Presentation To Grading Panel

- To what extent is the seminar persuasive that their strategies and concepts are not only appropriate, but feasible from a policy perspective?
- Did the seminar choose a challenging or ambitious aspect of its presentation as an implementation case? Does the case identify the senior leader charged with its implementation and all relevant stakeholders? Did the seminar address the full range of domestic and international influences and obstacles associated with implementing the innovation or idea? Did the implementation case provide recommendations that explain how the senior leader will convince the relevant stakeholders to support the initiative's implementation?
- How well did the seminar handle the Q&A? Was there broad participation? Was the seminar able to discuss how it handled difficult questions and disagreements?

Essential Preparation

- There are no required readings for this session.



NSDM FX-09

FX and NSDM Conclusion Session

Focus

This optional final session is designed to provide students and teaching teams with the opportunity to debrief the Final Exercise experience and provide general take aways and time for discussion regarding NSDM as a whole.

Objectives

- Discuss FX presentation and grading panel feedback.
- Reflect on NSDM course concepts and learning objectives.
- Ensure “FX Main Themes” questionnaire is complete.

Session Guidance

- Seminars will coordinate the time and locations of FX-09 with their faculty teaching team. Seminars must complete their FX presentations and receive their grade from the grading panel PRIOR to conducting FX-09.
- Seminars must complete the “FX Main Themes” questionnaire by FX-09.

Essential Preparation

- There are no required readings for this session.