



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 2023 - June 2023





# NATIONAL SECURITY DECISION MAKING 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

## Guidance

- 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 Readings (49 Pages)

- Jones, James L. "Foreword: U.S. National Security for the Twenty-First Century" in *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*, 2018.
- 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), chapters 1 and 2 (pp. 13-76).
- 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.

## Recommended Readings

- Mazarr, Michael J., Astrid Stuth Cevallos, Miranda Priebe, Andrew Radin, Kathleen Reedy, Alexander D. Rothenberg, Julia A. Thompson, and Jordan Willcox, *Measuring the Health of the Liberal International Order*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2017, 1-25.
- Biden, Joseph, R. Jr. The White House, National Security Memorandum, Memorandum on Reviewing the National Security Council System, Feb 04, 2021





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 01

## THE PERSPECTIVES OF ANALYSIS

### Focus

Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) examines various theories to explain how the U.S. government makes decisions and provides an overview of the international, domestic, and bureaucratic forces that shape national security policy. This session lays out themes that will be discussed in more detail in subsequent sessions and explores ways in which the study of decision-making can be a valuable way to analyze foreign policy actions at the national level. These decisions often deal with issues such as going to war, negotiating a ceasefire, imposing sanctions, entering an alliance, or signing a treaty.

### OBJECTIVES

- Familiarize students with terms of art and examples of some of the more prevalent foreign policy analysis models
- Distinguish, through examples and discussion, the various lenses through which foreign policy decisions and actions can be interpreted
- Set the stage for more in-depth examination of theories and frameworks in following sessions

### Guidance

- The textbook chapter note 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? What is meant by the term “levels of analysis?”
- We shall be looking at the terms “two-level games” and “levels of analysis” in greater depth. For now, what do you see as the basic concepts behind these terms? In broad terms, how might they explain how international and domestic political systems interact to influence policy-making?
- Decision-makers inevitably must act with incomplete information. Foreign policy analysts face similar informational challenges. What information would be especially important in a foreign policy context, and what data are easiest to come by, harder to come by, and nearly impossible to come by? What tools and methods can analysts use to understand foreign policy actions and their consequences?
- Foreign policy analysts are never likely to have all the information they would want. At the same time analysts should never simply guess. At times they must infer and/or extrapolate. What do you see as the difference in these terms?

### Essential Readings (52 Pages)

- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain, and David A. Cooper, "Foreign Policy Analysis," Chapter 2 in *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 14-51.
- 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.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 01

## INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

### Focus

The NSDM International Security sub-course is designed to assist students in analyzing security issues at the international level including the development of national and military strategies that advance and defend U.S. interests in this international strategic context. 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

### Guidance

- What role should the United States play in world affairs? What does the label "Strategic Competition" really mean in terms of defining America's strategic priorities and objectives?
- What is grand strategy and why is it important? What is America's grand strategy?
- What is meant by the phrase "liberal international order"? What is the significance of President Harry Truman's 1947 speech (regarding assistance to Greece and Turkey)?
- 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 Readings (46 Pages)

- Wyne, Ali. 2022. "Great-Power Competition Isn't a Foreign Policy." *The Washington Quarterly* 45 (2): 7–21.
- Feaver, Peter D. "Eight Myths about American Grand Strategy," *Forging an American Grand Strategy: Security a Path Through a Complex Future*, ed. Sheila R. Ronis, 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.
- Truman, Harry. "Recommendation for Assistance to Greece and Turkey [Truman Doctrine Speech]," Address Before a Joint Session of the Senate and the House of Representatives, Recommending Assistance to Greece and Turkey, March 21, 1947, <https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/truman-doctrine>.
- 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, February 4, 2022.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 02

## CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS

### Focus

For thirteen days in October 1962, the United States and the Soviet Union moved inexorably to the very brink of nuclear war. At the center of the conflict were Cuba-based Soviet missiles that could deliver nuclear payloads to most of the United States. In a haze of uncertainty, tensions, and a maelstrom of often conflicting advice, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev and U.S. President John F. Kennedy sought to achieve their respective geostrategic and political objectives while avoiding war. Long presented as a model of presidential decision-making, a study of the crisis provides a much more complicated and nuanced understanding of how U.S. leaders dealt with the crisis and how narrowly nuclear war was averted. FPA presents this as the first in a series of case studies that will require an increasingly sophisticated understanding of analytical tools, critical thinking, and the ability to clearly provide explanatory power in dealing with U.S. foreign policy decision-making.

### OBJECTIVES

- Using the case of the Cuban Missile Crisis as a vehicle, identify the various actors and factors that impacted U.S. decision-making in October of 1962
- Examine how different perspectives of decision-making can be used to provide a more complete understanding of forces active in foreign policy decision-making
- Assess how such an understanding might be useful in determining probable outcomes of on-going national security decisions

### Guidance

- How can various FPA frameworks help us to understand the actions taken by the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cuban Missile Crisis?

### Essential Readings (63 Pages)

- Allison, Graham, "The Cuban Missile Crisis," in Foreign Policy: Theories Actors Cases, 3rd edition. eds Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield, and Tim Dunne. Oxford University Press, 2016, 256-279.
- Allison, Graham, "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis," The American Political Science Review, Vol. 63, No. 3, 1969, 689-718.
- Allison, Graham, "Putin's Doomsday Threat: How to Prevent a Repeat of the Cuban Missile Crisis in Ukraine," Foreign Affairs, April 5, 2022.

### Recommended Resources

- Allison, Graham and Philip Zelikow, "The Cuban Missile Crisis: A First Cut," Chapter 2 in Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. New York: Longman Press, 1999, 109-120.
- Allison, Graham and Philip Zelikow, "The Cuban Missile Crisis: A Second Cut," Chapter 4 in Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. New York: Longman Press, 1999. 217-236.
- Allison, Graham and Philip Zelikow, "The Cuban Missile Crisis: A Third Cut," Chapter 6 in Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. New York: Longman Press, 1999. 329-347.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 02

## INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY I

### Focus

Fundamental to assessing the security environment and developing strategy is answering a few basic questions: how does the world work? What motivates state behavior? Any attempt to answer these questions yields a theory, and we all have them, whether we recognize them as theories or not. Some thinkers have worked to make these theories clear and explicit and have come up with distinctly different sets of answers to these central questions. Much of social science is an attempt to determine which of these theories is more accurate, but in a realm as large and complex as the international system, it is not so much a question of which theory is correct, as a question of how different theories can help practitioners and scholars understand specific situations. In this session, we will be introduced to two dominant theories of international relations: Realism and Liberalism. In the next session, we will be introduced to two critical approaches - constructivism and feminism. In all cases, the theories are trying to answer questions about why things happen the way they do: 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? How do they apply pressure to one another? How do coercion and deterrence and cooperation work? These theories propose different answers to these questions. The objective is not to decide which theory is correct, but to collect from each theory the questions that can be useful for complex situations.

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the main theories of how states and other actors in the system behave
- Analyze how these theories can be useful for the practitioner - specifically how it helps the practitioner know what questions to ask

### Guidance

- What do these theories ASSUME about the world? What do they ARGUE about the world? Where do they fundamentally agree/disagree? What kinds of alternative policies would they propose in various situations? For example, what would a Realist recommend as US policy vis a vis China? Vis a vis Russia? What would a Liberal recommend?
- How would we tell 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? (tying in to FPA)

### Essential Readings (113 Pages)

- Mearsheimer, John J. The Tragedy of Great Power Politics. New York: Norton, 2001, 29-54.
- Walt, Stephen M. "Why Alliances Endure or Collapse." Survival: Global Politics and Strategy 39, no. 1 (1997): 156-79.
- Jervis, Robert. "Cooperation under the Security Dilemma." World Politics 30, no. 2 (1978): 167-214 PLUS worksheet.
- Keohane, Robert O. "International Institutions: Can Interdependence Work?" Foreign Policy no. 110 (1998): 82-94.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 03

## THE UNITARY STATE PERSPECTIVE

### Focus

In this session we will take our first in-depth look at one of the lenses we will use to better understand foreign policy. The unitary state perspective focuses on the state as a whole, operating as a cohesive entity. This perspective draws attention to states as unitary actors who make decisions through a process of weighing the costs and benefits of different options in the pursuit of national interests. This perspective assumes that all options are weighted, and the state is acting as a rational actor that will choose the best (optimized) policy based on its national interests. This is an idealized view of how we want government to work and in reality, we know that people, organizations, and external influences will impact policy (those factors will be discussed in future classes). Assuming that states act as rational unitary actors allows analysts to explain and predict a wide range of foreign policy actions. As a result, this perspective is widely used.

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend how states can be analyzed as unitary actors who make foreign policy decisions through a process of optimization
- Identify the strengths and limitations of the unitary state perspective
- Apply the unitary state perspective to a case study to better understand U.S. foreign policy

### Guidance

- What does it mean to think of a state as a unitary actor?
- What sorts of disagreements and divisions does this perspective assume away?
- What is "rational" decision-making, in a social science context? What would it mean for a state to make rational foreign policy decisions? What factors would we expect to influence these decisions?
- How does the unitary state perspective help us understand the U.S. One China Policy over the last 40 years? Can we apply the perspective to the PRC and Taiwan and their policies?
- Richard Bush, in his interview about Taiwan, states, "They are stuck with relying on the US" What does he mean?

### Essential Readings (58 Pages)

- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Unitary State Perspective," Chapter 3 in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 52-87.
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Annex: Case Studies," in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 378-382.
- Lawrence, Susan and Caitlin Campbell, "Taiwan: Political and Security Issues", Congressional Research Service, July 25, 2022.
- U.S. Department of State, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, "U.S. Relations with Taiwan," U.S. Dept of State, May 28, 2022.
- Bush, Richard, "U.S. 'One-China Policy' and the Future of U.S.-Taiwan Relations," interview by India Soranson Way, Asia Experts Forum, October 8, 2021.
- Haass, Richard and David Sacks, "The Growing Danger or U.S. Ambiguity on Taiwan," Foreign Affairs, December 13, 2021.

### Recommended Resources

- Allison, Graham and Philip Zelikow, "The Cuban Missile Crisis: A First Cut," Chapter 2 in Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. New York: Longman Press, 1999, 109-120.
- Bush, Richard C. "A One-China Policy Primer." Center for East Asia Policy Studies. March 2017. 8-24.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 03

## INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY II

### Focus

As evidenced in IS-02, there are multiple ways to think about how the world works (theories). IS-02 introduced the two most dominant theories in U.S. and other Western thinking, but these are not the only two ways to think about the world. This session introduces the idea of critical theory - the idea that it is important to question the assumptions of standard or dominant 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. As with the first session, 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 in order 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

### Guidance

- What do these theories ASSUME about the world? What do they ARGUE about the world? Where do they fundamentally agree/disagree? Note that critical theories are less about proposing specific policy recommendations (see Cox's distinction between problem-solving theories and critical theories), and more about trouble-shooting the thinking and discussions around policy-making. What questions would a constructivist raise about Realist policy recommendations vis a 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?

### Essential Readings (83 Pages)

- 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, 207-213 (end of 1st para), 223-225.
- Bull, Hedley. The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977, 3-10, 13-27, and 40-52.
- Agius, Christine. "Social Constructivism." In Contemporary Security Studies, 5th ed., edited by Alan Collins, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019, 74-84, Case Study 6.3, and 87-89.
- Wilcox, Lauren. "Gendering the Cult of the Offensive." Security Studies 18, no. 2 (2009): 214-240.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 04

## TWO-LEVEL GAMES: SOURCES OF INFLUENCE

### Focus

In this session we move beyond the black box of the unitary state to explore how a state's foreign policy is influenced by both domestic and international actors. To do so, we introduce the concept of "two-level games." First introduced by political scientist Robert Putnam, this paradigm integrates explanations across the levels of analysis, examines the linkages between international (Putnam's Level 1) and domestic (Putnam's Level 2) politics, and addresses foreign policy-making. We will use a case study to understand how these dynamics play out.

### OBJECTIVES

- Examine "two-level games" as a foreign policy decision-making framework
- Consider the importance of other countries' foreign policy decision-making processes
- Apply the two-level games framework to a case study to evaluate a U.S. foreign policy decision

### Guidance

- What is the "two-level games" framework? How does it help to explain how international and domestic political systems interact to influence policy-making?
- Why is it important to understand the motivations and domestic political systems of other countries when conducting foreign policy analysis? How can we adapt foreign policy analysis tools for use outside the U.S. context?
- Goldstein and Shriver state in their conclusion, "Action by Congress, particularly in foreign affairs, is most frequently restrictive rather than directive" (171). How does this case demonstrate that?
- In what areas of the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) was Congress able to exert more power, and why?
- How did Congressional fear of "an imperial presidency" play out in the debates and amendments to the TRA?

### Essential Readings (59 Pages)

- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Domestic Politics," Chapter 9 in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 284-296 ONLY.
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Other Countries," Chapter 10 in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 334-345, 360-367 ONLY.
- Goldstein, Steven M. and Randall Schriver. "An Uncertain Relationship: The United States, Taiwan, and the Taiwan Relations Act," The China Quarterly, Vol. 165 (2001), 147-172.

### Recommended Resources

- Putnam, Robert D. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games." International Organization, Vol 42, No. 3 (1988), 427-440.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 04

## 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 on, 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

### Guidance

- 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?
- How important is the information lever of power to grand strategy? How does overemphasizing one tool of national power place strain on the other tools?
- What is the U.S. national interest articulated in the Biden administration's Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) report to Congress? What critical challenges need to be overcome in the U.S. implementation of WPS?

### Essential Readings (97 Pages)

- Reveron, Derek S. and Nikolas K. Gvosdev. "(Re)Discovering the National Interest: The Future of U.S. Foreign Policy and Defense Strategy," *Orbis* (Summer 2015): 1-18.
- Walt, Stephen. "Would You Die For That Country?" *Foreign Policy*, March 24, 2014, 1-6.
- Mead, Walter Russell. "America's Sticky Power," *Foreign Policy*, October 29, 2009, 1-9.
- Bishop, Donald M., "DIME, not DIME: Time to Align the Instruments of U.S. Informational Power," *The Strategy Bridge*, June 20, 2018, 1-10.
- Biden, Joseph. "United States Government Women, Peace, and Security Congressional Report." The White House, July 2022.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 05

## U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM AND FOREIGN POLICY

### Focus

The previous session introduced the idea that it is important to consider the ways in which the domestic political systems (DPS) of countries constrain foreign policy and influence individual decision makers. In this session we begin our deep dive into the specifics of the American system. This session is designed to provide a broad overview to the U.S. constitutional system and to explore why understanding the Constitution and the domestic political system (DPS) matters for foreign policy analysis. The DPS consists not only of the branches of government, and their sub-organizations, but also encompasses the legal structure and societal elements that can influence policy. No single part of the U.S. government has sole responsibility for U.S. national security, or can execute security policy in an effective manner without the cooperation and consent of other components.

### OBJECTIVES

- Understand the formal institutions that comprise the U.S. government and their relationship to the U.S. Constitution
- Analyze the ways in which the constitutional system constrains and enables U.S. foreign policy
- Apply your understanding of the constitutional system to a case study to better understand U.S. foreign policy decision-making

### Guidance

- What are the responsibilities and powers of the branches of American government, as defined in the U.S. Constitution? How do the principles established in this document affect the national security decision making process?
- How has the Constitution been interpreted to facilitate the modern national security system of the United States? How do these constitutional principles affect the organizations in which you serve?
- What constitutional issues were at stake during the Iran-Contra affair?

### Essential Readings (84 Pages)

- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Domestic Politics," Chapter 9 in *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 296-312 ONLY.
- "A Very Slim Reed: From the Phrases of the Constitution to the Theater Security Enterprise" in *Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise*, 25-51.
- Koh, Harold H. "Recognizing the Pattern of History," Chapter 2 in *The National Security Constitution*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990, 38-64.
- Hicks, D. Bruce "Presidential Foreign Policy Prerogative after the Iran-Contra Affair: A Review Essay" *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (1996) 962-977.

### Recommended Resources

- The Constitution of the United States of America, National Archives.
- Understanding the Iran-Contra Affairs, Brown University.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 05 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. Part of the larger concept of coercive diplomacy, deterrence has a long history as a strategy used by people and governments to manage and prevent conflict. Though the use of deterrence has been around for millennia, deterrence as a formal theory was developed largely after World War II in response to nuclear weapons as an effort to better understand these weapons and their effects. However, deterrence theory has important implications for strategy in both the conventional and nuclear domains. 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 a 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

- Examine 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

## Guidance

- 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 important distinctions in the different types of deterrence?
- What are the challenges for states to "extend" deterrence to protect allies? How would you assess U.S. efforts at extended deterrence?
- How do early deterrence concepts hold up in today's evolving international security environment? What are the challenges posed by multi-polar deterrence with more and increasingly capable nuclear weapon states?
- Do traditional concepts of deterrence apply to the domains of space and cyberspace? If not, why not, and how does deterrence theory need to adjust to account for these two domains?
- What is the best approach to deter a Chinese invasion of Taiwan -- denial or punishment? Is deterrence the correct strategy to address this security challenge?

## Essential Readings (54 Pages)

- Biddle, Tami Davis, "Coercion Theory: A Basic Introduction for Practitioners," Texas National Security Review 3:2 (Spring 2020), 94-109.
- Schelling, Thomas C. 1966. Arms and Influence. Edited by Harvard University. Center for International Affairs. New Haven: Yale University Press, 35-52.
- Manzo, Vincent, "Deterrence and Escalation in Cross-domain Operations: Where do Space and Cyberspace Fit?" Strategic Forum, No. 272, National Defense University, December 2011.
- McKinney, Jared M. and Peter Harris, "Broken Nest: Deterring China from Invading Taiwan," Parameters, 51:4 (2021), 23-36.

## Recommended Resources

- Jervis, Robert. 1978. "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma." World Politics 30 (2): 167-214.
- Schelling, Thomas C. 1963. The Strategy of Conflict. New York: Oxford University Press, Ch8, 187-203.
- Achen, Christopher H, and Duncan Snidal. 1989. "Rational Deterrence Theory and Comparative Case Studies." World Politics 41 (2): 143-69.
- Lebow, Richard Ned, and Janice Gross Stein. 1989. "Rational Deterrence Theory: I Think, Therefore I Deter." World Politics 41 (2): 208-224.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 06

## CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS

### Focus

Civil-military relations is the study of the relationships among the military, the civilian government, and the civilian population. In Foreign Policy Analysis, we are particularly concerned with how interactions between civilian policymakers and military officers influence policy formation and implementation, as well as how the public's perception of the military might affect the viability of various policy options. This session provides an opportunity to reflect on the status of U.S. civil-military relations today, as well as how the actions of military officers, politicians, civil servants, and citizens shape these key relationships.

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the relationships among the U.S. military, American society at large, and the nation's civilian leadership
- Define civilian control of the military and why it is important in a democratic society
- Analyze the factors that affect American senior military and civilian leadership's perspectives on force planning and the use of force

### Guidance

- How does the military fit into the U.S. constitutional system?
- What does it mean for civilians to control the military? Is military professionalism sufficient to ensure civilian control, or are "external" control methods also necessary?
- What role does military advice play in policy-making? What are the sources of civil-military friction in policy-making?
- Do members of the military view themselves as superior to civilian society? Is it a problem if they do? What policy or other changes might alter this perception?
- What are the key challenges for contemporary U.S. civil-military relations?

### Essential Readings (85 Pages)

- Blankshain, Jessica, "A Primer on US Civil-Military Relations for National Security Practitioners." Wild Blue Yonder, Air University, July 6, 2020.
- Davidson, Janine, "Civil-Military Friction and Presidential Decision Making: Explaining the Broken Dialogue." Political Science Quarterly, 43:1 (March 2013), 129-145.
- Brooks, Risa and Sharan Grewal. "'Twice the Citizen': How Military Attitudes of Superiority Undermine Civilian Control in the United States." Journal of Conflict Resolution, 55: 4-5 (2022), 623-650. Read 623-633, 644-646.
- Brooks, Risa, Jim Golby and Heidi Urban, "Crisis of Command: America's Broken Civil-Military Relationship Imperils National Security," Foreign Affairs (May/June 2021).
- Schake, Kori, Peter D. Feaver, Risa Brooks, Jim Golby, and Heidi Urban "Masters and Commanders: Are Civil-Military Relations in Crisis?" Foreign Affairs (September/October 2021).

### Recommended Resources

- Cohn, Lindsay. "NWC Talks: Civil-Military Relations," YouTube video, 19:01, March 24, 2020.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 06

## NUCLEAR DETERRENCE

### Focus

The United States was the first nation 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. This was a paradox: nuclear weapons were unlikely to be used, but their destructive power demanded continual thinking and planning about their role in protecting American national security. 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 has 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 and the plans for modernization
- Analyze the impact of Russia's nuclear saber rattling and Chinese nuclear modernization on deterrence
- Understand and evaluate the concept of integrated deterrence

### Guidance

- How large do you think the U.S. strategic nuclear force should be? Should the size, composition, and capability of certain parts of the force be adjusted?
- What are the arguments for and against U.S. nuclear modernization and what is your assessment? Can the United States afford all of the modernization plans to strategic nuclear forces that are currently on the table? If not, what should the priorities be?
- 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 United States respond?
- What is the meaning of "integrated deterrence"? How is it different from earlier conceptions of deterrence and is it useful? How might new or emerging technologies alter deterrence stability?

### Essential Readings (81 Pages)

- Logan, David C. 2022. "The Nuclear Balance Is What States Make of It." *International Security* 46, no. 4: 172–215
- Woolf, Amy F. "U.S. Strategic Nuclear Forces: Background, Developments, and Issues." Congressional Research Service, 14 December 2021, 1-9.
- Hersman, Rebecca K.C. and Joseph Rodgers, "Nuclear Modernization under Competing Pressures." Center for Strategic and International Studies, February 2021, 1-6.
- Schlosser, Eric. "What If Russia Uses Nuclear Weapons in Ukraine?" *The Atlantic*, 20 June 2022.
- Brown, Gerald C., "Understanding the Risks and Realities of China's Nuclear Forces." *Arms Control Today* 51, no. 5 (2021).

### Recommended Resources

- Department of Defense, "Nuclear Deterrence: America's Foundation and Backstop for National Defense," April 6, 2020.
- Lieber, Keir A, and Daryl G Press. 2017. "The New Era of Counterforce: Technological Change and the Future of Nuclear Deterrence." *International Security* 41, no.4: 9–49.
- Bell, Mark S., and Nicholas L. Miller. 2015. "Questioning the Effect of Nuclear Weapons on Conflict." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59, no.1: 74–92.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 07

## POLITICAL PARTIES, THINK TANKS, INTEREST GROUPS AND THEIR IMPACT ON FOREIGN POLICY

### 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 organizations that influence foreign policy. This session examines how the concerns and ideas promoted by non-governmental actors like political parties, lobbyists, think tanks, and interest groups engage with lawmakers and influence foreign policy outcomes. Students examine how these organizations operate overseas as transnational actors in their own right are able to shape outcomes at home and abroad. Finally, the session explores whether realigning factions within political parties are shaping fundamental debates over the future of U.S. grand strategy and the consequences of polarization for U.S. foreign policy.

### Guidance

- Why are interest groups formed? What mechanisms do they use to express their policy preferences, and to what extent do they influence policy or legislative decision-making processes?
- What makes some interest groups more influential than others? Which interest groups are likely to be most relevant in influencing foreign and defense policy?
- What are the arguments, if any, for including lobbyists in the legislative process?
- How do foreign policy-oriented think tanks compete for space in the realm of ideas, and how can they influence U.S. policymakers?
- What role do political parties play in shaping U.S. foreign policy? Is it still true that "politics stops at the water's edge"?
- How do recent trends toward polarization influence U.S. foreign policy? Are there still areas of bipartisan consensus? What are potential consequences of polarization for the formulation and execution of U.S. national security policy?

### Essential Readings (63 Pages)

- Cloud, John A. and Nikolas Gvosdev, "Deploying Influence and Expertise: Think Tanks, Interest Groups and Lobbyists in the Theater Security Enterprise," Chapter 6 in Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise, 97-118.
- Drezner, Daniel, "The Ideas Industry," Video: Talks at Google (7-37 minutes).
- Pevehouse, John C.W. and Felicity Vabulas, "Nudging the Needle: Foreign Lobbies and U.S. Human Rights Ratings," International Studies Quarterly 63: 1 (2019): 85-98.
- Ashford, Emma, and Trevor Thrall, "The Battle Inside the Political Parties for the Future of U.S. Foreign Policy," War on the Rocks, December 12, 2018.
- Orbán, Victor, "Address to the Conservative Political Action Conference," August 4, 2022.
- Shultz, Kenneth A, "Perils of Polarization for U.S. Foreign Policy," The Washington Quarterly, 40:4 (2017), 7-28.

### Recommended Resources

- Myrick, Rachel, "America is Back – But for How Long? Political Polarization and the End of U.S. Credibility," Foreign Affairs, June 14, 2021.
- Lowe, David, "Idea to Reality: NED at 30," National Endowment for Democracy, Accessed 2 September 2022.

### OBJECTIVES

- Identify the missions and roles of interest groups, political parties, lobbyists, and think tanks in influencing policy and legislative decisions in the defense and national security realms
- Analyze the potential influence of lobbyists, think tanks, political parties, and other non-state actors in the formation of foreign policy. Consider ways this may be changing
- Evaluate the benefits and drawbacks of domestic U.S. actors and non-U.S. foreign entities in shaping U.S. foreign policy through these organizations
- Discuss the consequences of polarization and the extent to which realigning factions within political parties are shaping debates about U.S. foreign policy





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 07

## POLITICAL ECONOMY

### Focus

A strong economy is a prerequisite for national security. Economic activity must provide a basic quality of life for citizens, while simultaneously providing sufficient resources to support those functions for which the state is responsible. History provides numerous examples of how political entities have managed the economic behavior of individuals and firms: some systems prioritize growth, while others prioritize stability, or a regime's ability to distribute patronage.

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 will prioritize, and how it will adjust market mechanisms in order to produce those desired outcomes. Comparative political economy looks at how different states approach the issues of production and distribution of resources, and how the decisions those states make affect their security and relations with the rest of the world.

International Political Economy looks at how states interact with one another in the global system. This includes how international trade benefits economies, the problems trade creates, and how the money and financial systems of different countries interact with each other, often through international institutions.

### OBJECTIVES

- Examine important economic concepts and use them in analyses of power, conflict, and cooperation
- Understand alternative economic system theories and the strengths and weaknesses of each
- Analyze how to relate economic performance to national security and other political outcomes
- Evaluate the concept and dynamics of globalization and de-globalization, and how they relate to inter- and intra-state conflict

### Guidance

- Since World War II, the international economic system has been dominated by the United States, and the United States has until recently encouraged all states to pursue a free market approach. This has been a source of disagreement and sometimes conflict. But why? What are the other ways of organizing an economy, and why might different states prefer different systems? How do different systems affect things like state interests, state power, and state stability?
- How do globalization, interdependence, and the rise of global value chains affect the likelihood of militarized conflict? How does polarity matter, and how do economic and military power interact?
- How does an understanding of economics help us appreciate the connections between military and grand strategy?

### Essential Readings (111 Pages and 10min Video)

- Cohn, Lindsay P. "Introduction to Political Economy Part I: Comparative & II: International." U.S. Naval War College. 2022 (revised).
- Kennedy, Paul, 1987, "The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers", New York: Random House Vintage Books: 278-286.
- Farrell, Henry, and Abraham L. Newman. "Weaponized Interdependence: How Global Economic Networks Shape State Coercion." *International Security*. 2019. 44 no. 1: 42-79.
- World Bank. "What are Global Value Chains: concepts and measurements" <https://video.ibm.com/recorded/115012697>
- Milanovic, Branko. "How the System was Rigged: the global economic order and the myth of sovereignty." *Foreign Affairs*. 2022. 101 no. 4: 197-203.
- Job, Brian L. "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: the dilemmas of middle powers." *Issues & Studies*. 2020. 56 no. 2: 1-24.
- Lu, Di. "Revisiting the US-China Trade Conflict." *Indian Journal of Asian Affairs*. 2021. 34 no. 1/2: 115-119.
- Mulder, Nicholas. "The Collateral Damage of a Long Economic War." *Foreign Affairs*. 26 Sep 2022.

### Recommended Resources

- World Bank. "Strategic Segmentation for GVCs" <https://video.ibm.com/recorded/115012749>





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 08

## MEDIA AND PUBLIC OPINION

### Focus

Mass media and public opinion are important influences on the policy-making process and theater security, but they can also influence each other and be influenced by policy elites. The relationship among institutions can be contentious: how much should elected officials follow the opinions of those they represent? How would you characterize the relationship between the military and the media? 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 role of the media as an influence on the policy-making process.

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the role the media plays in both the formal and informal national security process
- Discuss the impact of media coverage on both the formulation and the implementation of theater strategy
- Assess the role of public opinion in democratic policy-making and civil-military relations, and identify the influences can affect it

### Guidance

- How does the political fragmentation of news sources and the rise of social media as a main information source for Americans affect foreign policy making? What new challenge for national security might it pose?
- How would you characterize the relationship between the U.S. military and American news media outlets?
- How do senior leaders use the media to advance policy and political goals? How does the media influence their decisions? Does "the media" constitute an interest group with an independent agenda?
- How does public opinion constrain foreign policy decision-making? How responsive should national security leaders be to public opinion? Does the U.S. military need to care about its public image?
- What do Baum & Potter mean by the "elasticity of reality", and how is that relevant in making national security policy? Can you think of recent examples where public perception of 'facts' diverges from reality?
- Why is the U.S. military so trusted compared to other public institutions? What are the implications of that trust -- are there potential downsides (for the military or for the nation)?

### Essential Readings (71 Pages)

- Abramson, Jill, *Merchants of Truth: The Business of News and the Fight for Facts* (NY: Simon & Schuster, 2019), Prologue and Conclusion, 1-12, 423-430.
- Porch, Douglas, "NO BAD STORIES: The American Media-Military Relationship," *Naval War College Review* 55, no. 1 (2002): 85-107.
- Baum, Matthew A. and Philip B. K. Potter. "Media, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy in the Age of Social Media," *The Journal of Politics* (2019).
- Marguiles, Max and Jessica Blankshain "Specific Sources of Trust in Generals: Individual-Level Trust in the US Military," *Daedalus* (November 2022).

### Recommended Resources

- Burbach, David, "NWC Talks: Trust in the Military." YouTube video, 19:38, Sept. 20, 2019.
- Smeltz, Dina, Ivo Daalder, et al, "Foreign Policy for the Middle Class - What America Thinks [Results of the 2021 Chicago Council Survey of American Public Opinion on Foreign Affairs]", *Chicago Council on Global Affairs* (2021).
- Barrett, Paul, Justin Hendrix and Grant Sims, "How tech platforms fuel U.S. political polarization," *Brookings Institution* (2021).
- Harding, Luke, "Ukraine fears western support will fade as media loses interest in the war", *The Guardian* (2021).





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 08

## TRANSNATIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES

### Focus

Transnational and non-traditional security issues are key challenges for states. They may be defined as “nonmilitary threats that cross borders and either threaten the political and social integrity of a nation or the health of that nation’s inhabitants.” Demographic, environmental, economic, and social trends suggest that transnational security challenges will remain significant challenges in the decades ahead. These challenges generally fall into one of two broad, though often inter-related, categories: process-based (migration, climate change, infectious disease, etc.) and actor-based (organized crime, traffickers, terrorists, pirates, etc.). Certain challenges transcend clear state versus non-state categorization and challenge conventional notions of sovereignty, strategy, geography, power, military force structure, competition, and conflict.

### OBJECTIVES

- Analyze the difference between “traditional” and “non-traditional” security challenges
- Examine how international relations (IR) theory can elucidate the underlying dynamics of transnational security issues and perhaps aid in the development of effective strategies that can address these issues
- Assess the basic dynamics that drive the severity and probability of process-based and actor-based transnational challenges

### Guidance

- What are the differences between process-based and actor-based threats and how they can interact?
- Explain the global, historical, geographical and economic context in which non-traditional and transnational security challenges emerge and occur. How do these threats intersect with human security, state security and economies?
- How do non-traditional/transnational threats intersect with each other and with great power competition? What challenges and opportunities do these interactions pose for strategists and U.S. national interests?
- Assess the value and utility of the three IR theories (introduced in IS-02) in describing, explaining, and predicting the effects of transnational challenges on the international system.

### Essential Readings (107 Pages)

- Kaldor, Mary. “Human security in complex operations.” Prism2, no. 2 (2011): 3-14
- “Global Catastrophic Risks 2021: Navigating the Complex Intersections.” Global Challenges Foundation, 2021, 7-62.
- Bigio, Jammie and Rachel B. Vogelstein. “Ending Human Trafficking in the Twenty-First Century.” Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), Special Report No. 91, June 2021, 1-13.
- “2022 European Migrant Smuggling Centre: 6th Annual Report.” EUROPOL, 2022, 7-24.
- Poushter, Jacob, Moira Fagan and Sneha Gubbala. “Climate Change Remains Top Global Threat across 19-Country Survey.” Pew Research Center, August 31, 2022, 2-7.
- McCornick, Peter and Aaron Salberg. “Agriculture’s Achilles’ Heel: Water Insecurity Is the Greatest Threat to Sustaining Global Food Production.” CSIS, September 30, 2022, 1-5.

### Recommended Resources

- Dea Bankova, Prasanta Kumar Dutta, and Michael Ovaska. “The War in Ukraine is Fueling a Global Food Crisis.” Reuters, May 30, 2022: <https://graphics.reuters.com/UKRAINE-CRISIS/FOOD/zjvqkgomjvx/>. 1-17.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 09

## INTERVENTION IN BEIRUT, 1982-83

### Focus

The Reagan administration's decision to deploy Marines in response to the growing violence in Lebanon in the early 1980s is an example of decision-making in a highly complex international environment. This decision was profoundly affected by domestic U.S. factors, front-line military and diplomatic organizations, Congress, as well as the interpersonal dynamic that shaped the first term of the Reagan presidency. This case, which has enduring relevance in the study of foreign policy analysis and helps illustrate how the concepts used in this sub-course highlight the spectrum of influences at work in President Reagan's decision-making process. Case studies such as this offer the opportunity to appreciate the full breadth of the policy environment and gain a better understanding of how and why decisions are made.

### OBJECTIVES

- Analyze and explain a complex national security case
- Analyze the domestic and international influences on both senior policy makers and as well as national security organizations in the assessment and prioritization of national security threats and challenges
- Apply foreign policy analysis tools and theories to a major foreign policy decision

### Guidance

- Based on the information in the case study and the video, what were the international and domestic factors that influenced the President's initial decision to deploy Marines in Lebanon to facilitate the withdrawal of Palestinian fighters from Beirut?
- How did the deliberations and arguments change in the debate over returning the Marines to Beirut in the wake of the massacres at Sabra and Shatila? How accurately did decision makers in Washington perceive the influences -- both domestic and international -- that ultimately had an impact in determining the success of their policy?
- National security professionals must consider political, social, military, and economic factors when advising their military and civilian superiors. Which are the necessary and relevant factors when making strategic and operational recommendations.

### Essential Readings (28 Pages)

- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., "Case Study: Lebanon Revisited," Chapter 10 in Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise. Newport, RI: Naval War College, 2017, 219-246.
- Frontline, "Retreat from Beirut," 1985 Season, Episode 7, February 26, 1985, 55:58.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 09

## STRATEGIC COMPETITION AND RIVALRY

### Focus

The October 2022 National Security Strategy calls on the United States to adopt measures that “prioritize maintaining an enduring competitive edge over the PRC while constraining a still profoundly dangerous Russia.” This echoes language in the 2017 National Security Strategy which maintains that competition and rivalry with other great powers are “intertwined, long-term challenges” that are not merely “passing trends or momentary problems.” What is strategic competition, and how does rivalry with other major powers impact both U.S. national security and the workings of the international system?

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the concept of strategic competition and relate this to current U.S. strategy
- Identify the putative causes of strategic competition, especially with China and Russia
- Evaluate how a renewed emphasis on strategic competition might influence force planning and operational concept development

### Guidance

- How would you assess and differentiate U.S. competition dynamics with China and Russia? Are they the same? How are they different?
- What are the structural causes of U.S.-China competition? Can these structures be overcome? How?
- What are the structural causes of U.S.-Russia competition? Can these structures be overcome? How?
- With respect to China, the National Security Strategy calls on the United States to “work together to solve issues that matter most to the people of both countries” and “working together to solve great challenges is what the world expects from great powers, and because it’s directly in our interest.” Describe some ways in which the United States can compete with China and Russia without resulting in conflict or war? Does the mindset of “strategic competition” assume that conflict is inevitable? How does competition in the areas of values or governance play out, for instance, in terms of Women, Peace and Security initiatives? Can the United States find “new advantages” in these areas?
- How useful is the concept of strategic competition for understanding structural rivalries with China and Russia? Does the concept help to guide the development of effective strategies?

### Essential Readings (105 Pages)

- Copeland, Dale. “Systemic Theory and the Future of Great Power War and Peace,” Oxford Handbook of International Security, eds. Alexandra Gheciu and William C. Wohlforth (2018). Read section 15.1 (Theories of Great Power War).
- Dobbins, James, Howard J. Shatz, and Ali Wyne, Russia Is a Rogue, Not a Peer; China Is a Peer, Not a Rogue: Different Challenges, Different Responses. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2019.
- Wu, Zhengyu, “Classical Geopolitics, Realism and the Balance of Power Theory,” Journal of Strategic Studies 41:6 (2018). Please read 789-815.
- Chao, Brian C. and Hyin-Binn Cho, “Security in the Asia Pacific and Signaling At Sea,” International Relations of the Asia-Pacific (2022).
- Mearsheimer, John J. “The Inevitable Rivalry: America, China, and the Tragedy of Great-Power Politics.” Foreign Affairs, November/December 2021.
- Ikenberry, G. John, Andrew J. Nathan, Susan Thornton, Sun Zhe, and John J. Mearsheimer. “A Rival of America’s Making? The Debate over Washington’s China Strategy.” Foreign Affairs, March/April 2022.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 10

## THE PRESIDENT AND THE COGNITIVE DIMENSION

### Focus

Article II of the U.S. Constitution designates the president as commander in chief of the armed forces and confers significant executive power to the office. This session explores the question of how modern presidents shape the national security decision-making process. The increasing complexity of foreign policy requires that a president process advice and information from a wide variety of sources. Personality and cognitive disposition are important characteristics that form the basis of the president's world view and decision-making style; these attributes play a key role in shaping a president's national security decisions. Presidents bring to the office a wide range of human characteristics including biases, intuition, previous experiences, and other factors. The cognitive perspective examines the way people, and in particular presidents, think, process information, and make decisions within the framework of their constitutionally conferred executive power.

### OBJECTIVES

- Analyze the constitutional powers vested in the executive and identify the tools available in shaping and implementing foreign policy
- Examine how an individual decision maker can be affected by their experiences, expertise, biases, heuristics, emotions, belief systems, and operational codes
- Identify the role of risk and uncertainty in cognitive processes that impact decision-making in policymaking

### Guidance

- What Constitutional powers are reserved for the president? What powers are not explicitly directed and how has executive authority developed and evolved over time?
- Chapter 4 in the textbook discusses presidential scholar Fred Greenstein's argument that personal qualities are especially important in understanding how presidents perform, and describes many behavioral differences among administrations. How might their approaches have impacted their ability to accomplish national security objectives?
- How have presidents shaped or utilized their administrations to help them make decisions? The president's inner circle has unique access to the president. How do presidents organize and integrate advisors into policy decisions? What are common trends, what are the outliers?
- Presidents bring a wide variety of experiences and influences with them into the office. How do those shape their foreign policy agendas and their decision making?
- What cognitive paradigms (reflexes, habits, intuition, synthesis, leadership traits) have presidents relied upon in the past?

### Essential Readings (66 Pages)

- Brattebo, Douglas M. and Tom Lansford, "Chapter 5: The Presidency and Decision Making," *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*, ed. Derek S. Reveron, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and John Cloud, (New York: NY: Oxford University Press, 2018).
- Dickerson, John, "What if the Problem Isn't the President it's the Presidency?" *The Atlantic* 321, no. 4 (2018).
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Cognitive Perspective," Chapter 4 in *Decision Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 88-124.
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Annex: Case Studies, Case No. 5: Military Strike against Syria (2017)," in *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 406-410.

### Recommended Resources

- Knott, Stephen, "NWC Talks: Presidential Power and National Security." YouTube video, 17:15, May 1, 2019.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 10

## STRATEGIC RESTRAINT

### Focus

The first of the grand strategies we will consider, strategic restraint, has deep roots in American history. Strategic Restraint is linked to such luminaries as 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. Indeed, restraint 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

### Guidance

- Although the "Come Home America" article was written over 20 years ago, do you believe its primary arguments are still relevant today?
- Are the core assumptions that have underpinned U.S. grand strategy since the end of the Cold War still valid?
- Given the contemporary security environment that includes a return to geopolitics and "strategic 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? Why should we care?
- Would other nations provide more for their own security if the United States adapted 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 do the Joint Force missions, capabilities and force structure look like under a strategic restraint grand strategy?

### Essential Readings (54 Pages)

- Posen, Barry R. and Andrew L. Ross. "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy." *International Security* 21, no. 3 (1996): 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.
- Hjeltnaard, Kim. "'A reckoning is near': America has a vast overseas military empire. Does it still need it?" *USA Today*, February 25, 2021.
- McMaster, H.R. "The Retrenchment Syndrome: A Response to 'Come Home, America?'" *Foreign Affairs*, June 1, 2020.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 11

## THE NSC, WHITE HOUSE, AND PALACE POLITICS

### Focus

In this session we will look at the inner workings of the White House through the Palace Politics perspective. The course of policymaking can rapidly change due to the wide variety of top-level officials involved, informal relationships, internal rivalries, and palace intrigue. The wide variety of advisors that surround the president could be an expert in their field, have a close personal tie, or they could also be a career official. This perspective helps us see these influencers, who behind closed doors dramatically shape policy. Understanding how these individuals relate, gain access, and interact with the president can help us understand the ultimate policy or decision that results. As part of the inner working of the White House, we will also look closely at the National Security Council (NSC) which was created to help presidents develop better policies and make better national security decisions. We will look at how it was created, how it is generally organized, how it has changed with each president, and how it helps the president make better, more well-informed policies and decisions.

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend how palace politics can cause policy to intersect with or diverge from the unitary state perspective's "national interest" as agency leaders, White House staff, and other members of the President's inner circle jockey to gain the president's ear
- Understand the organization of the national security establishment
- Identify changes in the structure and operation of the national security establishment

### Guidance

- Why is this perspective termed "palace politics" and what does this mean? What examples stand out from the readings to illustrate the palace politics approach?
- How does this approach differ from perspectives we have previously discussed?
- How has the NSC changed over time and what has led to these changes? What issues should the NSC primarily address? How does the NSC facilitate interagency interaction and what challenges may be brought about by the NSC?
- Compare and contrast the different individuals selected to serve as National Security Advisors. Were there common themes across administrations?

### Essential Readings (88 Pages)

- Gvosdev, Nicholas, Jessica Blankshain and David Cooper, "Palace Politics Perspective," Chapter 7 in *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 192-237.
- Chollet, Derek, "The National Security Council: Is it Effective or Is it Broken?" Chapter 6 in *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*, ed. Derek S. Reveron, Nikolai K. Gvosdev, and John Cloud, New York: NY: Oxford University Press, 2018, 111-121.
- Schake, Kori, "The National Security Process," Chapter 7 in *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*, ed. Derek S. Reveron, Nikolai K. Gvosdev, and John Cloud, New York: NY: Oxford University Press, 2018, 123-132.
- Thrush, Glenn and Reid J. Epstein, "Why Obama picked Rice," *Politico*, June 6, 2013.
- Wright, Austin and Jeremy Herb, "Trump's new warrior-scholar," *Politico*, February 20, 2017.
- Lima, Christiano and Mathew Nussbaum, "John Bolton to replace H.R. McMaster as national security advisor," *Politico*, March 22, 2018.
- Bertrand, Natasha, "The inexorable rise of Jake Sullivan," *Politico*, November 27, 2021.
- Samuels, David, "The Storyteller and the President," *New York Times Magazine*, May 8, 2016.

### Recommended Resources

- Allison, Graham and Philip Zelikow, "The Cuban Missile Crisis: A Third Cut," Chapter 6 in *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. New York: Longman Press, 1999, 329-347.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 11

## BALANCE OF POWER REALISM

### Focus

This session will examine the realist-based grand strategies of offshore balancing and selective engagement. Both 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. Offshore balancers arrive from the sea and would avoid prolonged basing of U.S. troops abroad. They see a benefit in not being dependent on allies to defend the American national interest abroad. Selective engagers would advocate the use of forward bases to project military power. Consequently, selective engagement strategy would rely on the two primary pillars of the American security architecture since the end of World War II: NATO and the U.S.-Japan Alliance, and the U.S. bases associated with those alliances. Both strategies are “selective” in that neither sees every world region as a “vital” national interest.

### OBJECTIVES

- Identify, analyze, and evaluate the components of offshore balancing and selective engagement to include its underlying assumptions, key concepts, objectives, risks, and force requirement
- Evaluate the utility of offshore balancing and selective engagement to advance and defend national interests
- Assess the role of alliances in developing a successful security strategy

### Guidance

- Selective engagement stands solidly between “restraint” and “primacy” but the question that must be answered is how ‘selective’ is it? Why is this question difficult to answer?
- While consideration of national interests is clearly important to the realist, is it feasible for the United States to have a grand strategy which does not take idealism and principle into account?
- How do the required military capabilities for this strategy differ from those of primacy or isolationism?
- How do the required military capabilities of offshore balancing differ from those of classic 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?

### Essential Readings (71 Pages)

- Posen, Barry and Andrew Ross, “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy.” *International Security* (Winter 1996/1997): 15-21.
- Art, Robert J. “Selective Engagement in the Era of Austerity,” in Richard Fontaine and Kristin M. Lord (eds), *America’s Path: Grand Strategy for the Next Administration* (Washington, DC: Center for a New American Security), 15-27.
- Mearsheimer, John J. and Walt, Stephen M., “The Case for Offshore Balancing.” *Foreign Affairs* 95, no.4 (July-August 2016): 1-83.
- Walt, Stephen M., “Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power.” *International Security* 9, no.4 (Spring 1985): 3-43.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 12

## ORGANIZATIONAL PROCESS AND BUREAUCRATIC POLITICS

### Focus

State and societal-level explanations are important in accounting for foreign policy decision-making. There are two other lenses analysts can use to view these state level explanations: the organizational process and bureaucratic politics perspectives. The organizational process perspective draws attention to organizations as habitual actors who systematically process information and produce organizational outputs in the form of options and lower-level actions. Over time, organizations develop their own cultures which, in turn, significantly influence their behavior. The bureaucratic politics perspective, on the other hand, focuses on organizations as strategic actors represented by people in positions. This lens focuses on the bargaining that occurs among senior leaders of organizations who argue for policies that protect and promote the core interests of their specific agency or department. When viewed through this lens, decisions are seen as the result of compromises among competing bureaucratic interests.

### OBJECTIVES

- Identify the behavioral characteristics and limitations of organizations, such as major staffs, in formulating and implementing effective policies
- Identify the behavioral characteristics of and competing cultures inside different types of military and civilian organizations
- Identify how bureaucratic interests can both intersect with and diverge from the unitary state perspective's "national interests" as agency leaders evaluate a given national security problem in terms of threats or opportunities to their particular organization
- Analyze how bureaucratic bargaining among senior agency leaders shapes the outcome of national security decisions

### Guidance

- Compare and contrast the organizational process perspective with the unitary state perspective.
- Every government organization—whether a department, agency, service, or staff—develops its own culture. How do these different cultures and sub-cultures impact the way in which organizations operate internally and externally? Can you think of examples in your own career of instances where organizational behavior affected decision-making, processes or practices?
- How might military officers and civil servants operating in the national security policy arena navigate the dynamics of organizational behavior to assure mission success?
- 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 an outcome that was nobody's initial preference?

### Essential Readings (108 Pages)

- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Organizational Process Perspective," Chapter 5 in *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 125-161.
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Bureaucratic Politics Perspective," Chapter 6 in *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 162-191.
- Sagan, Scott Douglas, "The Perils of Proliferation: Organization Theory, Deterrence Theory, and the Spread of Nuclear Weapons," *International Security* 18:4 (1994) 66–107.

### Recommended Resources

- Halperin, Morton H. and Priscilla Clapp, with Arnold Kanter, "Organizational Interests," Chapter 3 in *Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy*, 2nd edition, 25-27, 38-40, 49-61.
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Annex: Case Studies," in *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 378-382.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 12

## LIBERAL INTERNATIONALISM

### Focus

Liberal internationalism draws on the “liberal paradigm” in international relations theory. The strategy accepts the idea that world politics does not have to consist of zero-sum conflict; instead, economic trade, collective security, and transnational problem-solving offer win-win outcomes. International institutions, rules, and norms facilitate the cooperation needed to achieve international peace and prosperity. Liberal internationalism also generally agree that the nature of regimes matter; democracies are more open to trade and cooperation than authoritarian governments. With important international institutions “born in the USA”, such as the United Nations, NATO, and World Bank, liberal internationalists argue that the United States benefits through a strategy of multinational cooperation. Lastly, Russia's invasion of Ukraine and China's rise have also strained the international liberal order; however, it is unclear whether or not these events mark a transition or not.

### OBJECTIVES

- Analyze the utility of liberal internationalism to advance and defend national interests
- Understand the ‘democratic peace’ theory and counterarguments, and evaluate the place of democracy promotion in U.S. grand strategy
- Evaluate the factors which may disrupt the international liberal order and discuss whether we are currently witnessing a transition to a new international arrangement

### Guidance

- Why has the United States promoted international institutions? What role does international security cooperation play in U.S. grand strategy?
- How does liberal internationalism create costs and benefits for the United States? What are the implications of liberal internationalism moving forward?
- Why does Miller think all U.S. administrations, regardless of party, promote democracy?
- Some argue that COVID-19 has the potential to bring an end to the liberal international order. Others argues that the pandemic could reignite its positive aspects. Which is more likely in the context of today's international system?
- How might China's growing global influence impact the liberal international order? Does China benefit from the current order? Is China seeking to create an order of its own design?
- How might Russia's aggression in Europe impact the liberal international order? Does the war in Ukraine strengthen or weaken it?

### Essential Readings (100 Pages)

- Slaughter, Anne-Marie. “The real new world order.” *Foreign affairs* (1997): 183-197.
- Posen, Barry R. and Andrew L. Ross. “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy.” *International Security* 21, no. 3 (1996): 23-32.
- Ikenberry, G. John. “The End of the Liberal International Order?” *International Affairs* 94, no. 1 (January 2018): 7-23.
- “2020 Civil Society Roadmap on Women, Peace and Security.” NGO: Working Group on Women, Peace, and Security, Dec 2020, 1-26.
- Miller, Paul. “American Grand Strategy and the Democratic Peace.” *Survival* 54, no. 2 (Apr 2012): 49-76.
- Walt, Stephen. “China Wants a ‘Rules-Based International Order,’ Too.” *Foreign Policy*, March 31, 2021, 1-6.
- Way, Lucan. “The Rebirth of the Liberal World Order?” *Journal of Democracy*, March 21, 2022, 1-16.

### Recommended Resources

- A Posen, Barry. “The Rise of Illiberal Hegemony.” *Foreign Affairs* 97, no. 2 (Mar/Apr 2018): 20-27.
- Weiss, Thomas G. “The United Nations: before, during and after 1945.” *International Affairs* 91, no. 6 (November 2015): 1221-1235.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 13

## DOD: D.C. AND COMBATANT COMMANDS

### Focus

Despite shifts in global power, the return to strategic competition, and contemporary challenges to national security, the United States remains the preeminent global military power, making the DoD front and center in foreign policy. Combatant Commanders continue to wield more power in their regions and are responsible for activities far beyond warfighting. Using these perspectives at the State/Societal level, this session will focus on the DoD and how it influences policymaking at the national-strategic and the theater-strategic levels. We will examine the role that the Secretary of Defense, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Combatant Commanders play in decision-making, reflect on how the military has changed over time, and identify the roles the services play in making or executing policy. Finally, this session establishes a foundation for future sessions in which we examine the relationship between Congress and the military, decisions governing the use of force, and defense budgeting.

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the structure, hierarchy, and functions of the Defense Department and subordinate organizations in U.S. national and theater security decision-making and policy processes
- Understand the role that DoD components play in developing and implementing national defense and military policy
- Examine how various defense establishment components sometimes arrive at different conclusions during foreign policy deliberations
- Understand how the organizational process perspective guides Defense Department outputs to national policy decision-makers

### Guidance

- How does the DoD structure affect the formulation of defense policy? How does the culture differ from other agencies?
- Do individual service cultures affect policy formation at the JCS level?
- Where are the friction points among the Secretary of Defense, JCS, Combatant Commanders and Service Secretaries?
- What are the DoD's bureaucratic interests and how does the organization protect those interests in the game of political bargaining and compromise at the executive level?
- What are the cascading effects on the DoD from internal changes or surprising events around the globe that have strategic impact? How do decisions in the Pentagon impact combatant commands?
- How has the DoD changed over time, why, and what implications are these changes likely to have in the future?

### Essential Readings (66 Pages)

- McInnis, Kathleen J., "Defense Primer: The Department of Defense" IFI0543 (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, updated November 8, 2021).
- Feickert, Andrew, "The Unified Command Plan and Combatant Commands: Background and Issues for Congress," R42077 (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, updated January 3, 2013), 1-10.
- Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "CJCSI 3100.01E, Joint Strategic Planning System," May 21, 2021, 1-3, Enclosures A, B, G, I.
- McMillan, Joseph and Franklin C. Miller, "The Office of the Secretary of Defense," Chapter 6 in *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*, Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof, eds. (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2nd edition, 2017, 120-141.
- Brown, Zachery T. and Kathleen McInnis, "The Pentagon's Office Culture is Stuck in 1968," *Foreign Policy*, October 25, 2021.
- Coffey, Ross, "NWC Talks: Combatant Command 101." YouTube video, 14:38, August 10, 2021.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 13

## PRIMACY

### Focus

Primacy is the most activist grand strategy. Primacy as a grand strategy 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

### Guidance

- 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?
- How would a country adopt a primacy grand strategy address a rising power (such as China)?
- What do concepts such as hegemonic stability theory and hegemonic war mean? Why are these examples relevant to the contemporary context?

### Essential Readings (92 Pages)

- Posen, Barry R. and Andrew L. Ross, "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy." *International Security* 21, no. 3, (Winter 1996-1997): 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.
- 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.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 14

## THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY AND INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT

### Focus

The Intelligence Community (IC) is an integral part of the interagency and national security decision-making processes. This session defines the nature of intelligence and addresses how the IC contributes analytically to strategic-level U.S. national security policy as well as to defense and theater operations. The session explores the limitations of intelligence and emphasizes the critically important advisory role that the IC plays. It illustrates how the IC operates in making assessments and provides intelligence support to leaders.

### Guidance

- The U.S. Intelligence Community includes 18 distinct organizations “charged with providing insight into actual or potential threats to the U.S. homeland, the American people, and national interests at home and abroad”, as the “Defense Primer” readings sets out. Why so many? How and why has the Intelligence Community developed in this way, and what impact does this structure and its related processes mean for policy decision-making?
- What role does Congress play in overseeing the Intelligence Community, why and how?
- What is the nature of intelligence and has its character changed in the 21<sup>st</sup> century? If so, what implications does this hold for modern-day intelligence gathering, analysis, and assessment?
- How does the IC serve and support the policy process and, in particular, the President of the United States? What norms, customs, rules, laws, and other factors come into play between policymakers and intelligence providers? How might intelligence at the strategic level differ from that focusing on operational or tactical decisions and why?
- Finally, what can intelligence do in support of policy decision-making, what will it not do and why?
- Why does intelligence at times fail (or fail to be heeded by policy decision-makers)?

### Essential Readings (63 Pages)

- Devine, Michael E., “Defense Primer: National and Defense Intelligence,” In Focus, (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service Reports, Updated December 13, 2021).
- Rosenbach, Eric and Aki J. Peritz, “Confrontation or Collaboration? Congress and the Intelligence Community,” (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Kennedy School Belfer Center’s Intelligence and Policy Project, 2009), 10-13, 18-23.
- Zegart, Amy, “Intelligence Basics: Knowns and Unknowns,” Chapter 4 in Spies, Lies and Algorithms: The History and Future of American Intelligence (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2022), 77-90; 102-105.
- Helgeson, John. L. “Afterward - Concluding Observations,” in Getting to Know the President: Intelligence Briefings of Presidential Candidates and Presidents-Elect 1952-2016, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency Center for the Study of Intelligence, October 2021), 269-287.
- Walton, Calder, “Can Intelligence Tell How Far Putin Will Go?,” War on the Rocks (February 28, 2022).
- Dahl, Erik, “Warnings Unheeded, Again: What the Intelligence Lessons of 9/11 Tell Us About the Coronavirus Today,” Center for Homeland Defense and Security, Naval Postgraduate School, YouTube, (December, 2020).
- Gibson, Lt. Gen. Karen, “The Role of Intelligence in the National Security Decision-Making Process,” Address to the U.S. Naval War College, YouTube, (January 22, 2020).

### OBJECTIVES

- Understand the United States’ modern Intelligence Community, its makeup, missions, and role(s) in supporting policy decision-making, as well as some of the enduring and novel challenges involved in intelligence gathering, analyzing and assessment
- Comprehend the role that the U.S. Congress plays in overseeing U.S. intelligence and how that impacts Executive-Legislative interactions on matters of intelligence policy and law
- Examine the distinctions between strategic-, operational- and tactical-level intelligence





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 14 CHINA

## Focus

IS-14 kicks off a new, six-session unit on the United States' future operating environment. In this session, we examine in depth twenty-first century China, its growth and characteristics, and its evolving relationship with the United States. IS-14 will consider the different facets of China's rise—cultural, diplomatic, economic, military, and otherwise—and what the implications are for China itself, for the U.S.-PRC bilateral relationship, and for both the Asia-Pacific regional order and the U.S.-created international order writ large. Consider questions such as: How did China get to where it is today? What does China want? What is China doing with its newfound resources and powers? Is there room—figuratively and literally—for China and the United States to co-exist as great powers in the western Pacific and in the international system?

## 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, including but not limited to the Belt and Road Initiative
- Assess China's possible range and flexibility of intentions
- Evaluate the ongoing debate over how the United States should engage with China, drawing on International Relations theories and their underlying assumptions about state behavior in the international system

## Guidance

- How has China changed in this nascent millennium? What have been the implications of such changes for China's power and standing in the international system, as well as its relationship with the United States?
- What does China want? "A world safe for autocracy?" A world in which it has displaced the United States as the most powerful country? Mere regional 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? Will growth in capabilities lead to increased ambitions?
- 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?
- What can International Relations theories tell us about China's rise, America's reaction, and the two countries' bilateral relationship? Examine the (de)merits of each major IR theory in relation to U.S.-PRC policy moving forward.

## Essential Readings (86 Pages)

- Goldstein, Avery. "A Rising China's Growing Presence: The Challenges of Global Engagement." In *China's Global Engagement: Cooperation, Competition, and Influence in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Jacques deLisle and Avery Goldstein, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2017, 1-33.
- 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, 293-307 and 310-314.
- Weiss, Jessica Chen. "A World Safe for Autocracy: China's Rise and the Future of Global Politics." *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2019.
- Wong, Audrye. "China's economic statecraft under Xi Jinping." The Brookings Institution (2019).
- Shirk, Susan L. *Overreach: How China Derailed Its Peaceful Rise*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2023. Chapter 8.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 15

## THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND DIPLOMACY

### Focus

American diplomats, known as foreign service officers, are key players on the foreign policy team representing the American people around the world. They build enduring relationships with governments and foreign publics to advance U.S. interests and manage global challenges. They have the duty of helping American citizens and advocating for American businesses abroad. Their reports, from their overseas vantage points, provide unique information and insights to policy-makers. Their work is changing, however, as new definitions of diplomatic practice encompass global topics such as health, science, technology, and climate. Wherever an administration falls on the spectrum between isolationism and internationalism, the demands of multilateral diplomacy are increasingly complex. Diplomacy and alliance management require deft handling of NATO allies, imaginative new groupings such as the Quad, and management of longstanding regional organizations such as the OAS. This unit explores the many dimensions of American diplomacy.

### OBJECTIVES

- Familiarize students with how the State Department, through its embassies and consulates, conducts foreign policy overseas
- Identify the State Department's role in the interagency policy-making process
- Analyze how traditional bilateral diplomacy is waning in an era when cross border issues play out on the multilateral stage
- Identify the ways in which the United States engages in multilateral diplomacy and manages its many alliances
- Assess insights into new fields of U.S. diplomacy including science, health, and climate

### Guidance

- How do America's alliances provide added diplomatic leverage?
- What is the Country Team and how does it function?
- In a world full of organizations and bureaucracies, what examples can you find where one-on-one diplomacy made the difference?
- What steps are necessary to build a relatively new alliance, such as the Quad, into a relevant and enduring means of advancing U.S. goals?
- How important are new lines of diplomatic efforts, such as science, health, technology, and climate?

### Essential Readings (74 Pages)

- Cloud, John A. and Damian Leader, "Chapter 10: Diplomacy, the State Department, and National Security," *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*, ed. Derek S. Reveron, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and John A. Cloud, (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2018), 185-195.
- Blinken, Antony, "Secretary Blinken's Remarks on Modernizing American Diplomacy," YouTube, Oct. 27, 2021, 25:00.
- Ford, Lindsay W. and James Goldgeier, "Retooling America's alliances to manage the China Challenge," *Brookings*, Jan. 25, 2021.
- Brands, Hal and Peter D. Fever, "What are America's Alliances Good For?" *Parameters*, 47: 2, Summer 2017, 15-30.
- Curtis, Lisa, Jacob Stokes, Joshua Fitt and Andrew Adams, "Operationalizing the Quad," *Center for a New American Security*, June 30, 2022.
- Montgomery, Kimberly and E. William Colglazier, "Emerging Technologies and Science Diplomacy," *Science & Diplomacy*, February 16, 2022.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 15

## 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. The COVID-19 pandemic has had a significant impact on the health and livelihood of the region, particularly for those with fewer resources to secure vaccines and mitigate the effects. U.S.-PRC relations have worsened and strategic competition has intensified with concerns for the effects of China's strategic direction and its growing military power on regional stability. Yet, while the primary U.S. lens in the Indo-Pacific is competition with China, many in the region do not see this issue in a similar manner. Several other security concerns also raise questions for 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 for national security professionals to have a clear and detailed understanding of the Indo-Pacific.

### OBJECTIVES

- Identify and assess United States and regional interests in the Asia-Pacific region
- Identify and analyze threats, challenges, and opportunities to the United States and other states in the Asia-Pacific region

### Guidance

- 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?
- What dangers does a nuclear-capable North Korea pose for the region? With denuclearization off the table, what should the goal be for U.S. policy and what measures should be used to achieve that goal?
- What are U.S. interests in the South China Sea and how important are they? What is the best possible outcome for U.S. interests, and what is the best route for achieving that outcome?
- How does Southeast Asia view great power competition? Should the United States do a better job of considering those views in its relations with the region?
- What are U.S. interests in the Indian Ocean region? Does the United States have enough “Indo” in its Indo-Pacific strategy? If not, what is missing and how would you fix it?

### Essential Readings (87 Pages)

- Blinken, Antony J., “A Free and Open Indo-Pacific,” Speech at Universitas Indonesia, December 14, 2021, 1-9.
- Cooper, Zach. “Indian Ocean Futures: Implications for U.S. Strategy in Asia Policy.” *Asia Policy* 16, no.3, 23-28.
- Cho, Hyun-Binn and Ariel Petrovics, “North Korea’s Strategically Ambiguous Nuclear Posture.” *Washington Quarterly* 45, no. 2, 39-58.
- Poling, Gregory, “Beijing’s Upper Hand in the South China Sea: Why Time Is Running Out to Secure U.S. Interests.” *Foreign Affairs*, August 18, 2022, 1-8.
- Huong Le Thu, “Southeast Asia in Great-Power Competition: Between Asserting Agency and Muddling Through.” Ashley J. Tellis, Alison Szalwinski, and Michael Wills (eds.), *Navigating Tumultuous Times in the Indo-Pacific, Strategic Asia 2021-22*, National Bureau of Asian Research, January 11, 2022, 160-185.
- Smith, Paul and Tara Kartha. “Strategic Partners or an Emerging Alliance? India and the United States in an Era of Global Power Transition.” *Comparative Strategy* 37, no. 5 (2018): 442-459.

### Recommended Resources

- Heginbotham, Eric and Richard J. Samuels, “Vulnerable US Alliances in Northeast Asia: The Nuclear Implications,” *Washington Quarterly*, 2021, 44, no.1, 157-175.
- Veerle Nowens, PODCAST: Episode 24: “US Perspectives on Maritime Security in the Indian Ocean Region,” RUSI, September 15, 2021.
- Asia Society, “In the Middle: Southeast Asia and Great Power Competition,” Webinar, July 20, 2022, <https://asiasociety.org/australia/events/middle-southeast-asia-and-great-power-competition>.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 16

## ECONOMIC TOOLS OF POWER

### Focus

The United States is a world leader in large measure through its ability to project enormous economic power and influence beyond its borders. Crafting economic policy as a critical component of foreign policy is a complex, interdisciplinary effort involving executive and legislative branches of government; a variety of monetary and financial institutions with global reach; and the indisputable role of 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. It poses the question: How can economic tools best be used to pursue foreign policy and national security goals?

### 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
- Evaluate the limitations of economic statecraft – where it is most likely to succeed and where it frequently fails
- Explore the role of the interagency in foreign economic policymaking
- Consider the challenges and trade-offs the United States faces when confronted with the dilemma of protecting national security but also retaining its lead in AI, quantum computing, and other cutting-edge technologies

### Guidance

- What is the purpose of economic statecraft, and what is the track record of its success? What are the obstacles and limitations?
- What considerations should policymakers give to the use of coercive economic tools, and what are the domestic costs?
- How does the United States use economic “carrots” such as trade, loans, and economic assistance, and how effective has it been?
- Amb. Marc Knapper describes the range of U.S. economic tools he’s using in Vietnam. Given that many of these are led by USAID, do you see these as examples of soft power or a response to market forces?

### Essential Readings (55 Pages)

- Eichengreen, Barry, “What Money Can’t Buy: The Limits of Economic Power,” *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2022.
- Rosenberg, Elizabeth, Peter Harrell, Paula J. Dobriansky and Adam Szubin, “America’s Use of Coercive Economic Statecraft: A Report from Select Members of the CNAS Task Force on the Future of U.S. Coercive Economic Statecraft,” Center for a New American Security, December 2020.
- Chivvis, Christopher S. and Ethan B. Kapstein, “U.S. Strategy and Economic Statecraft: Understanding the Tradeoffs,” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, April 28, 2022.
- United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, “Chairman Menendez Introduces Economic Statecraft for the Twenty-First Century Act,” (2:30-23:15).
- Knapper, Marc E., keynote address, “Building Resilient Supply Chains: Enhancing Cooperation with India, Vietnam and Other Emerging Markets,” CSIS, July 19, 2022 (4:15-19:00).
- Zoellick, Robert, “Economic Diplomacy,” address to the Mosbacher Institute for Trade, Economic, and Public Policy, Texas A&M University, April 12, 2022 (14:00-56:00).

### Recommended Resources

- Council on Foreign Relations, “What Happened When China Joined the WTO?,” *World 101 Global Era Issues*.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 16

## 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.

### Guidance

- 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 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 the development of 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 relations with Russia?
- To what extent is the U.S.-Russia relationship driven by developments in Europe? Can the United States reach accommodation with Russia over issues 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?

### 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

### Essential Readings (92 Pages)

- 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, Dorte Bach Nyemann, Juliette Bird, Vincenzo Coppola, and Lucie Beraud-Sudreau, EU-NATO Cooperation: A Secure Vision for Europe, Friends of Europe, June 3, 2019. EU-NATO cooperation: a secure vision for Europe - Friends of Europe. [All seminars should read the Introduction, the cyber security chapter, and the burden-sharing chapter. Your instructor will select whether to read the hybrid threats, counter-terrorism or crisis-management chapters.]
- Trenin, Dimitri. "European Security is Becoming Euro-Asian," Carnegie Moscow, December 18, 2019.
- Fischer, 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, March 3, 2022.
- Stoner, Kathryn, and Michael McFaul. "Who Lost Russia (This Time)? Vladimir Putin." The Washington Quarterly 38, no. 2 (2015): 167-187.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 17

## INTERAGENCY SIMULATION EXERCISE

### Focus

In this fictional scenario, it is May 24, 2022. 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. 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.

### Guidance

- Your faculty member will supply you with a specific role in the North Pacific Interagency Working Group (NPIWG) in the National Security Council of President James Walker.
- After reading the materials relevant to the situation in Lorica, you will consult with your agency partner to prepare for the crisis meeting of the NPIWG.
- You may need to decide how to navigate between the national interests of the United States and the priorities and culture of your home organization.

### Essential Readings (22 Pages)

- Stigler, Andrew, "Student Guide – Interagency Simulation Exercise," 2022.
- Background: "Lorica, a Gentle Giant."
- Background: "U.S. Policy Regarding Lorica Since 1999."
- Background: "Hypersonic Weapons: Overview, Country Programs, & Implications."
- Background: "Map of Lorica."
- Crisis: "President Xi Statement on China-Venezuela Cooperation."
- Crisis: "State Cable OAS Rep."
- Crisis: "State Cable EMB Beijing."
- Crisis: "VTC Transcript."
- Crisis: "Map of PRC Airbase Lorica."

### OBJECTIVES

- Understand the background of Lorica, the strategic role it plays in the Pacific, and the current situation
- Apply what you have learned about the interagency and the operations of government, as well as your strategic acumen, to the task of generating strategic perspective
- Use a crisis scenario to debate and arrive at policy recommendations for senior officials
- Experience the give-and-take of the interagency process and observe how agency equities affect the outcome
- With that advice, consult with your interagency colleagues to aid the group in supplying the president with strategic policy advice





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 17

## GREATER MIDDLE EAST AND CENTRAL ASIA

### Focus

The last several years in the Greater Middle East (GME) have witnessed tremendous geopolitical upheaval resulting from the 2011 Arab Awakening and numerous changes in government leadership, Syria's ongoing civil war, the rise of ISIS, the conflict in Yemen, an emboldened Iran, and other potentially destabilizing actions. Central Asia (CA) consists of the Central Asian Republics (CARs), which are geopolitically significant especially since the collapse of the Soviet Union and more recently the Russian invasion of Ukraine and its implications for the Central Asian region. The CARs play an important role in the context of strategic competition and the challenges related to these new configurations of power. Despite these challenges, the United States remains committed to promoting stability in the GME and CA regions, ensuring trade flows, combating terrorism, and preventing the spread of nuclear weapons.

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the roles that factors such as geopolitics, geo-strategy, culture and religion play in planning and executing security and cooperation activities in the Greater Middle East and Central Asia
- Comprehend the complex relationships between the concepts of security and national interests, while comprehending the political and military challenges facing the nations in the GME and CA regions
- Analyze the strategic alternatives available to U.S. strategic planning in the region

### Guidance

- Why is the Greater Middle East strategically important? What are U.S. national interests relative to these regions?
- Why is the Greater Middle East fraught with conflicts and violence?
- What is the role of state and non-state actors in the conflicts/violence in the region?
- What are the "white/black swans" in the GME and CA regions?
- What will be the principal security issues in the years to come? What can the United States do to prevent/manage these issues?

### Essential Readings (77 Pages and 38 min podcast)

- 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, January 18, 2022.
- Podcast: "The State of Affairs across the Middle East, with Steven A. Cook," Council on Foreign Relations, December 21, 2021 (38 min).
- "Central Asia 2022: Forecasts, Trends, and Risks," Central Asian Bureau for Analytical Reporting, July 1, 2022.
- Winn, Neil, and Stefan Gänzle. 2022. "Recalibrating EU Foreign Policy Vis-à-Vis Central Asia: Towards Principled Pragmatism and Resilience." Geopolitics: 1–20.
- Alinejad, Masih. "The Beginning of the End of the Islamic Republic." Foreign Affairs, October 18, 2022.

### Recommended Resources

- "Bitter Rivals," Frontline PBS Documentary, February 2018 (approximately 2 hours): <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/film/bitter-rivals-iran-and-saudi-arabia/>.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 18

## CONGRESS AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH THE MILITARY

### Focus

Congress engages in an enduring struggle to check the powers of an increasingly powerful President. The way in which Congress relates to the military provides insight regarding the ability of Congress to exercise its authority over the military and control the use of power. Article I of the Constitution grants Congress certain national security powers, including those to declare war, raise and support armies, provide and maintain a Navy, make rules for regulating the land and naval forces, and to create and empower executive branch departments. Additionally, Congress has the exclusive power of appropriating funds to support the U.S. government, and the responsibility to conduct oversight of how U.S. national security policy is formulated and executed. Personnel policy supports our national security priorities by recruiting and retaining servicemembers who will carry out the orders of the President. This session highlights the tensions that exist between the Legislative and Executive branches by examining the creation of laws and policies that govern DoD's attempts to prevent and reduce sexual assault in the military.

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the structure of Congress and its role in passing laws, appropriating funds, and overseeing the Executive Branch, as well as the process that the Legislative Branch employs to implement policy
- Examine how Congress and the military work together, or in tension, to create national security policies, institutions, and processes
- Understand how Congressional intent can shape attitudes about policies within the military over time

### Guidance

- What powers does Congress have in creating, shaping, and implementing national security policies?
- What limitations exist that prevent Congress from fully exercising its authority?
- Does Congress have a role in shaping the culture of the military, and if so, what tools are available to do so?
- Why are Members of Congress interested in how the military investigates and prosecutes cases of sexual assault?
- Why did leaders in the Department of Defense resist changes to the Uniform Code of Military Justice until 2021?
- How are matters of sexual assault in the military related to the implementation of Women, Peace, and Security initiatives?
- What other instances have you seen where tension exists between Congress and the military regarding a policy outcome, and how was it resolved? Did tensions dissipate after resolution?

### Essential Readings (99 Pages)

- Serafino, Nina M. and Eleni G. Ekmektsioglou, "Chapter 9: Congress and National Security," *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*, ed. Derek S. Reveron, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and John A. Cloud, (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2018).
- Biden, Joseph R., "A Proclamation on National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, 2022, Proclamation 10361 of March 31, 2022," *Federal Register* 87, no. 65 (April 5, 2022): 19589.
- Boczar, Amanda, "Managing Harassment and Assault in the Contemporary U.S. Military," *Managing Sex in the U.S. Military: Gender, Identity, and Behavior*, ed. Beth Bailey, Alesha E. Doan, Shannon Portillo, and Kara Dixon Vuic, (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2022), 219-235.
- Norris, Peter, "Congress and its Relationship with the Military Case Study Reader," U.S. Naval War College, August 25, 2022.

### Recommended Resources

- Walsh, Kathleen A., "Legislative Affairs and Congressional-Military Relations," Newport, R.I.: Naval War College faculty paper, updated 2012, 1-11.
- Mitchell, Ellen, "General slated to lead US Army Europe mistreated congressional staffer," *The Hill*, November 8, 2017.
- U.S. Congress. Legislative Process Videos 1-9.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 18 AFRICA

## Focus

Africa “has assumed a new, strategic place in U.S. foreign policy and in the definition of vital U.S. national interests,” according to the high-level U.S. Africa Policy Advisory Panel. Economic growth, democratization and political transformation are positive trends, while transnational terrorism and illicit trafficking, declining but persistent conflict, human insecurity, and environmental stresses present complex challenges. Assessing the region’s future security environment and developing and implementing appropriate strategies is further complicated by resource limitations, the fragile state of emerging African democracies, and a highly fluid regional political-security situation. To make sense of this, this session examines three interlocking components: geography, the political-security environment, and U.S. strategy.

### 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

## Guidance

- What are the most important strategic challenges, threats and opportunities to U.S. interests in the Africa?
- How do various factors at different levels (for example strategic and economic competition at the international level, regional issues such as terrorism, and local issues such as pollution) intersect in the African security environment? For instance, why is illegal, underreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing a security concern in Africa and how does it link with other issues such as strategic competition?
- What are the range of Chinese activities within Africa and what is the impact of these activities on African security?
- In what ways are African leaders and other African actors exercising agency in their international activities and how does better understanding African agency help inform more effective U.S. strategy?

## Essential Readings (65 Pages)

- Wilkins, Sam. “Does America Need an Africa Strategy?” War on the Rocks, April 2, 2020.
- Benabdallah, Lina. “China’s Soft-Power Advantage in Africa.” Foreign Affairs, December 23, 2021.
- Alden, Chris and Lu Jiang. “Brave New World: Debt, Industrialization and Security in China–Africa Relations.” International Affairs 95, no.3. (May 2019): 641–657.
- Shurkin, Michael. “Strengthening Sahelian Counterinsurgency Strategy.” Africa Security Brief 41, ACSS, July 25, 2022.
- “Seasick as COVID Locks Africa Down its Waters Remain Open to Plunder.” Greenpeace Africa. October 2020, 6-23.

## Recommended Resources

- Executive Office of the President, National Security Council, “U.S. Strategy Toward Sub-Saharan Africa,” August 2022, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/U.S.-Strategy-Toward-Sub-Saharan-Africa-FINAL.pdf>
- Stock, Robert. “The Map of Africa” Chapter 1 in Africa South of the Sahara: A Geographical Interpretation. 3rd Edition (New York: Guilford Press, 2013), 15-30.
- Singh, Naunihal. “NWC Talks: China in Africa.” YouTube.com. Video 13:50, December 18, 2019.
- Englebert, Pierre. “The ‘Real’ Map of Africa.” Foreign Affairs Snapshot, November 8, 2015, 1-6.
- Hicks, Marcus, Kyle Atwell, and Dan Collini. “Great-Power Competition Is Coming to Africa.” Foreign Affairs, March 4, 2021.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 19

## DECIDING WAR: ENGAGING, WITHDRAWING, OR AVOIDING

### Focus

On March 20, 2003, a United States-led coalition launched the invasion of Iraq, an initiative that ultimately led to the overthrow of Saddam Hussein's government. This session examines the events, dynamics, procedures, and perspectives that played a role in what was arguably the most consequential American military initiative of the post-Cold War era. Students will be offered an opportunity to assess the extent to which Iraqi actions and misperceptions may have contributed to the likelihood of war. American perceptions played a role as well. Congressional dynamics included legislators who offered reservations but ultimately authorized the attack. Former Senior Intelligence Officer Paul Pillar stated "9/11 made it politically possible for the first time to persuade the American people to break a tradition of not launching offensive wars."

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the range of factors that led to the decision to militarily confront Iraq
- Assess the role of perceptions, calculations, and beliefs in the processes that led to this decision
- Explore the role of the United States Congress in authorizing the conflict
- Examine both the American and Iraqi perspectives on the unfolding diplomatic, and ultimately military, confrontation

### Guidance

- Stigler discusses how the Congress and the Executive Branch interact when the prospect of military engagement is on the horizon. What factors influence domestic debates and struggles over authority when the potential use of force is at stake?
- What motivated the United States to take offensive action against Iraq? What are the factors and events that drove this decision? Was there dissent?
- What Iraqi actions, both in the years prior and in the weeks and months immediately preceding the invasion, played a role in the decision process?
- What were the assumptions and beliefs that motivated this decision? Was the decision the product of a rational process? Did cognitive factors impact the development of the policy of confronting Saddam?
- How did senior Iraqi officials perceive the unfolding crisis prior to the invasion?
- George W. Bush states that he "had tried to address the threat from Saddam Hussein without war." Was the war in Iraq something that could have been avoided?
- Was the role of intelligence a crucial factor, or did it merely offer confirmation for actions policymakers were already committed to?

### Essential Readings (83 Pages)

- Stigler, Andrew L., "The Decision for War," Chapter 5 in *Governing the Military* (New York: Routledge, 2019), pages 56-64.
- Fisher, Louis, "Deciding on War Against Iraq: Institutional Failures," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 118 No. 3 (2003), 389-410.
- Woods, Kevin, James Lacey, and Williamson Murray, "Saddam's Delusions: A View from the Inside," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 85 No. 3 (May/June 2006), 2-26.
- Bush, George W., *Decision Points* (New York: Crown Publishers, 2010), 223-253.

### Recommended Resources

- Purdum, Todd S., *A Time of Our Choosing* (New York: Times Books, 2003).





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 19

## 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 Caribbean and Central America, have experienced U.S. military interventions creating a very difficult environment for U.S. foreign policy execution. U.S. policymakers must accept the new “diplomatic competitiveness” as a more sophisticated Latin America increasingly engages with new 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 and geopolitical trends affect the security of countries in Latin America and the Caribbean
- Identify and analyze key issues in the U.S. - Canada relationship
- Assess how history, culture and geography matter within Latin America and the Caribbean

### Guidance

- How has Latin America's colonial history shaped contemporary regional political, economic and cultural characteristics?
- How has the United States' legacy of military intervention in Latin America impacted its ability to implement contemporary foreign policy in the region?
- How should the United States respond to contemporary security challenges such as criminal cartels and networks and external actors who compete with the US for regional influence?
- What are the most important issues in the US – Canada - Mexico relationship?

### Essential Readings (107 Pages)

- Kline, Harvey F., and Christine J. Wade. 2022. Latin American Politics and Development. Taylor and Francis. [Read: Part I - 1. The Context of Latin American Politics, 2. A Brief History of Latin America, 5. The Political Economy of Latin America, and 6. Latin America and the United States.]
- Berg, Ryan. "The Importance of Democracy Promotion to Great Power Competition in Latin America and the Caribbean." Center for Strategic & International Studies, 26 September 2022: 1-9.
- Reid, Michael. "A Region Caught Between Stagnation and Angry Street Protests." The Economist. June 2022: 1-10.
- Alden, Edward. "Who Lost North America?" Foreign Policy. 17 November 2021: 1-5.
- Vanherck, Glen. "NORAD and USNORTHCOM Strategy: Executive Summary." March 2021: 1-16.
- U.S. Department of State. "U.S. Relations with Canada: Bilateral Relations Fact Sheet." 19 August 2022.
- Meyer, Peter J. "Central America's Northern Triangle: Challenges for U.S. Policymakers in 2021." Congressional Research Service Insight, 13 May 2021: 1-3.
- Seelke, Clare. "Venezuela: Political Crisis and U.S. Policy." Congressional Research Service In Focus, 1 September 2022: 1-3.
- Sullivan, Mark P. "Latin America and the Caribbean: U.S. Policy Overview." Congressional Research Service In Focus, 29 April 2022: 1-3.

### Recommended Resources

- Sullivan, Mark P. "Latin America and the Caribbean: U.S. Policy and Key Issues in the 117th Congress." Congressional Research Service, 10 February 2022: 1-64.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 20

## FUNDING FOREIGN POLICY: AUTHORIZING AND APPROPRIATING

### Focus

This session answers two essential questions: how do policy-makers decide what to spend on defense, and what role(s) does Congress play in these decisions? Decisions on defense spending result from interactive Executive and Legislative Branch decision-making systems and processes. This session will outline the national security decision-making processes and dynamics that result in annual defense bills and address their long-term, strategic implications for national defense in an era of strategic change. Some of the readings also offer a critique of the current system and suggestions for how it might be improved.

### Guidance

- The annual U.S. defense budget is the result of numerous actors, institutions, and interests competing together and advancing through the processes established by two branches of government: the Executive and Legislative Branches. Understanding how these systems and processes work and interrelate in determining annual defense spending and its long-term implications is important for professionals working in the defense and national security realm.
- What is the impact of time on the budget cycle, and is there any way to shorten the multi-year process?
- Why do you suppose that members of Congress – including members of the President's party – tend to substantially increase the administration's defense budget requests?

### Essential Readings (52 Pages)

- Parrish, Molly, "Navigating the Billions: A Beginner's Guide to the Defense Budget," (Washington, DC: Center for a New American Security, February 11, 2020).
- Fiorentino, Dominick A., "The Executive Budget Process Timeline: In Brief," Congressional Research Service Report R47088, ver. 3 (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, May 5, 2022).
- McGarry, Brendan W., "Defense Primer: Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution (PPBE) Process," (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, updated May 20, 2022).
- Hale, Robert F., "Executive Summary, Overview & Key Findings," Financing the Fight: A History and Assessment of Department of Defense Budget Formulation Processes (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution Foreign Policy Division, April 2021), pp. 1-4.
- Crawford, Neta., "The U.S. Budgetary Costs of the Post-9/11 War," The Costs of War Project (Providence, RI: Brown University, Watson Center, September 1, 2021).
- Feldscher, Jacqueline., "House Committee Boosts Defense Budget by \$37B," Defense One (June 22, 2022).
- McGregor, Matt et al., "Pillars of the Modern Defense Budgeting System," (McLean, VA: MITRE Center for Data-Driven Policy, 2022).

### OBJECTIVES

- Understand the policy decision-making and lawmaking systems and processes that drive U.S. defense spending
- Consider a variety of policy factors that impact defense spending decisions, both internal to the Department of Defense and from external actors, interests, and influences
- Analyze the trade-offs that often result in defense spending decisions, and how these trade-offs impact long-term force planning and the resulting force structure





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 20 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. Let the debate on national interests in IS-04 and the grand strategy archetypes from IS 10-13 guide your thinking about power, interests, challenges, and approaches to the NSS.

## 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 between the ends, ways, and means
- Analyze how well the NSS lays out key national priorities
- Evaluate how well the NSS serves modern planning needs

## Guidance

- 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 rivals' strategies?

## Essential Readings (103 Pages)

- Biden, Joseph. "National Security Strategy." The White House, Oct. 2022.
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie. "It's Time to Get Honest About the Biden Doctrine," New York Times, Nov. 12, 2021.
- Kennan, George F. "The Inauguration of Organized Political Warfare," April 30, 1948.
- Lettow, Paul. 2021. "U.S. National Security Strategy: Lessons Learned." Texas National Security Review 4, no.2, 117-154.
- Smarter Strategies for the Twenty-First Century – Interview with H.R. McMaster, Orbis 65, no.2 (2021): 207-213.

## Recommended Resources

- Reagan, Ronald. "National Security Decision Directive 238." Declassified October 27, 2005. The Reagan Library. September 2, 1986.
- War on the Rocks, Net Assessment Podcast, "A Strategy-Budget Mismatch." April 29, 2022. <https://warontherocks.com/2022/04/a-strategy-budget-mismatch/>.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 21

## HOW SPACE FORCE WAS BORN: CASE STUDY

### 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 nation. In this session, we apply previous lessons on bureaucratic politics and the role of Congress and the president in national security policy to understand why the option of a new service was chosen, how Congressional interests and oversight shaped the new Space Force and consider the likely bureaucratic and political implications of a separate organization responsible for the space domain.

### OBJECTIVES

- Discuss the creation of the U.S. Space Force
- Identify the role of Congress in legislating the Space Force
- Examine the different priorities of stakeholders who influenced the congressional legislative process
- Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Space Force as it currently exists and how they reflect the legislative process that created it

### Guidance

- What problems have been identified with respect to U.S. space capabilities? To what extent do they represent changes in the international security environment versus domestic organizational and implementation difficulties?
- Why might space have been "neglected" bureaucratically within DoD before Space Force was created?
- What led to a separate space service being formally proposed? Would this specific choice have been likely without Donald Trump as President? Why did Congress approve a fully independent service after being opposed to even a Space Corps just a few years earlier?
- How did Congress shape the creation of the Space Force? What issues interested the House and Senate? What do you think the DoD and other Services wanted? What interest groups might have had a stake?
- What organizational and political challenges do you see for the new Space Force? Do you think the solution that was adopted will fix the problems that were identified several years earlier?
- How will a dedicated space service change the debates over U.S. military strategy and force planning? What role do you think Space Force will advocate for space in U.S. national strategy?

### Essential Readings (75 Pages)

- Chaplain, Christina, "Defense Space Acquisitions: Too Early to Determine If Recent Changes Will Resolve Persistent Fragmentation in Management and Oversight," Government Accountability Office, July 2016.
- Harrison, Todd, "Why We Need a Space Force," Center for Strategic and International Studies, October 3, 2018.
- Johnson, Kaitlyn, "Why a Space Force Can Wait," Center for Strategic and International Studies, October 3, 2018.
- Burbach, David, Space Force Case Reader, U.S. Naval War College, August 5, 2022.
- Farley, Robert, "Space Force: Ahead of Its Time or Dreadfully Premature," Cato Institute, December 1, 2020, 1-15.
- Center for Strategic and International Studies, "Commanding Space: The Story Behind the Space Force," video, 20:00, April 2019.

### Recommended Resources

- Spirtas, Michael, et. al., "A Separate Space: Creating a Military Service for Space," (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2020).
- Colby, Elbridge, "From Sanctuary to Battlefield: Framework for a U.S. Defense and Deterrence Strategy for Space," Center for a New American Security, 2016.
- United States Public Law 116-92, "National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2020," 116<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, December 20, 2019, 365-373.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 21

## NATIONAL ECONOMIC STRATEGY (GEO-ECONOMICS)

### Focus

As a means to pressure foreign countries, financial avenues are often appealing policy options. Wealthy nations such as the United States often have the ability to place adversaries under severe economic strain. Countries that play a prominent role in the international economic system can often use their leverage against other nations and thereby magnify the financial pressure that comes to bear on a policy target. However, economic policies can have disadvantages. For one, the U.S. preference for relying on the free market for economic solutions means the government can only ask, not task, private corporations. Additionally, economic instruments may have “pocketbook” impact on U.S. citizens, placing political limitations on the willingness of Congress and the executive branch to wield them. Economic tools of policy are sometimes used to buy time and appear engaged while other approaches are either actively considered or held in reserve as alternatives. Economic measures often receive additional attention because they are viewed as less confrontational (depending on the specific situation), and generate less of a public commitment to achieve a positive outcome than other tools of statecraft.

### OBJECTIVES

- Understand the role of economic tools and approaches to the development and execution of foreign policy.
- Comprehend the economic tools at the disposal of the president (such as sanctions) and those which require the active concurrence of the Congress (such as trade agreements)
- Discuss the international and the domestic economic systems and how they seek to impose limits on the U.S. agenda
- Assess the strategic and tactical advantages and disadvantages of economic policy options

### Guidance

- What is the spectrum of economic tools available when policymakers seek to either alter or reinforce the international status quo? How does the United States use its unique position to shape the world order?
- In recent years, the use of economic sanctions has often been used to deal with national security concerns. Do you think sanctions have become a substitute for military action?

### Essential Readings (74 Pages)

- Farrell, Henry, and Abraham L Newman. “Weaponized Interdependence: How Global Economic Networks Shape State Coercion.” *International security* 44, no. 1 (2019): 42–79.
- Harris, Jennifer and Robert B. Kahn, “Understanding and Improving U.S. Financial Sanctions,” *Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*, 2017.
- Jain, Ash and Matthew Kroenig, with Marianne Schneider-Petsinger. *A Democratic Trade Partnership: Ally Shoring to Counter Coercion and Secure Supply Chains*. Atlantic Council, 2022. [Read Executive Summary (2-6), Strategic Context (7-14) and Core Elements of DTEP (17-21)]

### Recommended Resources

- Dong Jung Kim (2022) Europe as a geoeconomic pivot: geography and the limits of US economic containment of China, *European Security* 31, no. 1, 97-116.
- Geoffrey Gertz & Miles M. Evers (2020) Geoeconomic Competition: Will State Capitalism Win?, *The Washington Quarterly* 43, no. 2, 117-136.
- Lim, Darren J. and Victor A. Ferguson. Informal economic sanctions: the political economy of Chinese coercion during the THAAD dispute, *Review of International Political Economy*, 2021.
- Horowitz, Liviu and Elias Götz (2020) The overlooked importance of economics: why the Bush Administration wanted NATO enlargement, *Journal of Strategic Studies* 43, no. 6-7, 847-868.
- Sergunin, Alexander, and Gunhild Hoogensen Gjørsv. 2020. “The Politics of Russian Arctic Shipping: Evolving Security and Geopolitical Factors.” *Polar Journal* 10 (2): 251–72.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 22

## ECONOMIC WARFARE: A CLOSER LOOK AT RUSSIAN SANCTIONS

### Focus

When Russia invaded Ukraine, the United States and its allies began an unprecedented effort to wield some of the most far-reaching economic sanctions ever attempted, and they ratcheted them up as the war continued. Putin equated them to “economic warfare,” and they affected Russia’s GDP, inflation, interest rates, and unemployment. Sanctions also froze the assets of hundreds of Russian oligarchs. In the near term, Russia avoided bankruptcy by continuing to earn revenue from oil and gas sales, although key European buyers began reducing their dependency. Russia’s ability to persist despite the most comprehensive sanctions ever imposed has set off debates among economists and foreign policy experts on the limits of economic tools of coercion. This session synthesizes knowledge acquired throughout the course, particularly in earlier economics-focused sessions in FPA and IS, and asks students for an in-depth assessment of the efficacy of sanctions as a tool of war.

### OBJECTIVES

- Review the range of economic tools available as a means of forcing behavior
- Trace the effects of different kinds of sanctions imposed against Russia, with an eye to identifying which were the most, and least, effective
- Consider the second- and third-order effects of economic sanctions for states imposing them, as well as those on the receiving end
- Distinguish, through examples and discussion, the various lenses through which foreign policy decisions and actions can be interpreted

### Guidance

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the various kinds of sanctions on Russia? What impact has sanctions had on Russia?
- Considering the opposing conclusion of the Yale (Sonnenfeld et al) and Stanford (International Working Group) studies, why is it so frustratingly difficult to evaluate the toll of sanctions?
- Why does the length of time matter, and how has the impact of sanctions against Russia changed over time?
- What are the influences of the U.S. domestic political system in shaping the sanctions regime?
- How effective is the threat of secondary sanctions in persuading countries outside a dispute (China and India, for example) to conform to largely Western-imposed sanctions policies?

### Essential Readings (71 Pages)

- Sonnenfeld, Jeffrey and Steven Tian, “Actually, the Russian Economy is Imploding,” Foreign Policy, July 22, 2022.
- The Economist, “Split Reality,” The Economist, August 27, 2022, 56-59.
- Kantchev, Georgi, Evan Gershkovich and Yuliya Chernova, “Fleeing Putin, Thousands of Educated Russians Are Moving Abroad,” Wall Street Journal, April 10, 2022.
- Nelson, Rebecca M., “Russia’s War on Ukraine: The Economic Impact of Sanctions,” CRS IF12092. May 3, 2022.
- Sonnenfeld, Jeffrey, Steven Tian, Franek Sokolowski, Michal Wyrebkowski and Mateusz Kasprowicz, “Business Retreats and Sanctions Are Crippling the Russian Economy,” SSRN, Aug. 4, 2022, 3-36.
- The International Working Group on Russian Sanctions, “Strengthening Financial Sanctions against the Russian Federation,” The International Working Group on Russian Sanctions Working Group Paper #4, June 22, 2022.
- Thompson-Jones, Mary, “Case Study Reader: Task Force Kleptocapture vs. the Megayachts,” U.S. Naval War College, August 30, 2022.

### Recommended Resources

- Korenok, Oleg, Swapnil Singh and Stan Veuger, “Russian Sanctions Are Working But Slowly,” Foreign Policy, July 18, 2022.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 22

## NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGIC GUIDANCE

### Focus

The National Defense Strategy (NDS) and National Military Strategy (NMS) are used to shape the future development of the U.S. military in support of the National Security Strategy (NSS). The Department of Defense (DoD) is currently focused on orienting future forces for great power competition. This session will introduce those changes and explore several contemporary defense strategy debates in greater depth. It also explores the issue of defense or force planning and its relationship to great power competition.

### OBJECTIVES

- Identify and analyze major directions of current U.S. defense strategic guidance
- Assess emerging strategic challenges and how they may affect future U.S. defense strategy

### Guidance

- How is military competition and conflict changing? What are the biggest current and future challenges to the U.S. Joint Force? What important conversations are not happening?
- How should the United States and allies adapt their forces, operational concepts, and posture to respond to new challenges? Do you agree with the National Defense Strategy (NDS) vision? What would you do differently?
- Has DoD actually made choices to prioritize strategic competition as the NSS, NDS, and NMS state? Are “hard choices” politically sustainable? If not, how should DoD respond? Should it build a more general-purpose force?
- How does strategic guidance get translated into a comprehensive force structure? What are some different types of defense (or force) planning (and what are advantages/disadvantages of each)?

### Essential Readings (77 Pages)

- Department of Defense. "2022 National Defense Strategy." 27 October 2022, III-IV, 1-23. [Assigned reading is only the NDS and does not include the Nuclear Posture or Missile Defense Reviews].
- Mazarr, Michael J., Katharina Ley Best, Burgess Laird, Eric V. Larson, Michael E. Linick, and Dan Madden. "The U.S. Department of Defense's Planning Process: Components and Challenges." Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2019. [Read Chapters 1 and 2]
- Blume, Susanna V., and Molly Parrish. "Make Good Choices, DoD: Optimizing Core Decisionmaking Processes for Great-Power Competition." Center for New American Security, November 2019, 3-20.
- Brands, Hal and Evan Braden Montgomery. "One War is Not Enough: Strategy and Force Planning for Great-Power Competition." The Strategist; Texas National Security Review 3, no.2 (Spring 2020).

### Recommended Resources

- Hale, Robert F. "Financing the Fight: A History and Assessment of Department of Defense Budget Formulation Processes" (Washington, DC: Brookings, April 2021), 1-44.
- Cook, Jim and Sean Sullivan. "Logic of Force Planning Lecture." Naval War College, 21 Oct 2021.]





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 23

## FUTURE FOREIGN POLICY CHALLENGES

### Focus

This session is aimed at exercising students' policy analysis skills as applied to a future-oriented policy decision-making challenge(s). The object of this session is to determine analytically what actors, factors, dynamics, powers, and influences in the national security policy decision-making ecosystem are likely to impact a future policy decision. Students will also look for insights into how U.S. policy might be decided in such a circumstance. Having a detailed understanding of the U.S. foreign policy-making apparatus, the policy ecosystem, and policy decision-making dynamics will provide students with the type of strategic foresight essential to the military and national security professional.

### OBJECTIVES

- Exercise all FPA concepts and tools to determine the art of the possible in a future-oriented, notional policy decision-making situation
- Evaluate the range of policy actors, factors, dynamics, and influences that could affect a U.S. policy decision regarding a critical national security concern

### Guidance

- This session will challenge students' comprehension of FPA concepts and tools with a notional (fictional) scenario that requires students to determine the most likely policy decision(s).
- The fictional scenario involves a surprise invasion by the People's Republic of China (PRC) of Taiwan-occupied islands (Quemoy/Kinmen/Jinmen and Matsu) that lie just offshore from the PRC mainland. This is a realistic scenario and a decision that policymakers could face in the near- to mid-term: what, if anything, to do in response? Faculty will provide additional details on this scenario during class.
- 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), including myriad domestic as well as international (two-level game) dynamics and pressures. In particular, Xinbo Wu, a leading Chinese foreign affairs analyst, provides insights into how Beijing has perceived and responded to past crises involving the United States.
- This session requires students to employ the full range of FPA concepts and tools to reach a compelling answer on how a U.S. policy decision-maker might react in such a scenario. Students may find earlier sessions, including the FPA-3 unitary state readings on U.S.-Taiwan policy particularly helpful. Indo-Pacific regional material and current U.S. strategies, particularly the most recent National Security Strategy and National Defense Strategy (unclassified fact sheet) discussed in the International Strategies sub-course are also pertinent. Finally, sessions on The Rise of Communist China, The Cold War, and The Return of Great Power Competition from the Strategy and Policy (or Strategy and War) syllabus, might also prove useful.

### Essential Readings (48 Pages)

- 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," Chapter 17 in *About Face: A History of America's Curious Relationship with China from Nixon to Clinton*. First edition. (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1999), 315-348.
- Wu, Xinbo, "Managing Crisis and Sustaining Peace Between China and the United States," (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, April 2008), 7-10; 23-7.
- Seligman, Laura and Alexander Ward, "Pentagon Chief's Calls to China Go Unanswered Amid Taiwan Crisis," *Politico* (August 5, 2022).
- 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).

### Recommended Resources

- Culver, John, "The Unfinished Chinese Civil War," *The Interpreter* (Sydney, Australia: The Lowy Institute, September 20, 2020).





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 23

## 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 challenges students to 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 also think about strategies to respond to those challenges, at the level of U.S. defense policy as a whole, 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

### Guidance

- 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 fold into each of the grand strategies discussed earlier in the course?
- Who is responsible for dealing with maritime security challenges? What organizations and entities have a "piece of the maritime interest pie?"
- The 2005 National Strategy for Maritime Security represents a multi-departmental effort to develop a cohesive strategy, not merely a naval strategy. The term maritime security includes a broader range of challenges than traditional naval threats -- what does it encompass? Who is responsible for dealing with maritime security challenges?
- As the challenges of the 21st century become more and 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 Readings (86 Pages)

- Hattendorf, John B. "What is a Maritime Strategy?" Soundings, no. 1 (October 2013): 1-10.
- Maritime Security Working Group. "The National Strategy for Maritime Security." September 2005, 1-31.
- Berger, David, M.M. Gilday, and Karl L. Schultz. "Advantage at Sea: Prevailing with Integrated All-Domain Naval Power." Washington, D.C., December 2020, 1-35.
- Congressional Research Service (CRS). "China Naval Modernization: Implications for U.S. Navy Capabilities—Background and Issues for Congress." March 8, 2022, 1-10.

### Recommended Resources

- Chief of Naval Operations Navigation Plan 2022 (Washington DC: United States Navy), 1-24.
- United States Marine Corps, Force Design 2030: Annual Update (May 2022): 1-20.
- Testimony of Admiral Linda L. Fagan, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, on "Taking the Helm: the Commandant's Vision for the U.S. Coast Guard," Before the House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation and Maritime Security, July 14, 2022.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 24

## THE INDONESIAN HANDSHAKE

### Focus

This session will allow you to practice demonstrating your comprehension of the material presented in the Foreign Policy Analysis sub-course in preparation for the final exam. You will work with readings that provide different perspectives and information on a national security case study. These materials provide both background and context through which to analyze a foreign policy decision.

### Guidance

- In August 2002, the Bush administration announced the resumption of military relations with Indonesia. You are required to use course concepts and materials to conduct an analysis of this case. What are the most important influences or factors that led to this decision? What was the combatant commander's role? Can you apply and distinguish between the analytical perspectives in this case study analysis?
- Note that there will be no "school solution" for this case or for the final examination. The case materials can support a variety of interpretations and may even include contradictory perspectives. Your task is to use course tools to analyze the evidence provided in order to provide your own answer to the question in a well-reasoned argument.
- Additional guidance will be provided on the specific question, methodology, and format for the analysis. Your instructor will provide guidance on how your seminar will discuss the case analysis in class.

### Essential Readings (71 Pages)

- Priest, Dana, "The Indonesian Handshake," Chapter 10 in *The Mission: Waging War and Keeping Peace with America's Military*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2003, 216-273.
- Nicksch, Larry, "Indonesia: U.S. Relations With the Indonesian Military, CRS, August 10, 1998.

### OBJECTIVES

- Analyze materials concerning a contemporary U.S. policy decision, demonstrate the ability to successfully synthesize the concepts and theories presented throughout the entirety of the policy analysis sub-course
- Demonstrate the ability to assess and evaluate which influences and actors were the most critical in the case study provided





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY – 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 and how is designed to help students think about the future of warfare (including role of cyber) and its operational and strategic implications.

### OBJECTIVES

- Think about what the future of warfare may entail and assess potential implications for future security environment, grand strategy, concepts and force planning

## Guidance

Based on what you have learned this over this term, the readings and your own knowledge think about the following questions:

- How will changes in the international system, technology, and the environment influence warfare?
- How and with what will future wars be fought?
- Where are wars most likely to occur and over what?
- Who is the U.S. 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 Readings (103 Pages)

- Nolan, Cathal J. "Do Generals Matter?" War on the Rocks, June 24, 2019.
- E. Cohen, et. Al., Peering into the Crystal Ball: Holistically Assessing the Future of Warfare. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2020.
- 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.
- Briggs, Chad. "Climate Change and Hybrid Warfare Strategies" Journal of Strategic Security 3, no. 4 (2020) : 45-57.
- Schrier, Rob. "COVID-19 and Cyber – Foreshadowing Future Non-Kinetic Hybrid Warfare." Cyber Defense Review 6. No. 2 (Spring 2021): 30-35.
- Zinni, Anthony, Mie Augier, and S. Barret, "Innovation: People Are More Important than Technology." Proceedings 18, no 8.
- Carvin, Stephanie. 2022. "How Not to War." International Affairs 98 (5): 1695–1716.

## Recommended Resources

- National Cyber Strategy of the United States of America, Washington, DC: The White House, 2018.





# NSDM FX - 01 THE FINAL EXERCISE

## 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 National Security Council Staff strategic planning working group developing the key tenets of a national security strategy, national military strategy, operating concepts, and a future force concept that advance and defend U.S. national interests over the next 20 years. They will communicate their vision and strategy to persuade audiences on their perspective.

### OBJECTIVES

- Demonstrate understanding of a wide range of NSDM course concepts through this capstone exercise.
- Conduct a global strategic assessment, create an outline national security strategy, create an outline military strategy, describe appropriate operating concepts, create a force concept to support the strategies and concepts, and create an implementation plan for one aspect of the NSS, NMS, operating concepts, or force structure concept.

## Guidance

- Your working group is assigned to produce and present a strategic estimate of the future security environment over the near (0-5 years), medium (5-15 years), and long (15-20 years) term, an outline of a national security strategy that advances and defends U.S. interests, an outline of a national military strategy, a list of three to five operating concepts (at least one of which must DoD-focused) necessary to advance the strategies, and a future force concept to support all of these. Finally, the group must choose one aspect of their strategies or of their force concept, or one operating concept, and describe in detail how the initiative would be executed.
- 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-7).
- 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. The grading panel will determine which seminar delivered the superior presentation within each group and will award 3 additional points to that seminar's presentation score. The maximum points that can be awarded for that seminar is 100; the other seminars in the group may only earn a high score of 97. Because the NSDM Final Exercise is designed as a team-based exercise, each seminar receives one grade that applies to all seminar members.

## Essential Readings (28 Pages)

- Reveron, Derek S. and Nikolas K. Gvosdev, "National Interests and Grand Strategy," The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security. Edited by Nikolas K Gvosdev, Derek S. Reveron, and John A. Cloud. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2018, 35-56.
- Brown, Charles Q., David H. Berger. "Opinion: To Compete with China and Russia, the U.S. Military Must Redefine 'Readiness'." Washington Post Online, February 1, 2021.

## Recommended Resources

- Commission on America's National Interests, America's National Interests (Cambridge, MA: Belfer Center, 2000), 5-21.
- Kennan, George F., "The Inauguration of Organized Political Warfare (Redacted Version)," April 30, 1948.





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

# NSDM FX - 01 THE FINAL EXERCISE

- Greer, Jim, "The Weaker Foe," Strategy Bridge, March 7, 2017





## NSDM FX - 02 - 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 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, identify needed operating concepts, and outline a force concept that supports all of these. This exercise is designed for the seminar to work collaboratively to develop these deliverables.

### OBJECTIVES

- Create a 40-45-minute oral presentation with visuals that outlines the seminar's proposed strategic estimate, strategy, national military strategy, operating concepts, force structure concept, and implementation case

### Guidance

- The required elements of the brief are:
- Strategic estimate (out to 20 years)
  - 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 to 5 yrs), medium (5-15 yrs), and long (15-20 yrs) 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.
- 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 end-state (Ends) for the world in each time period? The reason for the near, medium, and long-term analyses 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.
  - Which other actors will the United States need to influence in order 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?
- National Military Strategy
  - Nested within the outline of the national security strategy the seminar has devised, the seminar will formulate an outline for a National Military Strategy (NMS) that broadly describes how the military instrument of power will advance and defend national interests. Describe how the NMS supports the NSS.
  - Broadly assess the risks inherent in the proposed military strategic approach.
- Operating Concepts (3-5, minimum 1 DoD)
  - Describe three to five operating concepts the seminar believes the U.S. government needs to carry out its strategy.





## NSDM FX - 02 - 06

### SEMINAR PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT

- At least one of these must be a military joint force operating concept; the rest may involve other executive agencies and departments or remain DoD-focused.
- Review Dr. Jim Cook's article, "The Importance of Joint Concepts for the Planner" for historical examples of Joint Force operating concepts.
- Future Force Concept
  - Develop a conceptual Joint Force that supports the NSS and NMS and is capable of achieving 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 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 operating concepts, or a feature of the force concept.
  - 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 Readings (12 Pages)





## NSDM FX - 02 - 06

# SEMINAR PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT

- Congressional Research Service. "New U.S. Marine Corps Force Design Initiative: Force Design 2030", March 7, 2022.
- James Cook. "The Importance of Joint Concepts for the Planner," Joint Force Quarterly, Issue 99, 4th Quarter 2020, pp. 95-100.



### Recommended Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.



# NSDM FX - 07

## SEMINAR PRESENTATION REVIEW

### Focus

This session provides a dedicated time for the seminar to present their strategic estimate, NSS, NSM, operating concepts, future force concept, and implementation case to the faculty teaching team for feedback.

### Guidance

- This session concludes the preparation phase for NSDM FX. The seminar should be prepared to present the briefing in a format that closely resembles the final product that will be graded.
- The seminar may choose, in consultation with the faculty teaching team, to do this practice briefing before the date FX-7 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 email will serve as the read-ahead for the faculty grading panel. 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](mailto:sean.mahoney@usnwc.edu)

FX Deputy Director: LtCol Dan McVay, [daniel.mcvay@usnwc.edu](mailto:daniel.mcvay@usnwc.edu)

- The FX "Main Themes" questionnaire will be available at the conclusion of FX-7. Each seminar will complete an online questionnaire to catalogue the main themes of their FX products by FX-9. The questionnaire link will be delivered via Blackboard and e-mail

### OBJECTIVES

- Complete and present the seminar's brief
- Conduct a rehearsal of the seminar's product and receive feedback from the faculty teaching team
- Complete questionnaire on main themes of the seminar's FX presentation

### Essential Readings (0 Pages)

- There are no additional required readings for this session.

### Recommended Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





## NSDM FX - 07 SEMINAR PRESENTATION REVIEW

### PRESENTATION REVIEW RUBRIC

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





## NSDM FX – 08

# SEMINAR PRESENTATION TO THE GRADING PANEL

### Focus

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

### Guidance

- The faculty teaching team will provide additional guidance on the conduct of FX-8, 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 faculty panel. The FX is a team effort; it is expected that all seminar members engage during the Q&A period.
- Following the presentations by all group seminars, 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. The seminar that delivers the superior presentation within each group as determined by the grading panel will be awarded 3 additional points to be added to the grading panel's assessment value. The maximum points that can be awarded for the winning seminar is 100; the other group seminars may only earn a high score of 97. 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.
- Grading criteria (also see rubric from FX-07):
  - Are the strategic estimate, national and military strategies, operating concepts, future force concept, 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 brief present 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 security assessment?
  - Does the seminar link the future force concept to the security assessment, strategies, and operating concepts? To what extent does the future force concept support the strategies? To what extent does the force concept 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?
  - 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?

### OBJECTIVES

- Effectively communicate a 40-45-minute presentation on the seminar's estimate, strategies, concepts, and implementation case
- Effectively answer questions asked by the faculty panel for 30 minutes in a clear, articulate, and complete way





## NSDM FX – 08

# SEMINAR PRESENTATION TO THE GRADING PANEL

- 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 Readings (0 Pages)**

- There are no additional required readings for this session.





# NSDM FX - 09

## FX & NSDM WRAP-UP WITH TEACHING TEAM

### Focus

The final session is designed to give students and teaching teams the opportunity to wrap-up FX and NSDM in-person after seminars present their briefs to the grading panel.

### Guidance

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

### Essential Readings (14 Pages)

- 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.

### OBJECTIVES

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

