



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, and develop military strategy and force structure.

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.

Required Readings (55 Pages)

- [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.](#)
- [Nye, Joseph S., Jr. "Will the Liberal Order Survive?: The History of an Idea." Foreign Affairs 96, no. 1 \(2017\): 10-16.](#)
- [Jones, James L. "Foreword: U.S. National Security for the Twenty-First Century" in The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security, 2018.](#)
- [Hardt, Brent. "NWC Talks: What on Earth is the Liberal International Order?" YouTube video. 18:03. Nov 13, 2019.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Putnam, Robert D. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games." International Organization 42, no. 3 \(1988\): 427-460.](#)
- [Turner, Stansfield. \(1998\). Convocation address. Naval War College Review, 51\(1\), 72-80,](#)

OBJECTIVES

- Define national security and the influences that lead to foreign policy decisions.
- Understand the course structure, assignments, and expectations
- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1c, and 2c. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3..





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 01

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Focus

The NSDM Security Strategies 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 events for this sub-course will be a midterm exam and an analytic research paper.

OBJECTIVES

- Introduce the objectives and scope of the Security Strategies 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 Security Strategies paper.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, and 2b. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 1.c. (1), (3)..

Guidance

- What is strategy and what are the various levels of strategy?
- What is meant by the phrase "liberal international order"? How does U.S. grand strategy relate to this concept?
- What is the concept of polarity vis-à-vis the international distribution of power in the international system? What are the key differences between unipolar, bipolar and multipolar systems?

Required Readings (52 Pages)

- [Owens, Mackubin Thomas. "Strategy and the Strategic Way of Thinking." Naval War College Review 60, no. 4 \(2007\): 111-124.](#)
- [Colgan, Jeff D. "Three Visions of International Order." The Washington Quarterly 42, no. 2 \(2019\): 85-98](#)
- [Heisbourg, François. "War and Peace After the Age of Liberal Globalisation." Survival 60, no. 1 \(2018\): 211-228.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS - 01

POLICY ANALYSIS AND DECISION-MAKING

Focus

We launch the Policy Analysis sub-course by examining some of the theories of foreign policy analysis and providing an overview of the domestic forces involved in national security policy making. This session lays out themes that will be discussed in more detail in subsequent sessions and introduces a variety of lenses through which to view foreign policy decision making. Given the enormous complexity of variables behind any foreign policy decision, most scholars find a conceptual framework is helpful. These decisions often deal with life and death issues such as going to war, negotiating a cease fire, imposing sanctions, entering an alliance, or signing a treaty. Leaders often take actions under tight deadline pressure and without complete information. This session examines some of the types of decisions and provides a brief introductory look at some of the models (which will be examined in more depth in later sessions) through which those decisions can be analyzed.

OBJECTIVES

- Familiarizes students with terms of art and examples of some of the more prevalent foreign policy analysis models.
- Distinguishes, through examples and discussion, the various lenses through which foreign policy decisions and actions can be interpreted.
- Explores key decisions in U.S. foreign policy through the use of case studies.
- Sets the stage for more in-depth discussions on theories and models in following sessions.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 3a, 3b, and 5b. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3.

Guidance

- The writers note "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?
- It is often said that decision-makers must act with incomplete information. What information would be especially important in a foreign policy context, and what data is easiest to come by, harder to come by, and nearly impossible to come by?
- A theme throughout this sub-course is the growth of the national security "establishment." It is useful to take a moment and identify the many stakeholders in that establishment -- especially in the domestic political arena -- that have influence on foreign policy decisions.

Required Readings (51 Pages)

- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain, and David A. Cooper, "Introduction," Chapter 1 in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 1-9. \[AVAILABLE ONLINE ONLY\]](#)
- [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, pp. 14-51. \[AVAILABLE ONLINE ONLY\]](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 02

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY

🔍 Focus

Fundamental to assessing the security environment and developing grand strategy is answering a basic question: how does the world work? There is an extensive body of writing and thinking on this subject by international relations theorists. Theory plays an important role in all aspects of life helping to organize a complex world in ways that allow us to better understand what is happening. A theory purports to do three things: to describe the world, to predict how it might change, and to prescribe a response. Thus, policymakers and practitioners of grand strategy must be familiar with how theory can inform strategy and policymaking. The three predominant theoretical perspectives -- realism, liberalism and constructivism -- influence the ways in which policymakers look at the evolving international security environment as well as their efforts to develop an overall grand strategy. Phenomena such as international anarchy, the role of states vs. ideas, international organizations, balance of power, democratic peace, globalization, and human nature are central to the discussion. It is important, therefore, to develop an understanding of and appreciation for the way you view the world at the outset of our effort to grapple with developing grand strategy.

OBJECTIVES

- Examine various theories of international relations to understand the different conceptions of how the world works.
- Assess linkages among the theories of international relations and begin to determine the implications for the development of grand strategy.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Area 1a, 1b, 1d, and 3a. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3 .

≡ Guidance

- What are the basic tenets of each of the theories? What do you see as the strengths and weaknesses of each?
- When you compare these three theories, which ones provide the best explanation of how the world works? What is your reasoning for this assessment? Note that an acceptable answer is that all three may provide some explanatory value. If that is the case, when does one theory provide a better explanation than the others?

📖 Required Readings (64 Pages)

- [Snyder, Jack. "One World, Rival Theories." Foreign Policy, November/December 2004, no. 145, pp. 1-10.](#)
- [Mearsheimer, John. "Anarchy and the Struggle for Power." Chap. 2 in The Tragedy of Great Power Politics. \(WW Norton, 2014\), pp. 29-54. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)
- [Morgan, Patrick. "Liberalism." Chap. 3 in Contemporary Security Studies, 3rd edition. Edited by Alan Collins. \(Oxford University Press, 2013\), pp. 28-41. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)
- [Finnemore, Martha. "Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention." Chap. 3 in Essential Readings in World Politics, 2nd ed. Edited by Karen Mingst and Jack Snyder. \(WW Norton, 2004\), pp. 102-118. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)

👤 Foundational Resources

- There are no additional resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS - 02

CASE STUDY: AMERICANS IN LEBANON

Focus

The Reagan administration's decision to deploy Marines twice as a response to the growing violence in Lebanon in the early 1980s is an example of decision-making undertaken in a highly complex international environment, but one also profoundly affected by domestic U.S. factors, the interplay between national policymakers in Washington and front-line military and diplomatic organizations, as well as the particular interpersonal dynamic that shaped the first term of the Reagan presidency. This case, which has enduring relevance in the study of national security policy analysis, helps illustrate how the theoretical concepts used in this sub-course can be used to analyze actual policy decisions. The student of national security affairs must be aware of the entire spectrum of influences at work in particular cases in order to grasp the full breadth of the policy environment and gain a better understanding of how and why decisions are made.

OBJECTIVES

- Examine the complexities of a national security case study by examining the international and domestic influences that impacted the decision.
- Begin to apply foreign policy analysis theories to a major foreign policy decision.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2b, 2c, 2e, 3a, 3c, 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5e. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3..

Guidance

- Based on the information in the case study and the film, what were the international and domestic factors that affected the president's decisions, first to deploy Marines in Lebanon to facilitate the withdrawal of Palestinian fighters from Beirut, and then to return the Marine contingent in the wake of the massacres at Sabra and Shatila? Did any of these factors change over time? 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?
- To what extent (if at all) should military officers and other national security professionals consider political, social, and economic factors alongside military considerations when advising their military and civilian superiors? When is it appropriate (or inappropriate) to bring these factors into consideration when assessing strategic and tactical measures?

Required Readings (25 Pages)

- ["Case Study: Lebanon Revisited," Chapter 10 in Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise \(Newport, RI: Naval War College, 2017\), pp 219-246](#)
- During the class session, students will watch a Public Broadcasting System documentary film entitled "Retreating from Beirut" which will be the foundation for this and subsequent class discussions

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 03

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

- Identify the dimensions of national power and their role in shaping strategy.
- Assess the role national interests play in strategic thinking.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, and 1d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3

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?
- Do you agree with Walt's argument that alliances should be based on national interests? Is the right question for US leaders to answer when potential allies come calling "what's in it for us"?
- 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?

Required Readings (38 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, pp. 1-18.](#)
- [Walt, Stephen. "Would You Die For That Country?" Foreign Policy, March 24, 2014. pp. 1-6.](#)
- [Mead, Walter Russell. "America's Sticky Power," Foreign Policy, 29 October 2009, pp. 1-9.](#)
- [Walker, Christopher and Jessica Ludwig. "The Meaning of Sharp Power," Foreign Affairs, 16 November 2017.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session





POLICY ANALYSIS-03

THE UNITARY STATE PERSPECTIVE

Focus

Do states make rational decisions about national security policy in pursuit of their national interests? In this session, we consider the Unitary State Perspective, which is based on the premise that governments act as if they were single, unified entities choosing policy options through optimization. In other words, it assumes the unitary state responds to the demands of the international system to choose policies that will maximize the national interest. This session examines how U.S. national security processes and policies are affected by the actions of other actors such as states, intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in a constantly changing international system. In turn, for effective participation in the international political system (IPS), U.S. policymakers must understand the full range of instruments available to them to influence the behavior of other actors in the international system, and how others can use these same instruments to influence the United States. In keeping with the paradigm introduced in NSDM-1 of the “two-level” game, we also examine the interaction between the international and domestic political systems.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze the extent to which the unitary state perspective can help us understand state behavior.
- Analyze and understand key actors, tools, and rules in the international political system and how the international political system influences the U.S. national security decision making process.
- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, and 3a. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3...

Guidance

- How does the assumption that states act as if they were unified entities shape our understanding of their policy choices? Do states actually choose optimal policies, in accordance with their national interests? Why or why not?
- Why is the IPS important to understand, especially for U.S. policymakers and national security professionals?
- How do international rules, tools, and concepts, such as the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), help shape, influence, or constrain U.S. policy? What are the potential challenges to U.S. sovereignty, national power, and domestic politics given the technological advances and cyberspace tools in the modern era?

Required Readings (63 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. pp. 52-68. \[AVAILABLE ONLINE ONLY\]](#)
- ["The Regional and International Context for Theater Security" Chapter 7 in Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise. Newport, RI: Naval War College, 2017, pp. 125 - 151](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K. "Will NATO Live to 75?" NWC Talks, 2019](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 04

DETERRENCE THEORY AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS

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 deterrence and nuclear weapons 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 the competition with a rising China and a resurgent Russia, but also because of the threats from a nuclear North Korea and continual concern over a potential Iranian nuclear program, along with the consideration of deterrence in other domains such as cyber space and "gray zone" conflict.

OBJECTIVES

- Assess the workings of deterrence and the role deterrence plays in protecting U.S. interests.
- Analyze and evaluate the tools available for implementing deterrence.
- Evaluate the role and composition of the U.S. nuclear force in the 21st century.
- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1d, and 2b. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 3.b. (1), (2), (3), (4).C

Guidance

- What are the dilemmas of deterrence theory and how do states construct a credible deterrence posture? What role does rationality play in deterrence calculations? What are the important distinctions in the different types of deterrence?
- How do deterrence concepts dating back to the Cold War era hold up in today's evolving international security environment? What are the challenges of multi-polar deterrence and how might new or emerging technologies alter deterrence stability?
- How large do you think the U.S. strategic nuclear force should be? Do we still need a Nuclear Triad to maintain credible deterrence? If so, should certain parts of the Triad be adjusted – e.g., fewer land-based ICBMs and more SSBNs? Can the United States afford all of the modernization plans for its strategic nuclear forces that are currently on the table?

Required Readings (50 Pages)

- [Freedman, Lawrence. "The Meaning of Deterrence." Chap. 2 in Deterrence. Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2004. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\].](#)
- [Krepinevich Jr, Andrew F. "The Eroding Balance of Terror: The Decline of Deterrence," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 98, No. 1 \(Jan/Feb 2019\), pp. 62-74.](#)
- [Woolf, Amy F. "U.S. Strategic Nuclear Forces: Background, Developments, and Issues," Congressional Research Service, March 6, 2018. \[READ pp. 1-9 and pp 43-52.\]](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Department of Defense. "Nuclear Posture Review." 2018.](#)
- [Nichols, Tom. "NWC Talks: Preventive War in the 21st Century." YouTube video. 12:51. May 29, 2019. <https://youtu.be/6DimWwz8-P8>.](#)
- [Nichols, Thomas M. "U.S. Nuclear Strategy: The Search for Meaning." Chap. 20 in The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2018.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 04

COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE

Focus

How do leaders and policymakers in the national security arena actually reach decisions? In this session, we consider the cognitive process – that is, the way people think, and how they process information.

In the “rational actor model,” we filter out the influence of individual human beings by treating the state as a single “rational actor.” But states are composed of people who bring to the table a range of human characteristics when trying to reach decisions, including biases, intuition, previous experiences, limited information, and other factors.

Sometimes, this human behavior can produce creative breakthroughs; at other times, it can be quite dangerous, as Robert Jervis suggests in his hypotheses on misperception.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze how an individual decision maker can be affected by their experiences, expertise, biases, heuristics, emotions, belief systems, operational codes as compared to the rational actor model.
- Analyze the role of risk and uncertainty in cognitive processes that impact decision making in policymaking.
- Assess the conditions that allow and understand how cognitive processes within groups/teams such as groupthink and polythink operate in decision making.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d.. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 though E-E-3.

Guidance

- How does having an awareness of the natural limitations of the cognitive abilities of individual decision makers help us to identify ways to mitigate problems in the decision-making process?
- “Heuristics” are convenient and useful mental shortcuts that people rely on when faced with complex decisions. They rely on what they know, or on previous rules or examples, to help them navigate situations in which they are confronted by risk, ambiguity, and uncertainty. These same heuristics, however, can lead decision-makers astray. How can we recognize, and minimize, the negative effects associated with such heuristic shortcuts?
- The military tends to manage risk and uncertainty through the management of and structuring of information. Often, this leads to replacing qualitative reason – that is, grappling with the specific and sometimes challenging uniqueness of a problem – with the analysis of quantitative and measurable metrics. What are the strength and weaknesses of each approach?
- Why do state leaders and their advisers tend to misperceive the leaders and actions of other states in the national security environment? Why do they assume, for example, that their own actions are clear and positive, while those of their adversaries are ambiguous or even hostile? What cognitive factors sometimes push otherwise intelligent and prudent leaders toward conclusions that are based more in belief than in reality?

Required Readings (76 Pages)

- [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, pp. 88-122. \[AVAILABLE ONLINE ONLY\]](#)
- [Jervis, Robert. "Hypotheses on misperception." World politics 20, no. 3 \(1968\): 454-479](#)
- [Jones, Nate, Thomas S. Blanton, and Lauren Harper, eds. "The 1983 War Scare Declassified and For Real." National Security Archive, 2015 \(Only Website is Required, Full Report is Available for Download as Foundational Resource\)](#)

Foundational Resources

- Kahneman, Daniel and Patrick Egan. Thinking, fast and slow. Vol. 1. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011 [Available in Library]





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 05

COMPARATIVE 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 states and other political entities have managed the economic behavior of individuals and groups, and there is no global consensus on which system is best. Some systems prioritize growth, while others prioritize stability, and others still prioritize the regime's ability to distribute patronage.

Political economy refers to the processes by which market activity is structured and regulated by the political unit. An idealized pure free market optimizes the values of efficiency and individual liberty (to dispose of property as the individual prefers), but still requires rules to function, and can create instability and inequality. Political processes determine which values a state will prioritize (e.g., equality, stability, regime survival), 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.

OBJECTIVES

- Understand alternative economic system theories.
- Analyze the economic characteristics of a few different models and the advantages and disadvantages of each.
- Understand how to relate economic performance to national security and other political outcomes.
- Assess the relationship between successful states, failed states and economic systems.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, and 1d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3 .

≡ 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 codified in the policies of many international economic institutions (see SS-6, International Political Economy), and 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?
- China's economic system is neither a typical centrally-planned communist system, nor a market system either of the liberal or coordinated kind. The Chinese Communist Party has for many years been working to maintain enough control over the system that their regime remains stable and secure, but not so much that the economy cannot be competitive. They have accomplished enormous growth. But how will China transform its economy into one that can sustain both a large middle-class population and a growing military capability? Can this be done without enormous social upheaval?
- A narrative in the developed and developing worlds suggests that countries that develop a middle class will also move toward democracy/greater political liberty – indeed, this has been the basis of much of U.S. foreign policy for several decades. But is this cause-effect relationship real? What is the relationship between a country's political system and its level of economic development?

☰ Required Readings (60 Pages)

- [Cohn, Lindsay P. "Introduction to Political Economy Part I: Comparative" U.S. Naval War College 2019 \(revised\).](#)
- [Campbell, John L., and Ove K. Pedersen. "Institutional Competitiveness in the Global Economy: Denmark, the United States, and the Varieties of Capitalism" Regulation and Governance \(2007\): 230-246.](#)
- [Cheung, Tai Ming. "Bridging the Civil-Military Technological Divide in the Information Age." Chap. 1 in Fortifying China: The Struggle to Build a Modern Defense Economy. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009. \[Accessed via E-reserves\].](#)
- [Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and George W. Downs. "Development and Democracy." Foreign Affairs 84, no. 5 \(2005\): 77-86. doi:10.2307/20031707.](#)

📖 Foundational Resources

- ["Tragedy of the Commons," in the Encyclopedia of Environmental Science, David E. Alexander and Rhodes W. Fairbridge \(eds\) \(Boston: Kluwer, 1999\): 601-602.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 05

ORGANIZATIONAL PROCESS PERSPECTIVE

🔍 Focus

Military and civilian staffs are an essential component of the U.S. national security environment. These staffs exist for a multitude of purposes and perform a wide range of tasks. To some degree, this makes every staff unique. However, any major staff, military or civilian, is an organization, and organizations tend to follow certain patterns of behavior. These patterns allow the observant practitioner to anticipate potential actions and reactions in the policymaking process. For example, the very structure of the organization will affect the manner in which the staff acquires and processes information, assigns work, makes decisions, and implements policy. Over time, organizations also develop their own cultures, which in turn significantly influence their behavior. National security professionals who work on major staffs need to understand the impact of these factors in order to enhance the contribution they make to organizational success as well as limit the degree of personal frustration they might experience over organizational factors beyond their control. National security professionals who understand the impact of organizational behavior will find their jobs far easier to master and are far more likely to make positive contributions to their organizations, and to understand the ways in which their organizational context shapes their own behavior.

OBJECTIVES

- Examine the behavioral characteristics and limitations of organizations, such as major staffs, in formulating and implementing effective policies.
- Examine the behavioral characteristics of, and competing cultures inside, different types of military and civilian organizations
- Identify the possible cascading and reinforcing effects of organizational behavior on mission accomplishment.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 2c, 2e, 3a, 3c, 5b, 5c. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3.

≡ Guidance

- These readings provide an overview of organizational interests, cultures, and behaviors that build on foreign policy analysis foundations and emphasize how organizational structures and processes can affect outcomes. Real-world examples are provided to assess how organizational interests, culture, and behavior affect policy and outcomes.
- Every government organization—whether 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?
- In reviewing the 9/11 case study, do you see any examples of the types of organizational behavior described in the first reading? How did these behaviors affect real-world outcomes?
- How might military officers and civil servants operating in the national security policy arena navigate the dynamics of organizational behavior to assure mission success?

📖 Required Readings (54 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*, pp. 125-160 \[AVAILABLE ONLINE ONLY\]](#)

- [Chapter 9, "Case Study: 'We Have Some Planes,'" in *Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise*, pp. 171-218](#)
- [Bill Moyers Journal: 9/11 For the Record," PBS video, :055, "PBS.org show 123," December 6, 2011](#)

👤 Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 06

INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY

Focus

In the previous session we explored the debates on how states choose to organize their economies, both in theory and looking at practical examples and problems seen today. In this session, we focus on the economic relations among states. At the simplest theoretical level, we consider why and how countries interact with each other in the first place. We consider how international trade benefits economies, discuss the problems trade creates, understand how trade can take place using different currencies, and how the money and financial systems of different countries interact with each other. There is an inherent political component to the world economy and sovereignty governs political choices states make in the international economic system. This session introduces some ideas about international economic governance and looks at the debate about what the global economy will look like in coming years.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze what drives economic behavior among states and what motivates a state to adopt a specific set of international economic policies.
- Assess the advantages and disadvantages of global trade and considerations that drive state decision making with respect to international trade policy.
- Evaluate how global economic competition can both strengthen as well as damage relations among global economic actors.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, and 1d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3 .

Guidance

- What does "globalization" mean, and why does it matter? Several of the readings explain how the interdependence of economies works, how it has both positive and negative aspects, and how it affects issues of security and statecraft as well as prosperity and well-being.
- Why might states consider acceding to international regimes (sets of rules/organizations) beneficial? Why do other states object to such regimes on the grounds of "sovereignty"? Does viewing the world through a primarily economic lens change how we view security?
- How do war and other military actions, or punitive economic actions, affect the states that engage in them?
- How do trends in technology matter for economic activity? For trade? For the movement of people? For the concept of state sovereignty?

Required Readings (53 Pages)

- [Cohn, Lindsay P., 2019 \(revised\), "Introduction to Political Economy Part II: International".](#)
- [Kennedy, Paul M. The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000. New York: Random House, 1987. \[Read 278-286\] \[Accessed via E-reserves\].](#)
- [Sharma, Ruchir. "The Boom was a Blip: Getting used to Slow Growth." Foreign Affairs 96, no. 3 \(2017\): 104.](#)
- [Lund, Susan and Laura Tyson. "Globalization is Not in Retreat: Digital Technology and the Future of Trade Susan Lund and Laura Tyson." Foreign Affairs 97, no. 3 \(2018\): 130.](#)
- [Bown, Chad P., Robert W. Staiger, and Alan O. Sykes, 2017, "Multilateral or Bilateral Trade Deals? Lessons from History", Ch. 14 in Economics and Policy in the Age of Trump, Chad P. Bown \(ed\), London: Centre for Economic Policy Research Press: 153-163.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [The World Trade Organization website.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 06

BUREAUCRATIC POLITICS PERSPECTIVE

Q Focus

A federal government official named Rufus E. Miles, Jr. once famously quipped that in government “where you stand depends on where you sit”. This axiom has become known as Miles' Law. We have already used the organizational process perspective to examine how individual organizations within the national security apparatus process information and enact policy, with or without guidance from senior leadership. In this session, we introduce two additional perspectives that focus on the role of the various individuals who represent these organizations within the wider government—the bureaucratic politics and sub-bureaucratic perspectives. Bureaucratic politics focuses analysis on the bargaining that occurs among senior leaders of organizations arguing for policies that protect or promote the interests of their specific agency or department. Decisions are therefore seen as the result of compromises between competing bureaucratic interests rather than the broader "national interest", or an automatic output of organizational routines. The sub-bureaucratic politics prism peers even further into organizations to explore how bargaining works at lower bureaucratic levels, often focusing on specific issue interests rather than broader agency interests. You will be asked to evaluate how the bureaucratic and sub-bureaucratic politics perspectives intersect and contrast with each other and the organizational process perspective.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze how bureaucratic interests can both intersect with and diverge from the rational "national interest" 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.
- Assess the extent to which lower-level officials can influence decisions and how bargaining and coalition building is different at subordinate bureaucratic levels.
- Evaluate the interplay of organizational processes and cultures, bureaucratic politics, and subordinate bureaucratic politics.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 3a, 3c, 3d, 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, and 5e. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. .

Guidance

- How does the bureaucratic politics perspective challenge the common assumption that countries function as "rational actors" that make foreign policy decisions that are intended to optimize their national interests?
- Why does high-level bargaining among the senior leaders of key national security agencies sometimes lead to an outcome that was nobody's initial preference?
- How do sources of influence, bureaucratic interests, and bargaining tactics differ between high-level bureaucratic politics and bargaining at lower levels?
- What is the interplay between the analytic focus of the bureaucratic and sub-bureaucratic politics lenses and that of the organizational behavior and culture factors that were explored in the last session? Are these useful conceptual distinctions to differentiate among different sources of organizational influence on policymaking?

☰ Required Readings (96 Pages)

- [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, pp. 162-191 \[AVAILABLE ONLINE ONLY\]](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Sub-Bureaucratic Politics Perspective," Chapter 8 in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 238-283 \[AVAILABLE ONLINE ONLY\]](#)
- [Gates, Robert Michael, "Waging War on the Pentagon," Chapter 4 in Duty: Memoirs of a Secretary at War. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2014, pp. 115-135 only \[Accessed via E-Reserve\]](#)

📖 Foundational Resources

- [Cooper, David, "NWC Talks: Understanding the Real 'Deep State.'" YouTube video, 13:36, July 1, 2019.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 07

TRANSNATIONAL AND NON-TRADITIONAL SECURITY ISSUES

Focus

Transnational and nontraditional security issues have emerged as 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 issues will remain significant challenges in the decades ahead. These issues 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 state versus non-state categories. Governments, however, are organized primarily to deal with other states and the primary focus for many military forces is to prevent and prepare for conflict with other states, although the bulk of their daily ‘security duties’ may involve addressing transnational and nontraditional security issues. These issues are often seen as the ‘dark side’ of globalization which may challenge conventional notions of sovereignty, strategy, geography, military force structure and war.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze how globalization helps to fuel and to sustain transnational and nontraditional security issues.
- Comprehend the basic dynamics of transnational crime and terrorism.
- Assess and analyze emerging opportunities and challenges that transnational processes and security issues pose for strategy development.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2c, 3c, 3d, 4a, and 5c. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3.

Guidance

- 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 states and economies?
- What level of threat do they pose? Which threats will be most important over the next 20 years?
- Explain the difference between process-based and actor-based threats and how they can interact.

Required Readings (55 Pages)

- [McQuaid, Julia, Pamela G. Faber, and Zack Gold. "Transnational Challenges and U.S. National Security: Defining and Prioritizing Borderless Threats." CNA Occasional Paper. November 2017, 1-19.](#)
- [Shier, Brian La and James Stanish. "The National Security Impacts of Climate Change." Journal of National Security Law & Policy 10, no. 1 \(2019\): 27-43](#)
- [UNODC. "Environmental Crime – The Trafficking of Wildlife and Timber." UN Office on Drugs and Crime. 2012, pp. 1-4.](#)
- [Moore, Pauline. "International Terrorism." Chap. 28 in *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2018.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [UNODC. "World Drug Report 2019." UN Office on Drugs and Crime. 2019.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 07

PALACE POLITICS PERSPECTIVE

🔍 Focus

Previous sessions have focused on theories of foreign policy decision-making, like the role of cognitive or psychological factors, standard operating procedures, organizational routines, and different levels of bureaucratic bargaining in foreign policy analysis. This session introduces a further approach, one which is often overlooked in academic studies of executive level decision-making: the impact of what we call "palace politics". Put simply, it matters a great deal who is whispering in the president's ear, and advisers therefore jockey for position in trying to get as close as possible to the centers of power. This can have an important impact on policymaking. In examining this process, we will look at the impact which this 'jockeying' within the president's inner circle exerts on the shape of American foreign policy.

☰ Guidance

- Why is this paradigm 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 the cognitive, organizational process or bureaucratic politics perspectives?
- What do we mean by the term 'groupthink'? What is the difference between groupthink and polythink? How might each of these dysfunctions be avoided in policy discussions?
- How does the Iraq case study demonstrate the parallel applicability of all the perspectives discussed in this and prior sessions? How would we explain the US decision to invade Iraq using these different perspectives? Which have the most explanatory salience in this particular case?

📖 Required Readings (71 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, pp.192-235. \[AVAILABLE ONLINE ONLY\]](#)
- [Smith, Steve. "Groupthink and the Hostage Rescue Mission." *British Journal of Political Science* 15, no. 1 \(1985\): 117-123.](#)
- [Houghton, David Patrick, 'Into Iraq: A War of Choice', Chapter 10 \(pp.218-247\) in The Decision Point: Six Case Studies in Foreign Policy Decision-Making \(New York: Oxford University Press, 2013\). \[Accessed via E-Reserve\]](#)

📚 Foundational Resources

- [Stratfor Worldview, "From West Point to the Trump Administration", 2019.](#)

OBJECTIVES

- Examine how palace politics can cause policy to intersect with or diverge from the rational "national interest" as agency leaders, White House staff, and other members of the President's inner circle jockey to gain the president's ear.
- Analyze how the palace politics approach differs from but builds upon other approaches studied in the sub-course.
- Synthesize the palace politics approach and other perspectives within a single case study in order to understand how each would explain a major foreign policy decision.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2c, 2e, 3a, 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5g. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. .





SECURITY STRATEGIES-08 STRATEGIC RESTRAINT

🔍 Focus

Strategic restraint has deep roots in American history, 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

- Assess the relative position of the US 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.
- Support CJCS and OPMEP Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2c, and 2e. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3

☰ 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 "great power competition," is this a feasible grand strategy for the United States?
- What would a U.S. grand strategy of strategic restraint mean for U.S. influence within the international system? Why should we care?
- Would other nations provide for their own security if the United States adapted a less active 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 are the missions, capabilities and attributes of the joint force under this grand strategy?

☰ Required Readings (56 Pages)

- [Posen, Barry and Andrew Ross, "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy", International Security, Winter 1996/1997, pp 3-14.](#)
- [Gholz, Eugene, Daryl G. Press, Harvey M. Sapolsky, "Come Home, America: The Strategy of Restraint in the Face of Temptation," International Security, Spring 1997 \(Vol. 2, No. 4\) pp. 5-17.](#)
- [Ashford, Emma, "Power and Pragmatism: Reforming American Foreign Policy for the 21st Century," in Michael J. Zak Lecture Series New Voices in Grand Strategy, Center for a New American Security, 11 April 2019, pp. 4-10.](#)
- [Brands, Hal and Peter Feaver, "Stress-Testing American Grand Strategy," Survival, January 2017, pp. 93-120.](#)

🖥️ Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS - 08

THE NATIONAL SECURITY ESTABLISHMENT

🔍 Focus

The president is aided in the conduct of foreign policy by the efforts of many thousands of people working for a number of executive branch departments. The Secretary of State is the oldest cabinet position, and incoming presidents often look to State to play the lead role in foreign policy. Yet the Department of Defense far outstrips the Department of State in resources, and often holds other advantages in policy debates. This session examines the mission and structure of the departments involved in foreign policy, and explores how they interact.

OBJECTIVES

- Examine the elements of the national security establishment
- Assess the interactions of the key executive branch departments involved in foreign policy
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 3a, 3c, and 3d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3..

🔧 Guidance

- What are the key executive branch departments involved in foreign policy and national security? How are they similar and how are they different?
- In terms of resources, how do these departments compare? What advantages and disadvantages does each department have in debates over policy?
- Are different departments more or less prominent in certain types of foreign policy situations?
- Has the balance between departments changed in the post-9/11 environment?

📖 Required Readings (76 Pages)

- [Reveron, Derek S., *Exporting Security: International Engagement, Security Cooperation, and the Changing Face of the US Military* \(Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2016\), 2nd ed., Chapter 4 "Demilitarizing Combatant Commands," pp. 95-120. \[Accessed via E-Reserve\]](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nicholas, Jessica Blankshain and David Cooper, 'Domestic Politics', Chapter 9 in *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory Into Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp.284-333. \[AVAILABLE ONLINE ONLY\]](#)

📚 Foundational Resources

- [Murray, Shoon, and Anthony Quintain, "Combatant Commanders, Ambassadorial Authority, and the Conduct of Diplomacy," in Gordon Adams and Shoon Murray, ed.s, *Mission Creep: The Militarization of US Foreign Policy?* \(Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2014\), Chapter 9, pp. 166-191. \(CHROME or SAFARI only, IE/EDGE do not work\)](#)
- [Burns, William J., *The Back Channel: A Memoir of American Diplomacy and the Case for its Renewal*. \(New York: Random House, 2019\), Chapter 5, "Age of Terror: The Inversion of Force and Diplomacy," pp. 147-199. \[Accessed via E-Reserve\]](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-09

BALANCE OF POWER REALISM

🔍 Focus

Grand strategies of offshore balancing and selective engagement 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 “vital.”

OBJECTIVES

- Identify, analyze and evaluate the components of offshore balancing and selective engagement to include its underlying assumptions, key concepts, objectives, risks, and force requirements.
- 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.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2c, and 2e. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 1.c.(1), (2), (3), (5), and (7).

☰ Guidance

- How ‘selective’ is selective engagement? 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?
- What are the factors that enable alliances to persist or to fail? What are the strategic risks associated with coalitions of the willing or partnerships? What should the role of alliances, coalitions of the willing, or partnerships be in grand strategy?

📖 Required Readings (46 Pages)

- [Posen, Barry and Andrew Ross, “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy”, International Security, Winter 1996/1997, pp 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 \(Washington, DC: Center for a New American Security\), pp. 15-27.](#)
- [Mearsheimer, John J. and Walt, Stephen M., “The Case for Offshore Balancing”, Foreign Affairs, Volume 95, number 4, July-August 2016, pp. 70-83.](#)
- [Cook, James L. “Military Alliances in the 21st Century: Still Relevant, or Relic of Cold War?” Orbis, Fall 2013, pp. 1-15.](#)

🖥️ Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS - 09

THE PRESIDENCY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

🔍 Focus

Article II of the U.S. Constitution makes the president commander in chief of the armed forces and confers significant executive power in the office. Most scholars agree that the power of the presidency in the realm of foreign policy has grown over the last 70 years -- mostly at the expense of the legislative branch. This session explores the question of how a president shapes the national security decision-making process, and what makes the process either successful or dysfunctional. The increasing complexity of the international arena requires that a president gain advice and information from a wide variety of expert sources, which is one reason for the expansion of the executive branch. Personality and cognitive disposition are important, since so much power is vested in a single person. A president's world view and decision-making style can also play a key role.

☰ Guidance

- Brattebo and Landsford write that "The personal characteristics of the president can often reinforce, eclipse, or even contradict the objective national security interests of the United States when it comes to making important decisions about the direction, scope, and tenor of national security policy." Considering the dozen presidents who have served since the establishment of the National Security Council, which ones -- and which structures -- were most adept at organizing what can be an unwieldy system?
- How important is "chemistry" in the relationship between a president and his National Security Advisor (NSA)? What are some common traits and workplace practices among NSAs seen as most successful? What causes this relationship to fail?
- What were some of the methods, according to the Eisenhower case study, which the president used to ensure optimal consideration of all foreign policy options? Can you link these approaches to some of his noteworthy foreign policy successes?

📖 Required Readings (74 Pages)

- [Brattebo, Douglas M. and Tom Landsford. "The Presidency and Decision-Making," in The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security, Oxford University Press, 2018. New York, pp. 97-110.](#)
- [Cormier, Daniel J. "Eisenhower Reconsidered: Policymaking Lessons for Today," Orbis, 2019](#)
- [Daalder, Ivo H and I.M. Destler. "I'm a Gut Player," in In the Shadow of the Oval Office: Profiles of the National Security Advisers and the Presidents, 2009. New York, Simon & Schuster. pp. 250-298. \[Accessed via E-Reserve\]](#)
- [Knott, Stephen. "NWC Talks: Presidential Power and National Security \[Video\]](#)

📚 Foundational Resources

- [The Constitution of the United States.](#)

OBJECTIVES

- Examine the role of the president, and tools available, in shaping and implementing foreign policy.
- Examine the constitutional powers vested in the executive and identify the changing relationship between the president and other branches of government, looking especially for stress points.
- Assess how theater level problems rise to the level of the presidential agenda.
- Evaluate lessons learned from how presidents handled specific foreign policy making challenges.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 1c, 1d, 3a, 4a, 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3..





SECURITY STRATEGIES-10

LIBERAL INTERNATIONALISM

🔍 Focus

Liberal internationalism 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 internationalists also generally agree that the nature of regimes matter; democracies are expected to be more peaceful and 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 multilateral cooperation.

OBJECTIVES

- Evaluate 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
- Analyze the role the United Nations plays in international security in general, and U.S. foreign policy in particular.
- Support CJCS Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2c, and 2e. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. .

📖 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?
- Where does the United Nations fit into the strategy of liberal internationalism? How might UN institutions change to address contemporary challenges?
- Why does Miller think all U.S. administrations, regardless of party, promote democracy? What are the implications for the national security system discussed in the policy analysis subcourse?

📖 Required Readings (60 Pages)

- [Posen, Barry and Andrew Ross, “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy,” *International Security*, Winter 1996/1997, pp. 21-30.](#)
- [Ikenberry, G. John. “The End of the Liberal International Order?” *International Affairs*, Vol. 94, No. 1 \(January 2018\), pp. 7-23.](#)
- [Miller, Paul, “American Grand Strategy and the Democratic Peace,” *Survival*, Apr 2012, Vol.54 \(2\), pp. 49-76.](#)
- [Weiss, Thomas G. “The United Nations: before, during and after 1945,” *International Affairs*, November 2015, Vol.91\(6\), pp. 1221-1235.](#)

📖 Foundational Resources

- [Posen, Barry “The Rise of Illiberal Hegemony” *Foreign Affairs*, Mar/Apr 2018 Vol. 97, Issue 2, pp. 20-27.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 10

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS

Q Focus

As the constitutional scholar Edwin Corwin once famously observed, the Constitution is an "invitation to struggle for the privilege of directing American foreign policy." Although many scholars and casual observers argue that the Executive Branch dominates when it comes to national security policy making, the Legislative Branch does have the ability to have a significant influence on national and security policy. Article I of the Constitution grants Congress certain powers regarding national security, 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. In addition, Congress has the power of the purse and oversight responsibilities for how U.S. national security policy is formulated and executed. Previous sessions in Policy Analysis have stressed that the authorities, missions, and budgets of different organizations within the national security enterprise ultimately are all set by congressional mandate. This session examines Congress' roles and responsibilities (both in terms of what elected members do and what is handled by the professional and personal staffs) in crafting legislation dealing with national security affairs and in providing oversight of the U.S. national security establishment.

OBJECTIVES

- Examine the structure of Congress and its role in passing laws, appropriating funds, and overseeing the Executive Branch, as well as the processes that the Legislative Branch employs to implement policy.
- Analyze how Congress works with the Executive Branch, especially the Department of Defense, to establish effective national security policies, institutions, and processes.
- Examine how military officers and other national security professionals interact with the Legislative Branch.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 2c, 3a, 5b, 5d, and 5g. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. .

Guidance

- How do members of Congress seek to balance a strategic vision of the national interest with the need to focus on constituent service?
- How much influence does Congress have on defense policy relative to the Executive Branch?
- How does Congress conduct oversight of the Executive Branch?
- What is the impact of polarization on the National Security Strategy?

📖 Required Readings (54 Pages)

- [Cushman, Charles B., Jr. "Congress and the Politics of Defense and Foreign Policymaking: Big Barriers to Balance," Chapter 5 in Mission Creep: The Militarization of US Foreign Policy? Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2014, pp. 74-93 \(CHROME or SAFARI only, no IE/Edge\)](#)
- [Serafino, Nina M. and Ekmeksioglou, Eleni G., 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, pp. 151-171](#)
- [Schultz, Kenneth A. "Perils of Polarization for U.S. Foreign Policy", Washington Quarterly Winter 2018, Volume 40, Issue 4, pp. 7-24](#)

📚 Foundational Resources

- [Walsh, Kathleen A. "Legislative Affairs and Congressional-Military Relations," Newport, R.I.: Naval War College faculty paper, updated 2012](#) (Provides an overview of what today's military officers need to know about the legislative process, interacting with Congress, the Constitution, and the role of Congress in the policy analysis decision making process.
- [The Constitution of the United States.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-11 PRIMACY

🔍 Focus

When the Soviet Union collapsed on Christmas Day in 1991, the United States found itself relatively more powerful than any other international actor. Since then, U.S. power has continued to exceed that of its rivals. For those that advocate primacy as a grand strategy, that state of affairs should be actively maintained: the United States should not only dominate international politics, but international politics should be “Americanized” – characterized by market-oriented democracies. American primacists seek a preponderance of power to dissuade new competitors from emerging, but also to promote American values such as democracy, human rights and a global free market.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify, analyze and evaluate the components of primacy to include its underlying assumptions, key concepts, objectives, risks, and force requirements.
- Evaluate the utility of primacy to advance and defend national interests.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2c, and 2e. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3..

📌 Guidance

- While change in the global order created a situation where the United States was the solo superpower, how do advocates of primacy see U.S. power should be used?
- While national interests are clearly important, what limits do interests play in primacy as grand strategy?
- How do the required military capabilities for this strategy differ from those of other grand strategies?
- What are the positive and negative effects of a global role of the United States?
- What are the strategic risks associated with following a grand strategy of primacy?

📖 Required Readings (52 Pages)

- [Posen, Barry and Andrew Ross. “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy”. *International Security*, Winter 1996/1997, pp 32-43.](#)
- [Wohlforth, William C. 1999. "The Stability of a Unipolar World." *International Security* 24 \(1\): 5-41. \[Read pp. 23-41\].](#)
- [Lieber, Robert J. "Staying Power and the American Future: Problems of Primacy, Policy, and Grand Strategy." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 34, no. 4 \(2011\): 509-530.](#)
- [Norrlof, Carla, and William C. Wohlforth. “Is US Grand Strategy Self-Defeating? Deep Engagement, Military Spending and Sovereign Debt.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 36, no. 3 \(May 2019\): 227–47. \[Scan only\].](#)

👤 Foundational Resources

- [Cheney, Dick. "Defense Strategy for the 1990s: The Regional Defense Strategy," January 1993](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 11

THE U.S. JUDICIARY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Q Focus

The U.S. judiciary is increasingly weighing in on constitutional questions surrounding foreign policy, many of which involve the role of the military. Since 9/11 the Supreme Court has ruled on the extent to which the constitution permits -- or prohibits -- the President and Congress to limit civil liberties for the sake of national security. This was not always the case. Up until the end of World War II, the Court was reluctant to "wage war from the bench," declining to review the wartime decisions of other branches of government. But there is a growing body of recent case law in which the Supreme Court has served as a check on Presidential, and occasionally Congressional, authority. The court has stepped in at a time when national security threats have become increasingly international, asymmetric, and non-traditional. This session explores some of the cases arising from Guantanamo; the Presidential Executive Orders governing detainees; the rise of military commissions; and Congressional efforts to revise the Authorization for the use of Military Force (AUMF) to accommodate legal rulings.

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the role of the judiciary as a key player in adjudicating national security policy questions.
- Analyze recent legal cases directly affecting the military and national security, such as AUMF, Military Commissions, and Detention.
- Compare Executive Orders from Presidents Bush, Obama, and Trump on the detention and interrogation of accused terrorists.
- Evaluate recent Supreme Court decisions regarding detentions in Guantanamo.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 2c, 3a, 5b, and 5g. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. .

≡ Guidance

- How have Presidential Executive Orders evolved since 9/11 to cover detention and treatment; and why did it prove so difficult to close Guantanamo?
- How have the courts dealt with successive administration attempts to deal with "enemy combatants," and why did they [prove to be vulnerable?
- How has Congress' reluctance to update AUMF played out in conflicts between the executive and the judiciary?

☰ Required Readings (57 Pages)

- [Breyer, Stephen "The Court and the World: American Law and the New Global Realities, \(New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2015\), Chapter 4. \[Accessed via E-Reserve\]](#)
- [American Bar Association Standing Committee on Law and National Security, Report to Congress: "U.S. Military Commissions: Looking Forward," May 2018, pp 7-33; 42-47](#)
- [Fontaine, Richard and Vance Serchuk, "Congress Should Oversee America's Wars, not Just Authorize Them," Lawfare, June 7, 2018](#)
- [Vladeck, Steve, "The Misbegotten Court of Military Commission Review," Lawfare, May 24, 2016](#)

📖 Foundational Resources

- [Joint Resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against those responsible for the recent attacks launched against the United States \(2001 AUMF\)](#)
- [George W. Bush, Executive Order , Feb. 14, 2007](#)
- [George W. Bush, Executive Order, July 20, 2007](#)
- [Barack Obama, Executive Order, Jan. 22, 2009](#)
- [Barack Obama, Executive Order, Mar. 7, 2011](#)
- [Donald J. Trump, Executive Order, Jan. 30, 2018](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-12 SOUTH AND CENTRAL ASIA

🔍 Focus

As Washington considers policy options toward South and Central Asia, geopolitical rivalries among major powers influence the prospects for future cooperation, growth, and stability in the region. South Asia faces regional and transnational challenges such as terrorism, inter-ethnic tension, territorial disputes, resource constraints, and the specter of nuclear conflict. In Afghanistan, long-simmering tensions among regional rivals complicate Kabul's efforts to overcome persistent security challenges and establish stability necessary to develop its economy. Farther to the north, Central Asia is at the fulcrum of a great power rivalry among Russia, China, and the United States. Despite the challenges, some countervailing opportunities are emerging in the form of regional trade, energy, and security arrangements. With efforts to link resource-rich regions with fast-growing markets, the region is positioned to play a key role in the evolving geopolitics of the 21st century.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify and assess the United States' and regional actors' interests in South and Central Asia.
- Identify and analyze threats, challenges, and opportunities to the United States and other states in South and Central Asia.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2c, 3a, and 3c. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3.

☰ Guidance

- What are the United States' strategic interests in South and Central Asia?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses in current U.S. policies and strategies vis-à-vis Afghanistan? What approach might the United States and its allies take to help bring durable stability to this troubled region?
- Is the strategy of deterrence waning in South Asia? What policy options exist for the United States to mitigate nuclear threats and ensure the security of nuclear weapons in South Asia?
- What are the major challenges pertaining to U.S. interests in Central Asia? Do U.S. interests in the region merit increased attention and investment or is this an area where the United States can afford to do less?
- How should the United States approach the risk to regional instability from insurgent/terrorist groups in the region?
- What is the climate related security risk in South/Central Asia? Is this an area the United States should take seriously?

📖 Required Readings (55 Pages)

- [Thomas, Clayton. "Afghanistan: Background and Policy in Brief." Congressional Research Service, August 2019, pp. 1-16.](#)
- [Blackwell, Robert D., Ashley J. Tellis. "The India Dividend: New Delhi Remains Washington's Best Hope in Asia." Foreign Affairs, Sept/Oct 2019, pp. 173-183.](#)
- [Mirimanova, Natalia, Camilla Born, and Pernilla Nordqvist. "Central Asia: A Climate Related Security Risk Assessment." Report from Expert Working Group on Climate Related Security Risks, Dec 2018 pp. 1-15.](#)
- [Lushenko, Paul. "Book Review Roundtable: A Look Into the Islamic State-Khorasan." Texas International Security Review, August 13, 2019 pp. 13-27.](#)

🖥️ Foundational Resources

- ["Central Asia's Economic Picture." CSIS Panel Podcast, 18 Nov 2018 \(76 minutes\)](#)
- [Cordesman, Anthony H. "A War in Crisis! Afghanistan in mid-2019," CSIS Report1, 7 July 2019 pp. 1-187](#)
- [Matveeva, Anna; Guistozzi, Antonio. "The Central Asian Militants: Cannon Fodder of Global Jihadism or Revolutionary Vanguard?" Small Wars and Insurgencies, March 20, 2018, pp. 190-202.](#)
- [O'Donnell, Frank. "Nuclear Southern Asia." YouTube video. 12:51. September 23, 2019.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 12

CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS

Focus

Civil-military relations is the study of the relationships among the military, the government, and the population. In Policy Analysis, we are particularly concerned with how interactions between civilian policymakers and military officers influence policy formation and execution, 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 American civil-military relations today, as well as how individual officers', politicians', civil servants', and citizens' actions shape these key relationships.

Guidance

- 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 is the proper role of military advice in policymaking? What are the sources of civil-military friction in policymaking?
- How does Congress participate in civilian control of the military? Does it matter whether members of Congress have military experience?

Required Readings (56 Pages)

- [Blankshain, Jessica. "A Primer on U.S. Civil-Military Relations," adapted from Mackubin Owens. "What Military Officers Need to Know About Civil-Military Relations," Newport, R.I.: Naval War College faculty paper, May 2015](#)
- [Davidson, Janine. "Civil-Military Friction and Presidential Decision Making: Explaining the Broken Dialogue" *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 1 \(March 2013\), pp. 129-145 \(CHROME, FIREFOX or SAFARI only, IE/EDGE do not work\)](#)
- [Golby, Jim. "Improving Advice and Earning Autonomy: Building Trust in the Strategic Dialogue," *The Strategy Bridge*, 3 October 2017](#)
- [Lupton, Danielle L. "Out of the Service, into the House: Military Experience and Congressional War Oversight." *Political Research Quarterly* 70, no. 2 \(2017\): 327-339](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the relationships among the U.S. military, American society at large, and the nation's civilian leadership.
- Analyze civilian control of the military and why it is important in a democratic society.
- Assess the factors that affect American senior military and civilian leadership's perspectives on force planning and the use of force.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1c, 2c, 3a, 5a, 5b, 5c, 5f, 5g, and CJCS SAE 6.d.2. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3..





SECURITY STRATEGIES-13 ASIA-PACIFIC

🔍 Focus

The Asia-Pacific region is one of the most dynamic in the world where the United States has important economic and security interests. Economic development continues at a steady pace, with trade, investment, and economic integration remaining on the rise; though the U.S.-China trade war and its associated ripple effects have raised serious concerns. While the economic picture in the region is generally optimistic, a number of security challenges raise questions for the future of peace and stability in the region. North Korea's nuclear and ballistic missile ambitions and a plethora of island disputes create numerous potential flashpoints for conflict. More importantly, uncertainties over China's strategic direction and its growing military power raise further questions about future regional stability. With the growth of economic and military power in the Asia-Pacific and ongoing assessments that the 21st century will be an Asian century, it is essential for national security planners to have a clear and detailed understanding of this region.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify and assess United States' and regional actors' 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.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2c, 3a, and 3c. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3.

≡ Guidance

- What makes Xi Jinping so different from previous Chinese leaders? Why has Xi been so focused on enhancing and centralizing government power? What does this portend for both Chinese domestic and foreign policy along with Sino-US relations?
- What are U.S. and North Korean goals regarding denuclearization? What are strategy options for dealing with North Korea?
- What are U.S. and Chinese interests in the South and East China Seas, how important are these interests, and why do they clash? What are strategic options for the United States in dealing with this clash of interests?

☰ Required Readings (64 Pages)

- [Economy, Elizabeth C. "China's New Revolution: The Reign of Xi Jinping." Foreign Affairs 97, no. 3 \(2018\): 60-74.](#)
- [Kim, Duyeon, "Negotiating Toward a Denuclearization-Peace Roadmap on the Korean Peninsula." CNAS, 2019, pp. 1-27.](#)
- [Brands, Hal and Zack Cooper. "Getting Serious about the Strategy: the South China Sea." Naval War College Review 71, no. 1 \(Winter 2018\): 1-22.](#)
- [Campbell, Kurt M. and Jake Sullivan. "Competition without Catastrophe: How America can both Challenge and Coexist with China." Foreign Affairs 98, no. 5 \(2019\): 96-110.](#)
- [Holmes, James. "NWC Talks: Understanding China's Maritime Strategy." YouTube video. 10:24. Nov 4, 2019.](#)

🖥️ Foundational Resources

- [Department of Defense, INDO-PACIFIC Strategy Report: Preparedness, Partnerships, and Promoting a Networked Region, June 1, 2019.](#)
- [Pence, Michael. "Remarks by Vice President Pence on the Administration's Policy Toward China." Whitehouse.gov. October 4, 2018.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 13

ECONOMIC STATECRAFT

Q Focus

Many consider a country's economic strength one of the primary elements of its political-military power, and many argue the importance of the economic/financial instrument of power has been increasing in the national and theater security enterprise for the last half-century. Traditionally, the Department of Defense and the uniformed military have been only occasional players on the economic side of U.S. foreign policy. Nevertheless, national security professionals can find incorporating U.S. economic tools as part of a coordinated theater security strategy challenging because different parts of the government handle economic and security matters—and they are not always aligned. 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 much more immediate “pocketbook” impacts on U.S. citizens thereby placing political limitations on the willingness of Congress and the Executive Branch to use them as part of a national strategy.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify the role of the president, various councils in the White House, Congress and various U.S. government agencies in pursuing the economic agenda.
- Examine how economic and security matters are integrated in the interagency process.
- Differentiate 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).
- Analyze the international and the domestic economic systems and how they seek to impose limits on the U.S. agenda.
- Assess some of the costs and benefits of trade barriers.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 1c, 3a, 3c, 4a, 5b, and 5c. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3.

Guidance

- There is a debate in the United States on whether the "E" in D-I-M-E should be a tool of national policy or should be kept apart in order to maximize wealth. Where are you in this debate?
- In recent years, the use of economic sanctions has become the norm as a response to deal with national security concerns. Do you think sanctions have become a substitute for military action?
- How important are U.S. domestic issues when we look at economics and national security? Is the U.S. government set up so that our national security interests are paramount? U.S. actions such as promoting free trade, extending large amounts of economic assistance, and underwriting the functioning of the global system can pay important strategic dividends—yet are often unpopular domestically. As you explore the readings, think about what role the combatant commander has on these economic issues in his area of responsibility.
- President Trump has pushed economic issues, particularly trade, to a new level of importance in our national security policy. What are the implications of this emphasis for U.S. foreign policy?

≡ Required Readings (65 Pages)

- [Cloud, John A. and Nikolas K. Gvosdev, "How U.S. Economic Policymaking is Distinct from its National Security Counterpart," Policy Analysis Reader, Newport: Naval War College, 2018](#)
- [Blackwill, Robert D. and Jennifer M. Harris. "The Lost Art of Economic Statecraft," Foreign Affairs, February 16, 2016 \(CHROME or SAFARI only, IE/EDGE do not work\)](#)
- [Fishman, Edward. "Even Smarter Sanctions: How to Fight in the Era of Economic Warfare." Foreign Affairs 96, no. 6 \(2017\): 102-110 \(CHROME or SAFARI only, IE/EDGE do not work\)](#)
- [Abrami, Regina. "The Delta Blues: U.S. Vietnam Catfish Trade Dispute \(A\)," Harvard Business School case study #9-706-003, \(Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School, November 22, 2005\) \[Accessed via E-Reserve\]](#)

📖 Foundational Resources

- Bishop, Matthew. "Essential Economics." London, England: Profile Books, 2004 [Available in Library]
- ["Gini in the Bottle: Inequality in America." The Economist \(2013\)](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES- 14 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, 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

- Identify and assess United States’ and regional actors’ interests in Africa
- Identify and analyze threats, challenges, and opportunities to the United States and other states in Africa.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2c, 3a, and 3c. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3..

🔧 Guidance

- What challenges do Africa's geography and history pose for U.S. strategists?
- What do you think should be the most important strategic concerns to U.S. planners and strategists in Africa- geopolitical competition, transnational security threats, and other threats?
- Explain how various factors at various levels (geopolitics and economics at the international level, regional issues such as politics, borders and resources and local issues such as culture combine to influence U.S. interests in Africa.

📖 Required Readings (51 Pages)

- [Englebert, Pierre. “The ‘Real’ Map of Africa.” Foreign Affairs Snapshot, November 8, 2015, pp. 1-6.](#)
- [Cilliers, Jackie. “Violent Islamic Extremism and Terrorism in Africa.” ISS Paper 286, Institute for Security Studies \(Pretoria\), October 2015, pp. 2-19.](#)
- [Standing, Andre. “Criminality in Africa’s Fishing Industry: A Threat to Human Security.” Africa Security Brief, No. 33 \(2017\), pp. 1-12.](#)
- [Duchatel, Mathieu, Richard Gowan, and Manuel Lafont Rapnouil. Into Africa: China's Global Security Shift: European Council on Foreign Relations, 2016.](#)

📚 Foundational Resources

- [Stock, Robert. “The Map of Africa” Chap. 1 in Africa South of the Sahara: A Geographical Interpretation. New York: Guilford Press, 2013. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 14

THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL AND THE INTERAGENCY

Q Focus

This session examines U.S. national security decision making, policy formulation, and interagency process at the Strategic (NSC and Committees) and Operational (Embassy, Combatant Command, and Task Force levels). The National Security Act of 1947 established the National Security Council and tasked this deliberative body with the following purpose:

“The function of the Council shall be to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security.”

The interagency environment is heavily influenced by the effects of statutory authority, organizational interests, processes and culture. When various national security tasks employ all instruments of national power in the accomplishment of national objectives, this interagency collaboration is often labeled as a “whole of government” approach.

≡ Guidance

- What elements of a formal decision making structure and process are attractive to organizations and decision makers?
- How does statutory authority affect interagency operations and mission?
- What conditions and influences in the interagency environment make a “whole of government” approach challenging?
- What interagency environmental conditions facilitate collaboration and overcome organizational friction and resistance?
- How does a representative of an interagency organization operate effectively in an interagency environment?

☰ Required Readings (50 Pages)

- [Presidential Memorandum: Organization of the National Security Council, the Homeland Security Council and Subcommittees, White House, April 4, 2017](#)
- [Chapter 5. "Issues with the Interagency and Theater Security." in Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise, pp.77-96](#)
- [Doyle, Brett. "Lessons on Collaboration from Recent Conflicts: The Whole-of-Nation and Whole-of-Government Approaches in Action," \(Fort Leavenworth, KS: InterAgency Journal\) VOL 10, No.1 \(2019\) p.105-122](#)
- [Rand Corporation. "The U.S. Military Response to the 2010 Haiti Earthquake." \(Santa Monica: CA\). pp.1-20](#)

🗺 Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify the structure and function of the National Security Council and subordinate committees in U.S. national security decision making and policy formulation.
- Examine the U.S. interagency process at the strategic and operational level and determine the desired characteristics of effective execution.
- Assess the organizations and stakeholders operating in the interagency environment and analyze their interests and positions that have influence or impact on an interagency operation or mission.
- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2c, 3a, 3c, 4a, 5b, 5c, and 5d. CJCSI 1800.01E, pages E-E-1 through E-E-3.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-15 EUROPE AND RUSSIA

🔍 Focus

The goal of this session is to provide an overview of the European theater and the dynamics of European security, as well as the role of the United States within the European security system.

☰ 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 (the Middle East, etc.) 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

- Identify and assess United States' and regional actors' interests in the European region.
- Identify and analyze threats, challenges, and opportunities to the United States and other states in the European region.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2c, 3a, and 3c. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3.

☰ Required Readings (59 Pages)

- [Mattox, Gale A. "The Transatlantic Security Landscape in Europe," Chap. 32 in *Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.](#)
- [Chekov, Alexander D., and Anna V. Makarycheva, Anastasia M. Solomentseva, Maxim A. Suchkov and Andrey A. Sushentsov, " War of the Future: A View from Russia," *Survival* 61:6 \(2019\), 25-48.](#)
- [Garganus, Julia and Eugene Rumer. *Russia's Global Ambitions in Perspective*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, February 2019.](#)

🖥️ Foundational Resources

- [Hardt, Brent. "NWC Talks: The European Union: America's Indispensable Global Partner." YouTube.com Video. 15:01 October 16, 2019.](#)
- [Archick, Kristin. "The European Union: Ongoing Challenges and Future Prospects." Congressional Research Service, December 3, 2018.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 15

DECIDING WAR: EXECUTIVE-LEGISLATIVE TENSIONS

Q Focus

This session raises difficult questions about the definition and character of modern war; about the potential for war and secret wars to grow in number, size, and scale; and the role of both the executive and legislative branches in deciding why, when, where and how U.S. Armed Forces are authorized to use military force.

Guidance

- Are we at war? This is a surprisingly difficult question to answer, as is identifying where and why the U.S. military is currently engaged in war, combat, hostilities, or conflict around the world. In the age of wars against non-state actors, “associated forces” and affiliated states, nations, organizations, and persons, the lines between war, conflict, and the use of military force have blurred while the authorizations to use various sorts of military force against a wider range of actors have expanded, leading to growing tensions between the legislative and executive branches.
- Who decides when the United States and its armed forces go to war or are engaged in hostilities, Congress or the executive?
- The United States has not officially declared war since World War II. What, then, has been the process(es) for deciding to make war or engage U.S. military forces abroad since then? Building on discussions in earlier sessions, how difficult or easy is it for the Commander-in-Chief to commit military forces overseas today? Why?
- With the growing use of drone strikes, these often secret wars mark a new phenomenon where the American public does not necessarily know that a war and use of U.S. military forces (in addition to intelligence assets) has been decided. If war is the “organized use of violence to achieve political ends” as Clausewitz argues, Brooks asks: What if the war itself is secret? What and whose political ends are served?

≡ Required Readings (51 Pages)

- [Congressional Research Service. “The War Powers Resolution: Concepts and Practice” \(R42699\), updated March 8, 2019 - Summary and pp 44-54 only](#)
- [Rudalevige, Andrew. “Attacking Syria Wasn’t Legal a Year Ago. It’s Still Not,” The Monkey Cage, Washington Post \(April 13, 2018\)](#)
- [Brooks, Rosa. “The Secret War,” Chapter Five in How Everything Became War and the Military Became Everything: Tales from the Pentagon \(New York: Simon & Schuster, 2016\), pages 104-128. \(24 pages\) \[Accessed via E-Reserve\]](#)
- [Singh, Naunihal. “Ambush in Tongo Tongo, Niger,” Newport, RI.: Naval War College faculty paper, 2018](#)

📖 Foundational Resources

- [Joint Resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against those responsible for the recent attacks launched against the United States \(2001 AUMF\)](#)
- [Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 \(2002 AUMF\)](#)
- [Letter from the President – Authorization for the use of United States Armed Forces in connection with the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant \(“draft” AUMF\)](#)

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the tensions that exist between the Executive and Legislative branches of the U.S. government in deciding why, when, where and how to make war.
- Comprehend the use of Authorizations of the Use of Military Force (AUMF) in recent U.S. military conflicts, why AUMFs have been employed, and how this and other legislative tools relate to current strategies and policies.
- Assess the use of drones and other new or innovative approaches to waging war and how policymakers decide their use in military conflicts.
- Evaluate the ways in which U.S. military missions have expanded to include operations in places like Niger without necessarily Congress’ approval or full involvement in decision making.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2b, 2c, 2f, 3a, 3c, 4a, 5b, and 5c. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. .





SECURITY STRATEGIES-16 THE 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. From a regional security perspective, some of the more important security issues are the illegal movements of people, narcotics trafficking, increased criminal and gang activity, transnational organized crime, as well as the confluence of Marxist insurgency movements and criminal cartels with established global terrorist organizations. Simultaneously, the region continues searching for the right balance between three competing economic systems: 1) extreme socialism led by authoritarian, populist leaders, 2) moderate socialism where democratically elected figures blend the virtues of public and private economic activity to promote trade and development, but also legislate programs designed to reduce poverty, and 3) a traditional neo-liberal, free-market form of capitalism. Complicating the diplomatic challenge is a long-standing suspicion and distrust of the United States. Countries of the region, particularly in the Caribbean and Central America, have experienced U.S. military interventions creating what continues to be a very difficult environment for U.S. foreign policy execution. U.S. policy-makers 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 an alarming increase in regional transnational criminal activity.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify and assess United States' and regional actors' interests in the Western Hemisphere.
- Identify and analyze threats, challenges, and opportunities to the United States and other states in the Western Hemisphere.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2c, 3a, and 3c. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3.

≡ 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 failing states, criminal cartels and networks, and external actors competing for regional influence?

📖 Required Readings (39 Pages)

- [Wiarda, Howard J. and Harvey F. Kline. "The Context of Latin American Politics," "The Pattern of Historical Development," and "Interest Groups and Political Parties," pages 3-16 in Latin American Politics and Development. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 2017. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)
- [Weeks, Gregory. "The Future of U.S. Policy Toward Latin America," Georgetown Journal of International Affairs, 10 August 2017, pp. 1-8](#)
- [Ferrara, Dominic. "China's Encroachment in Latin America: An Economic Policy Issue," Council on Hemispheric Affairs, VOL 38, NO 7/April 19 2018, pp 1-6.](#)
- [Cone, Jason and Bonacasa, Marc Bosch. "Invisible War: Central America's Forgotten Humanitarian Crises," Brown Journal of World Affairs, 2018, Spring/Summer 2018, Volume XXIV, Issue II, pp 225-237.](#)

📚 Foundational Resources

- [Sullivan, Mark P. "Latin America and the Caribbean: Issues in the 115th Congress." Congressional Research Service, January 29, 2019.](#)
- [McCabe, Larry. "NWC Talks: U.S. Interests in Latin America." YouTube.com Video. September 30, 2019.](#)
- [Ashby, Paul. "U.S. National Security in the Western Hemisphere." Chap. 33 in The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2018.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 16

INTELLIGENCE

🔍 Focus

This session addresses how the Intelligence Community (IC) contributes to U.S. national security policy, as well as strategic decisions.

☰ Guidance

- What role (s) does the Intelligence Community play in advising and supporting U.S. national security policy, defense strategy, and military operations?
- How does the IC advise and support policymaking and what are some of the challenges they face in doing so? What do policymakers expect and is that something the IC can deliver?
- How do changes in the international and domestic political systems impact the Intelligence Community and how it advises and supports national security policy?

☰ Required Readings (39 Pages)

- [Jervis, Robert. "Why Intelligence and Policymakers Clash," Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 125, No. 2, Summer 2010, pp. 185-204.](#)
- [George, Roger Z. "The Art of Strategy and Intelligence," in Analyzing Intelligence: National Security Practitioners' Perspectives, 2nd ed., Roger Z. George and James B. Bruce, eds., Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2014, Chapter 11.](#)
- [Friedman, Jeffrey A., and Richard Zeckhauser. "Handling and mishandling estimative probability: likelihood, confidence, and the search for Bin Laden." Intelligence and National Security 30, no. 1 \(2015\): 77-99](#)
- [Helgerson, John. "Concluding Observations," Chapter 8 in Getting to Know the President, Second Edition: Intelligence Briefings of Presidential Candidates, 1952-2004, pp. 177-192.](#)

📖 Foundational Resources

- Fingar, Tom. "Office of the Director of National Intelligence: From Pariah to Pinata to Managing Partner," Chapter 9 in The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth, 2nd edition, eds. Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2017, pp. 185-204. [Hardcopy Textbook Issued]

OBJECTIVES

- Understand the roles, functions, structure and organizational behavior of the Intelligence Community.
- Examine how changes in the international system can affect intelligence and, in turn, defense policy, military strategy and operations.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 1c, 2c, 3a, 3c, 3d, 4a, 5a, 5b, and 5c. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-17 GREATER MIDDLE EAST

🔍 Focus

The last several years in the Greater Middle East 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 atrocious conflict in Yemen, an emboldened Iran, and other potentially destabilizing actions. Despite these challenges, the United States remains committed to promoting stability in the region, ensuring trade flows, combating terrorism, and preventing the spread of nuclear weapons.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify and assess United States' and regional actors' interests in the Greater Middle East.
- Identify and analyze threats, challenges, and opportunities to the United States and other states in the Greater Middle East.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2c, 3a, and 3c. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3.

📌 Guidance

- Why is the Greater Middle East strategically important?
- 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 will be the principal security issues in the years to come? What can the United States do to prevent/manage these issues?

📖 Required Readings (52 Pages)

- [Gabriel Scheinmann, "The Map that Ruined the Middle East," The Tower, July 2013.](#)
- ["Ending the Yemen Quagmire: Lessons for Washington from Four Years of War," International Crisis Group, April 15, 2019.](#)
- [Amal Kandeel, "In the Face of Climate Change: Challenges of Water Scarcity and Security in MENA," Atlantic Council, June 11, 2019.](#)
- [Vali Nasr, "Iran among the Ruins," Foreign Affairs, March/April 2018.](#)
- [F. Gregory Gause III \(2019\) "Should We Stay or Should We Go? The United States and the Middle East", Survival, 61:5, 7-24.](#)

📺 Foundational Resources

- ["Bitter Rivals." Frontline PBS Documentary, February 2018.](#)
- [Alvi, Hayat. " NWC Talks: U.S. Interests in the Middle East." YouTube.com video. 13:23. July 2, 2019.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 17

DIPLOMACY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

🔍 Focus

Diplomacy is the primary instrument of national statecraft for managing a nation's foreign relations, minimizing external threats, defusing crises and advancing security and prosperity in the global arena. Diplomacy is the art of managing interactions with friends and foes alike to find common ground and advance national interests. Drawing upon all the tools of national power – military, economic, and information -- it seeks to persuade others to act in ways that reinforce or are not opposed to a country's core interests. Diplomatic success is often measured by conflicts avoided or crises resolved, while failures can lead to war or loss of influence. Diplomats represent the American people and the president in capital cities, remote outposts, and warzones, building enduring relationships that strengthen our ability to manage global challenges, offer unique insights to policymakers on emerging threats and opportunities, and protect citizens abroad. This session offers a case study of the far-reaching and complex international diplomatic effort that engaged all the great powers – the United States, the EU, Russia and China – in a multilateral framework to constrain Iranian nuclear development and remove a major source of regional tension in the Middle East. The case study demonstrates how persistent, creative and skillful diplomatic engagement, drawing on all the tools of statecraft, can advance core national interests and reduce the risk of military conflict.

OBJECTIVES

- Understand the vital role of diplomacy and the State Department in strengthening national security.
- Examine the strengths, capabilities, and constraints of the Department of State.
- Assess the close inter-relationship between diplomatic and military elements of power.
- Evaluate the multiple foreign, domestic, and bureaucratic influences on the conduct of diplomacy.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 1c, 1d, 2c, 3a, 3c, 4a, 5b, 5c, and 5d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3.

≡ Guidance

- What are the primary roles of a diplomat? How is the State Department staffed and resourced? How do those resources compare with those of DoD? What is the role of an Ambassador in coordinating the inter-agency?
- Why do nations engage diplomatically with friends and enemies? What is the difference between bilateral and multilateral diplomacy and what advantages and disadvantages does each type of engagement present?
- How can diplomacy be used to solve or mitigate problems and resolve conflict? In the case of the Iranian nuclear threat, how did bilateral and multilateral diplomatic efforts complement each other to reach an international agreement? What role did economic pressure and the threat of military action play in complementing diplomatic efforts?
- What factors shaped the diplomatic outcome of the JCPOA – domestic politics in the United States and Iran, Israeli pressures, the Gulf States, public opinion, bureaucratic interests? Consider how such factors shape diplomatic efforts.

☰ Required Readings (68 Pages)

- [Cloud, John A. and Leader, Damian, "Diplomacy, the State Department, and National Security," in The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security, eds. Derek S. Reveron, Nikolas L Gvosdev, and John A. Cloud, \(Oxford University Press, 2018\) pp. 185-195.](#)
- [Burns, William J., "Iran and the Bomb: The Secret Talks," in The Back Channel: A Memoir of American Diplomacy and the Case for Its Renewal, New York, Random House, 2019. Pp. 337-387. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)
- [Bergman, Ronan and Mazetti, Mark, "The Secret History of the Push to Strike Iran," New York Times Magazine, 8 September 2019. Pp. 28-33, 50, 52-4.](#)
- [Cloud, John A. "NWC Talks: The Role of Diplomacy." YouTube video, 9:52, Sept 10, 2019.](#)

🖥️ Foundational Resources

- Grossman, Marc, "The State Department: Culture as Interagency Destiny?" in George, Roger Z. and Rishikof, Harvey (eds.). *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*. Second Edition. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2017. Pp. 81-96 [Hardcopy Textbook Issued]
- ["Regaining the Strategic Initiative on Iran," and "A New Strategy Toward Iran," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, The Backchannel, The Archive: \(Scroll to 2008-2014\).](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-18 PAPER PEER REVIEW

Focus

Writing well requires practice. Even the best writers--especially the best writers--repeatedly revise their work to ensure that their ideas are clearly and powerfully conveyed. Honest, critical, constructive feedback from others is a critical part of this process. Your Security Strategies paper provides you an opportunity to address an important issue related to national security. How you communicate your ideas is just as important as the ideas themselves, since a good idea that is poorly expressed can be easily overlooked or dismissed.

OBJECTIVES

- Provide critical feedback to at least two of your fellow students.
- Receive critical feedback from two of your fellow students.
- Support SAE 6.d. (1).

Guidance

- Does the paper have a clear introduction that features a thesis statement (typically found in the first or second paragraph)?
 - Do successive arguments and evidence presented in the paper link back to or build upon the thesis?
- Is the paper well-organized?
 - Does the paper have a logical flow that allows the reader to easily follow the author's logic and presentation of evidence?
- Does the paper rely on effective evidence?
 - Are the sources cited of a high level of quality (i.e. primary sources if possible, or reputable secondary sources)?
 - Are quotes well used to support points made, but not overused?
 - Are the footnotes/endnotes properly formatted?
- Does the paper consistently feature sound analysis and original thinking?
 - Is the thesis supported by logic and facts and not mere assertions or opinion?
 - Are the parts of the paper logically consistent with each other--for example, if there are recommendations, do they actually address the problems identified?
- Does the paper effectively consider counterarguments (either in the body of the paper or in a separate section)?
 - Does the author present persuasive arguments that rebut or overcome the counterarguments?
- Is the paper well-written?
 - Is the writing clear and accessible?
 - Is the paper free from significant grammatical or structural problems?
 - Does the paper largely avoid the use of passive voice?

Required Readings (15 Pages)

- [NWC Pocket Writing and Style Guide](#)
- [Security Strategies Paper Instruction](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS-18 INTERAGENCY SIMULATION

🔍 Focus

Having examined how the president develops policy and coordinates the entire range of agencies and departments charged with national security, you will now engage in a simulation, designed to exercise the mechanics of an interagency Policy Coordination Committee meeting in real time. While only an approximation, it illustrates the challenges and difficulties of developing a policy that can encompass and support the agenda and priorities of different regional and functional components of the U.S. national security system.

This scenario will require you, as a group, to navigate among competing equities and preferences of a constellation of interests and organizations, including the White House, the Joint Staff, OSD, the combatant command, the geographic and functional bureaus of the Department of State, the Departments of the Treasury and Commerce, the intelligence community, and various functional agencies. You will be asked to prioritize and adjudicate between multiple, overlapping concerns, including counter-terrorism, cyber security, financial controls, counter-narcotics, human rights and democratization.

≡ Guidance

- How will your interagency group achieve a decision on policy recommendations? Will it require the intervention of either the deputies or of the principals (the heads of the executive departments) to settle disputes and conflicts?
- What might be some of the real-world consequences of a failure to bring together disparate views in order to fashion options for a timely presidential decision?
- A former Obama White House staffer was quoted that what is “fundamentally wrong with the NSC process” is that “there’s too much airing of every agency’s views ... not enough adjudicating.” After completing the simulation, what is your opinion of this assessment?
- In their article, General Barno and Dr. Bensahel conclude: “A lack of understanding between the diverse people traveling across our governmental solar system can have serious policy consequences. It risks undermining unity of effort and adding confusion to already-complex intergovernmental processes. And misunderstandings and bruised egos often endure far beyond the topic at hand, souring important personal relationships for months and even years. We all get better by learning these lessons before living through more bad examples — which can only help improve U.S. national security policymaking.” How important are interpersonal relationships in such environments? How do the rules of the process help or hurt finding solutions?

📖 Required Readings (45 Pages)

- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K. “The ‘Azania’ Policy Coordinating Committee Simulation: The Scenario.” Newport, R.I.: Naval War College faculty scenario, 2016.](#)
- [Carlin, John P. “Detect, Disrupt, Deter: A Whole of Government Approach to National Security Cyber Threats,” Harvard National Security Journal 7 \(2016\), pp. 392-436. \(CHROME or SAFARI only, IE/EDGE do not work\)](#)
- [Barno, David and Nora Bensahel. “The Military is From Mars, Civilians are From Venus: Avoiding Planetary Collisions in the Conference Room,” War on the Rocks, March 22, 2016.](#)

🖥️ Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify the challenges in promoting coordination of national security policy across the various agencies and departments of government. • Demonstrate the role of the National Security staff in organizing and facilitating the interagency process. • Identify the roles of different members of an interagency working group. • Analyze the operation of the interagency process in dealing with a pressing theater security issue. • Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2b, 2c, 3a, 3c, 4a, 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, 5g, and CJCS SAE 6.d.2. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. .





SECURITY STRATEGIES-19

NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

Focus

The National Security Strategy (NSS) arose from the Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-433). It mandates that the administration submit to Congress the national security strategy of the United States, outlining “worldwide interests, goals, and objectives.” The NSS outlines an administration's strategic vision and approximate grand strategy, detailing the nation's major security concerns, and how the administration plans to use the instruments of national power to address them. The NSS serves many purposes. It generates internal policy coherence within the executive branch. It helps ensure that Congress is informed of U.S. national security efforts and assists in aligning the budget with national efforts. It is a strategic communications tool, for both domestic and foreign audiences. The NSS is not meant to be stand-alone guidance, but rather to intertwine and with other key strategic documents, particularly the National Defense Strategy as well as other planning documents of other key foreign affairs agencies.

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the purpose of National Strategic Guidance documents and how current strategies define U.S. security concerns and efforts to address them.
- Consider the coordination between the ends, ways, and means.
- Assess how well the NSS lays out key national priorities.
- Evaluate how well the NSS serves modern planning needs
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 2c, 2e, 5b, 5c, and 5d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 1.c.(1), (2), and (3).

Guidance

- What can you discern from the NSS organization? How does it signal national priorities? How well does it align with the actions of foreign policy?
- 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 fails to map out strategy. What purpose does the NSS serve?

Required Readings (42 Pages)

- [Blankenship, Brian D. and Benjamin Denison. "Is America Prepared for Great- Power Competition?" Survival 61, no. 5 \(2019\): 43-64.](#)
- [Glaser, John, Christopher A. Preble, and A. Trevor Thrall. "Towards a More Prudent American Grand Strategy." Survival 61, no. 5 \(2019\): 25-42.](#)
- [Lissner, Rebecca Friedman. "The National Security Strategy is Not a Strategy." Foreign Affairs, Dec. 19, 2017, pp. 1-4.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Trump, Donald J. "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America." The White House, December 2017.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 19

MEDIA AND PUBLIC OPINION

🔍 Focus

Mass media and public opinion are important influences on the policy-making process and national security, but they can also influence each other and be influenced by policy elites. The relationship of these institutions can be contentious: How much should elected leaders follow the opinions of those they represent? How should the military's legitimate concern for operational security be balanced with journalists' right to report information? A rising concern is how technological advances from the fragmentation of cable TV news to the rise of social media have produced new methods to spread information and misinformation to the public, bypassing the filters and fact-checking of the traditional editorial process. In this lesson you will explore some of these debates and consider the role of the media as an influence upon and target of the policymaking process.

OBJECTIVES

- Understand the role the media plays in both the formal and informal national security process.
- Analyze the impact of media coverage on both the development and the execution of theater security.
- Assess the role of public opinion in democratic policy-making and civil-military relations, and what influences can affect it.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 2c, 5a, 5b, 5d, and 5g. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3..

≡ Guidance

- Do the U.S. military and the American news media have an adversarial relationship? Has it varied over time? What do you think is the proper role of the American news media with respect to U.S. national security?"
- How do senior policymakers use the media to advance their policy and political goals? How does the media exert influence on their decisions? Does "the media" constitute an interest group with an agenda?
- How does the fragmentation of news sources and the rise of social media as a primary information source for Americans affect foreign policy and the U.S. military? How might that matter at your level of command?
- Where is U.S. public opinion most aligned or least aligned with U.S. strategy? How much does public opinion shape or constrain overall foreign policy, specific military decisions (e.g., what weapons to buy), or combat operations? What influence do senior political, policymaking, or military leaders have on public opinion?
- It is often said that the U.S. military is the most trusted institution in the country. Why do you think Americans say they feel that way? Does it matter? How do such feelings help, or, harm the U.S. military? What factors, internal to the military or external to it, might cause the public's esteem for the military to decline?

☰ Required Readings (72 Pages)

- Diamond, John M. "The Media: Witness to the National Security Enterprise", in George, Roger Z., 1949, Harvey Rishikof, and Georgetown University. Center for Peace and Security Studies. *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*, 2nd Edition. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2017, pp 353 - 378. (Hardcopy Textbook Issued)
- [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* \(2019\)](#)
- [Burbach, David T. "Gaining Trust while Losing Wars: Confidence in the U.S. Military After Iraq and Afghanistan." *Orbis* 61, no. 2 \(2017\): 154-171](#)

📖 Foundational Resources

- [Burbach, David, "NWC Talks: Trust in the Military." YouTube video, 19:38, Sept. 20, 2019.](#)
- [Dina Smeltz, Ivo Daalder, Karl Friedhoff, Craig Kafura, and Lily Wojtowicz. *America Engaged: American Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy*. Chicago Council on Global Affairs, 2018](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-20 ISSUES IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

🔍 Focus

The National Defense Strategy and National Military Strategy are supposed to shape the future development of the U.S. military in support of the National Security Strategy. The Department of Defense is currently focused on orienting future forces for great power competition. This session asks you to assess those changes and to explore several contemporary defense strategy debates at greater depth.

📌 Guidance

- How is military competition and conflict changing? What are the biggest challenges to the current U.S. Joint Force?
- How should the U.S. 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?
- The NSS, NDS, and NMS all claim to set priorities for great power competition. Have they actually made choices? Politically, will the United States be able to make hard choices and sustain priorities over time? If impossible, how should DoD respond -- should it build a more general-purpose force structure instead?
- Since 1990 the U.S. military primarily operated and planned against non-nuclear adversaries. Is "the American way of war" feasible against peer nuclear states? How might conventional operations be affected by the possibility of nuclear escalation? What should our expectations for "victory" be against a peer nuclear state?
- What is "political warfare" (and how does that term relate to "hybrid war" or "information operations")? How do you assess the ability of the United States to defend against or to employ it relative to competitors? What is the role of the military in responding, and what implications for the force? How should the United States respond with non-military means?
- How does space matter to U.S. national security and to American national power overall? What role will space play in future ground-based military conflicts? Will space become a theater of armed conflict itself? What should be the roles, missions, and capabilities of U.S. Space Force?
- What do you think are the most important debates taking place today about how to shape the future Joint Force? What important conversations are not happening?

📖 Required Readings (58 Pages)

- [Dougherty, Christopher M. "Why America Needs a New Way of War." Center for a New American Security, June 2019, pp 6 - 37.](#)
- [Talmadge, Caitlin. "Would China Go Nuclear? Assessing the Risk of Chinese Nuclear Escalation in a Conventional War with the United States." International Security, Vol. 41, No. 4 \(Spring 2017\). \[read 50-64; 90-92; skim 65-89\]](#)
- [Robinson, Linda. "Modern Political Warfare: Current Practices and Possible Responses." RAND Corporation 2018, pp 1-6, xii - xxv.](#)
- [Weeden, Brian. "Space Force is More Important than Space Command." War on The Rocks, July 2019.](#)

📚 Foundational Resources

- [U.S. Department of Defense. "Summary of the 2018 National Defense Strategy." October 2018.](#)
- [Joint Staff. "Description of the National Military Strategy 2018." July 2019.](#)

OBJECTIVES

- Identify and assess major directions of current U.S. defense strategic guidance
- Analyze emerging strategic challenges and assess how they may affect future U.S. defense strategy
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2e, 3a, 3c, 5b, 5c, and 5d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 1.c.(1), (2), (3), (5), (7); SAE 3.b.(3), (a), (c), (d), (e); SAE 5.c.(5).





POLICY ANALYSIS - 20

LOBBYISTS, INTEREST GROUPS & THINK TANKS

🔍 Focus

This session will provide information on and insights into the often obscure world of foreign policy and national security think tank experts, lobbyists, and consultants. This networked community of non-governmental actors has grown significantly in size, scope, and influence over the past half-century and is being replicated in various foreign capitals. But what impact are they having on U.S. national security and defense policy decision making? Can this impact be measured, and how do they gain and wield their influence? Can such actors influence how national security policy is conceived, developed and executed? This session raises questions about what types of power and influence these non-governmental actors possess, how they seek to influence lawmakers and policy decision makers, and what impact this can have on the policy analysis decision support function.

☰ Guidance

- Why are lobbies and interest groups formed? How and why do they express their policy preferences, and to what extent do they influence the policy and legislative decision making processes?
- What is the impact of the “revolving door” between government service, lobbying firms and/or think tanks and of the “iron triangle” among government, industry, and Congress? How do these sectors influence positions in the Executive Branch?
- What are public policy think tanks, why do they exist, and what, if anything, makes them influential? How do they differ from other non-governmental organizations and non-state actors and why? What, in particular, is the role of federally funded think tanks in the conception of U.S. foreign and defense policy?
- Given the growth and dynamism of the lobbying, interest group and think-tank sectors, what implications arise for policy and legislative decision-making processes, and what impact might they have on your role in supporting national security affairs?

☰ Required Readings (40 Pages)

- Warburg, Gerald Felix. “Lobbyists: U.S. National Security and Special Interests,” in *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*, 2nd edition, eds. Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2017, Chapter 15, pp. 323-340 [Hardcopy Textbook Issued]
- Laipson, Ellen. “Think Tanks: Supporting Cast Players in the National Security Enterprise,” in *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*, 2nd edition, eds. Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2017, Chapter 16, pp. 341-352 [Hardcopy Textbook Issued]
- [Kingdon, John W. “Wrapping Things Up,” in *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*, 2nd ed., New York: Little, Brown & Company, 1995, pp.196-208 \[Accessed via E-Reserve\]](#)

👤 Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify the missions and roles of lobbyists, interests groups, think tanks and consultants in influencing policy and legislative decisions in the defense and national security realms.
- Comprehend how these institutions and individuals function, why they function this way(s), what stakes and interests they have in policy and legislative decision making processes, as well as what impact they might have (or not) on decisions, and the implications thereon for policymakers.
- Discuss the potential influence of lobbyists, think tanks and other non-state actors or non-governmental organizations in the formation of policy and how this might be changing.
- Analyze how and why both domestic U.S. actors and non-U.S. interest groups (including other governments) might seek to lobby and influence the U.S. government.
- Develop the ability to critically assess the product, sources of information, and analyses that these institutions produce as well as the networks they employ to try to influence policy decisions.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Area 1b, 2c, 5a, 5b, and 5g. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3..





SECURITY STRATEGIES-21

MARITIME STRATEGY

Focus

The global maritime commons -- oceans and littorals -- provide everything from convenient transportation routes to primary food sources to underwater hiding places for nuclear arsenals. This session asks you to consider the current maritime security environment, including traditional military threats the U.S. Navy might confront, to a broader range of challenges to "good order at sea". You 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 the nations in your assigned theater.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze principal traditional and non-traditional maritime security challenges.
- Comprehend U.S. maritime strategy and assess its suitability to the maritime security environment.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3c, 3d, 5b, 5c, 5d, and 5e. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 1.c.(1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (7).

Guidance

- What are the principal maritime interests of the United States? How do the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard contribute to overall defense and national security?
- Do you agree with the description of the challenges facing the United States in the Navy's "Design for Maintaining Maritime Superiority"? Does the Navy's strategic plan make sense to you? What are some alternative visions (for the USMC vision, see the Foundational reading)? What would you recommend to the CNO or the USMC Commandant?
- An important defense planning debate is "forward presence" vs other demands on forces -- being held in readiness to deploy to global conflicts, maintenance, training & wargaming against future challenges, etc. What are the major arguments on either side? Do you think the United States has the balance correct today?
- The term "maritime security" includes a broader range of challenges than traditional naval threats -- what does it encompass? What maritime security threats matter to the United States? To our partner nations? What is the Navy's role in addressing non-traditional threats, and if not through the Navy, how else can U.S. strategy address such issues?
- What do "hybrid warfare" and "gray zone" mean in a maritime context? What are major examples of maritime 'gray zone' tactics? It is often suggested competitors like China and Russia can more effectively use "gray zone" strategies than the United States -- why, and do you agree? How should the United States respond?

Required Readings (62 Pages)

- [Richardson, John M. "A Design for Maintaining Maritime Superiority, ver 2.0." Washington D.C., December 2018.](#)
- [Rubel, Robert C. "Posture vs Presence: The Relationship between Global Naval Engagement and Naval War-Fighting Posture." Naval War College Review, Autumn 2016.](#)
- [Bueger, Christian and Timothy Edmunds. "Beyond Seablindness: A New Agenda for Maritime Security Studies." International Affairs 93, no. 6 \(2017\): 1293-1311.](#)
- [Holmes, James R. and Toshi Yoshihara. "Deterring China in the Gray Zone: Lessons of the South China Sea for U.S. Alliances", Orbis, May 2017.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Berger, David. "Commandant's Planning Guidance." United States Marine Corps, August 2019.](#)
- [Posen, Barry R. "Command of the Commons: The Military Foundation of U.S. Hegemony." International Security 28, no. 1 \(2003\): 5-46.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 21

FOREIGN AID, DEVELOPMENT, AND PHILANTHROPY

Focus

Within the 3D paradigm of Defense, Diplomacy, and Development, the rationale for contributing to development includes national security, commercial interests, and humanitarian concerns. The saying "without security there is no development and without development there is no security" continues to illustrate the motives for foreign assistance. Government is not the only player. In addition to numerous agencies with a role in foreign assistance, corporate investment and private voluntary philanthropy are key players in the U.S. development presence abroad.

OBJECTIVES

- Describe the rationale for development as a component of U.S. foreign policy.
- Identify the role of Congress and government agencies in foreign assistance.
- Examine the long-running contribution of private industry and charitable philanthropy to development assistance
- Describe examples where goals of the USG and private philanthropic organizations do not align.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 1c, 2c, 3a, 3c, and 5b. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3.

Guidance

- Why does the U.S. government authorize approximately \$40 billion of foreign assistance every year?
- How do the Executive and Legislative branches factor into development?
- In an era in which the largest private foundations have assistance programs that far outstrip the government, (i.e. the Gates Foundation is now worth about \$50 billion; the Nature Conservancy has assets that are larger than many African counties in which it operates; and religious organizations ranging from Catholic relief to the Mormon church all operate longstanding overseas assistance programs) how feasible is it for the United States to link foreign aid to national security concerns?
- What happens when private U.S. assistance runs counter to U.S. foreign policy?

Required Readings (36 Pages)

- [Daschle, Thomas A. and Coleman, Norm. "The Case for U.S. Foreign Assistance." Center for Strategic and International Studies. March 26, 2019](#) (Watch Video until 41:10)
- [Tarnoff, Curt and Lawson, Marion. Foreign Aid: An Introduction to U.S. Programs and Policy \(Washington, D.C. CRS, 2019\) Read 1-10; 23-25; 29-31 and skim the rest](#)
- [Walker, Darren. "Old Money, New Order: American Philanthropies and the Defense of Liberal Democracy," in Foreign Affairs, Oct. 15, 2018. pp 1-6.](#) (CHROME or SAFARI only, no IE/Edge)
- [Global Philanthropy and Remittances \(Hudson Institute, 2016\). pp. 2-14](#)
- [Petraeus, David, et al. "IAB Open Letter," Letter to Congressional leadership about proposed budget reductions in diplomacy and defense\) Feb. 27, 2017](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Anderson, G. William and Connie Veillette, "Soldiers in Sandals," in Gordon Adams and Shoon Murray, eds. Chapter 6 in Mission Creep: The Militarization of U.S. Foreign Policy? Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2014\), 97-119](#) (CHROME or SAFARI only, no IE/Edge)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-22

CYBER, TECHNOLOGY AND THE FUTURE OF WAR

Focus

The previous 21 sessions analyzed the international security environment and assessed the utility of various grand strategies to advance and defend national interests. This final session examines questions regarding the future of conflict, war and emerging technologies and how military strategists ought to think about and incorporate these important trends into future operational planning.

Guidance

- In what ways will future warfare be impacted by developments in the cyber domain capabilities and data collection and analysis? What organizational structure will best support the U.S. public and private sector approach to cybersecurity?
- In what ways will technology have a greater impact on future conflicts? Are there advances in certain areas of technology research that should not be incorporated in future warfare?
- What is the proper role of humans in future conflict? What is the proper role of automation, robotics and artificial intelligence in future conflict?

Required Readings (56 Pages)

- [The Economist. "The New Battlegrounds – The Future of War," The Economist Group, 25 January 2018, pp 1-6.](#)
- [Segal, Adam. "The Anatomy of Cyber Power," The Hacked World Order, Chapter 2, Public Affairs -Hachette Book Group, 2017, pp 31-56. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)
- [Sanger, David E., "Three Crises in the Valley," The Perfect Weapon. Chapter XI, Crown Publishing Group. Penguin Random House, 2018, pp 240-267. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Department of Defense. "Summary: The DOD Cyber Strategy, 2018."](#)
- [Jaikaran, Chris. "Cybersecurity: Selected Issues for the 116th Congress." Congressional Research Service, 9 March 2018.](#)

OBJECTIVES

- Assess alternative views of the future of international security and analyze their strategic assumptions.
- Analyze the relevance of these views to the development of strategy.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 2a, 2e, and 2f. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 4.c. (1), (2), (3).





POLICY ANALYSIS - 22

EXAM PREPARATION - CASE STUDY ANALYSIS

Focus

This session will allow you to practice demonstrating your comprehension of the material presented in the Policy Analysis sub course in preparation for the final exam. You will be provided a variety of materials, which collectively provide the context by which a policy decision can be analyzed. You are required to use course concepts and materials while relying on the insights and expertise you have gained through our readings and classroom discussions to conduct your analysis

Guidance

- Additional guidance will be provided in class on the specific format and methodology for the analysis.

Required Readings (TBD Pages)

- Required materials will be provided prior to the analysis.

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.

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.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2b, 2c, 3a, 3c, 4a, 5b, 5c, and 5d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 6.d. (1)..





CAPSTONE - 1

THINKING LIKE A STRATEGIST

🔍 Focus

The purpose of this session is to bring the threads together from the two NSDM sub-courses (Policy Analysis and Security Strategies). Strategy is a roadmap that provides guidance on how national instruments of power will be applied to bring about end states that advance national interests. This session will provide insights into how to think about assumptions, values and interests, how to envision strategic end-states, how to assess an environment based on your goals and values, and how to think systematically through possible ways to achieve those goals. In particular, in the Final Exercise, students will move from interpreting existing strategic documents to framing their own vision of strategic guidance for the future.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze how national interests are determined and prioritized.
- Assess the process by which abstract end states are translated into concrete achievable objectives.
- Assess how strategic objectives are matched with instruments of national power and used for force planning.
- Evaluate how risk and trade-offs are assessed.
- CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2b, 2c, 2e, 2f, 3a, 3c, 3d, 3e, 5b, and 5d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 1.c. (1), (3)..

📌 Guidance

- How is strategic direction formulated? How are national interests conceptualized?
- How are broad, abstract and aspirational strategic end states interpreted and defined into guidance that can shape policymaking? What happens when the process of translating broad strategic overviews into more concrete guidance becomes confused?
- To what extent should strategists take into consideration complex analyses of threats and opportunities, options for action, costs and benefits, and capacities for implementation in developing guidance? How is this likely to take shape over the next twenty years?
- In identifying possible threats or opportunities, how critical is it for strategists to assess in what ways, with what probability, and over what time line the identified issues will play out? How should U.S. national strategy evolve between now and 2040?
- What distinctions should be drawn between preferred end states and the choices of means or tools to achieve them?

📖 Required Readings (36 Pages)

- [Derek S. Reveron 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.](#)
- [The Commission on America's National Interests, America's National Interests \(Cambridge, MA: Belfer Center, 2000\), 5-21.](#)
- [Nikolas K. Gvosdev, "Force Planning from Strategy to Procurement: Walking Through the Documents," Policy Analysis Reader \(Newport, RI: Naval War College, 2018\), 160-168.](#)

📚 Foundational Resources

- [Jim Greer, "The Weaker Foe," Strategy Bridge, March 7, 2017.](#)





CAPSTONE LECTURE -2

THE LOGIC OF FORCE PLANNING

Focus

Force planning is the art of translating strategy into future force structure within available resources. To meet the requirements of an uncertain future, the force planner must make choices today for a range of futures. Force planners must also determine the desired attributes and size of future forces.

The Logic of Force Planning is intended to answer three fundamental questions: 1) What characteristics should the force possess? 2) How much is enough? 3) What risks are associated with the force and how can we manage them?

Commencing with the assessment phase, the conditions and characteristics of the security environment are analyzed to create a projection of the future security environment that identifies potential threats, opportunities, and sources of risk. Strategic assessments include examination of numerous environmental factors and conditions and can recognize the environmental trends and characteristics that will shape the future.

In the strategy phase, the evaluation of the future security environment is used to create strategies that accomplish strategic objectives in the promotion and defense of national interests. Strategy inspires the crafting of Operational Concepts which express the ways in which the future force will operate in the future security environment. As force planners assess the ways, required capabilities and future force attributes become evident. Those capabilities are then validated against existing and anticipated future technology and both materiel and non-materiel solutions are determined to field these capabilities.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze how strategic direction guides the development of a Joint force structure that can effectively execute operations in support of national strategic objectives.
- Assess the importance of resource constraints and risk in the force planning process.
- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1e, 2f, 3a, 3b, 3c, 3e, and 5c. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 1.c. (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (7).

Guidance

- Does a strategy-driven approach to force planning make sense to you? Moreover, is it realistic?
- What strategic and structural factors do force planners need to take into account when developing a force structure?
- What do you think the application of resource constraints at the end of the process?
- What is the role of concepts in the force planning process?
- Is there a risk with this approach that the military will always be looking for more capabilities than it can afford?

Required Readings (14 Pages)

- [Owens, Mackubin, "Military Force Planning and National Security," The Oxford Handbook of US National Security, \(Oxford University Press, 2018\) pp. 277-290.](#)

Foundational Resources

- None.





CAPSTONE - 3

STRATEGY AND FORCE STRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

Q Focus

The Department of Defense accomplishes Force Planning through the operation of formal resource allocation processes. The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff operate these processes in the execution of their statutory responsibilities. These formal processes perform the analysis and provide the decision support that shape force planning decisions.

The Secretary of Defense utilizes the Planning Programming, Budgeting and Execution (PPBE) system to conduct an assessment of the present and future security environment, craft defense strategy, and render decisions on programs and budgets to the various DoD components.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff utilizes the Joint Strategic Planning System (JSPS) to fulfill his Title 10 responsibilities, maintain a global perspective and develop military advice for the President and the Secretary of Defense. The Chairman uses JSPS to conduct assessments of the Joint Force, develop the National Military Strategy, and make program recommendations to the Secretary of Defense and DoD components.

During the programming and budgeting phase of force planning, acquisition programs field validated capabilities for the joint force that enable the accomplishment of military tasks and missions in support of national strategy. PPBE decisions apply budget resources to acquisition programs which deliver the required capability at a cost and quantity over a period of time.

OBJECTIVES

- Evaluate the methodologies and the formal force planning processes used by the Department of Defense to make program and budget decisions.
- Assess the necessary elements of effective strategic direction from the Secretary of Defense to force planners in the development of force structure.
- Evaluate the process elements that define and recommend joint force structure attributes.
- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 2b, 3a, 3b, 3c, 3e, 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 1.c. (5), (6).

≡ Guidance

- How does the Secretary of Defense execute statutory authority and manage the Department of Defense?
- What are the essential elements and necessary conditions that contribute to effective strategic direction to force planners?
- How does the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff advise the Secretary of Defense on joint warfighting issues in force planning?

☰ Required Readings (36 Pages)

- [Sharp, Travis. "Did Dollars Follow Strategy - Analysis of the 2020 Defense Budget Request." Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments \(Washington D.C.:2019\).](#)
- [Bent, Rodney, Budgeting for 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, pp. 265-276.](#)

📖 Foundational Resources

- [Congressional Research Service, "Navy Force Structure and Shipbuilding Plan - Background and Issues for Congress. \(Washington D.C.\). 20 September 2019.](#)
- [Gunzinger, Mark, Carl Rehberg, Jacob Cohn, Timothy A. Walton, and Lukas Autenried, "An Air Force for an Era of Great Power Competition." Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments. \(Washington D.C., 2019\).](#)
- [Perkins, David C. "Multi Domain Battle - The advent of the 21st Century War," \(Fort Leavenworth KS\), NOV-DEC 2017.](#)
- [Berger, David H. "Commandant's Planning Guidance." \(Washington D.C.: HQ USMC\) 16 July 2019.](#)





CAPSTONE-4: FORCE PLANNING - STRATEGY MEETS BUDGET

Focus

P. H. Liotta and Richmond Lloyd, writing in the Naval War College Review in 2005, observed: “Today’s decisions about strategy and force planning will fundamentally influence future strategy and force posture. Done well, such decisions and choices can prove a powerful investment in the future.” This session provides an opportunity for students to hear from former senior DOD officials about how the interaction of strategic and budgetary factors can impact force planning decisions, including what influenced the process and how their efforts were affected by political realities.

Guidance

- The presence of former senior officials provides us with the opportunity to compare the theory of force planning with the practice, at least in the instances under discussion. For example, some of the issues that could be discussed are:
- Did strategy actually drive the process?
- What other factors also come into play?
- Was the NSS the appropriate strategy document or did DOD actually use the NMS or other documents? Do you see any dramatic changes in this Administration next budget?
- What role did OMB or the Congress play in pushing budgetary or other considerations over strategic ones?

Required Readings (0 Pages)

- Review readings from your previous sessions.

Foundational Resources

- None.

OBJECTIVES

- Gain perspectives from former officials on budgetary realities for DOD, and how this impacts planning and programming for the future, including what current budgetary challenges may mean for future investments and personnel costs.
- Understand the “guns vs. butter” tradeoffs in the current defense and national budget and how senior officials must navigate between competing spending priorities.
- Assess the question as to whether strategy drives budgets or vice versa.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 2c, 3a, 3c, 4a, 5b, 5d, and 5g. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3
-





NSDM FX-1 THE FINAL EXERCISE

🔍 Focus

The Final Exercise (FX) is the capstone event where students demonstrate mastery of concepts from the NSDM course to engage in the process of strategic assessment, planning, operating concepts development, force structure, and implementation. Each seminar will play the role of a National Security Council Staff strategic planning working group developing the key tenets of a strategy, operating concepts and a force structure that advances and defends U.S. national interests over the next 20 years.

📌 Guidance

- Your working group is assigned to produce and present a strategic estimate of the future security environment over the next 20 years, an outline of a strategy that advances and defends U.S. national interests, and a list of five operating concepts necessary to advance the strategy. The group must also outline a national military strategy and explain how they would structure the U.S. armed forces to support the strategy. Finally, the group must choose one aspect of the strategy or one operating concept and describe how the initiative would be executed.
- The output will be a 45-min brief including the five elements outlined above, followed by a 15-min Q&A period. Each seminar shall designate at least two briefers, but 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 during the scheduled Seminar Presentation Review.
- Grading: Each seminar will brief a faculty panel. Provide three black-and-white paper copies (2 slides per page) of the brief to the members of the faculty panel at the start of the presentation.
- The faculty grading panel can award the seminar up to 95 points based on their brief and Q&A performance. Because the NSDM FX is a collective team effort, the seminar receives one grade that applies to all seminar members.
- Each grading panel will choose one seminar to move forward to an executive faculty grading panel. That panel will then select two seminars to present their briefings to a panel of senior high level national security professionals.
- One of these two finalist seminars presenting to the Senior National Security Professional Panel will be selected to receive the College's Forrestal Award for Excellence in Strategy Development and Force Planning. Extra points are awarded for moving forward.
- Since certain individuals in a seminar might contribute to the NSDM FX process in a way perceived by their peers to be above the seminar norm, the seminar will have the option to select up to four individuals deserving extra academic recognition by receiving three extra points to their individual FX grade. Alternatively, the seminar may choose to distribute one extra point to each member of the seminar, recognizing equal effort from all seminar members (faculty will distribute a ballot).

📖 Required Readings (0 Pages)

- None

📚 Foundational Resources

- [Trump NSS](#); [Obama 2010 NSS](#); [Bush 2006 NSS](#); [Clinton 1996 NSS](#)
- [Russian Federation's 2015 National Security Strategy](#); [CSIS analysis of Russian 2015 NSS](#); [EU's 2016 Global Strategy for Foreign and Security Policy](#)

OBJECTIVES

- Demonstrate understanding of a wide range of NSDM course concepts through this capstone exercise.
- Conduct a global strategic assessment, create a strategy, describe operating concepts, create an appropriate outline military strategy and force structure, and create an implementation plan.
- CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2b, 2c, 3a, 3c, 3d, 3e, 4a, 5b, and 5c. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 1.c. (3), (4), (5), (6), (7); 3.b. (2), (4), (7).





NSDM FX 2-6 SEMINAR PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT

Q Focus

In the NSDM sub-courses and Capstone sessions, students have learned concepts, skills, and substantive information about the world that should help the seminar 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. national interests, identify needed operating concepts, and develop an outline national military strategy and force structure.

≡ Guidance

- The required elements of the brief are:
- Strategic estimate
 - The seminar is not bound by current strategic documents and should determine its own national priorities and preferences. The seminar should then 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 the United States' interests align with those of other actors, and where might there be tension?
 - Consider both the likelihood and the severity of various potentially negative events/trends in the region.
- National Security Strategy
 - Having determined which trends the United States would like to encourage and which ones it would like to discourage, 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 you 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.
 - Are there other actors the United States will 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?
- Operating Concepts
 - Describe five operating concepts the seminar believes the U.S. government needs in order to carry out its strategy (Please refer to Capstone Lecture-2).
 - At least two of these must be joint force operating concepts; the rest may also be DoD focused, or they can involve other executive agencies and departments.
- National Military Strategy and Force Plan
 - 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.
 - Utilizing an online force development calculator tool that will be provided, develop the Joint Force that supports your NSS and NMS, utilizes your operating concepts, and is capable of achieving the strategic objectives assigned to the military instrument of power.

OBJECTIVES

- Create a 45-minute oral presentation with visuals that outlines the seminar's proposed strategic estimate, strategy, operating concepts, national military strategy and force plan, and implementation case; target audience is the Under Secretary of Defense level en route to the Principals.
- CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1d, 1e, 2b, 2c, 2e, 2f, 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e, 4a, 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 1.c. (3), (4), (5), (6), (7). SAE 3.b. (2), (4), (7).





NSDM FX 2-6 SEMINAR PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT

- The seminar will develop a force structure within resource constraints. Specific budget guidance will be provided at the FX-1 session at the start of the exercise. The seminar's force structure must comply with the fiscal guidance.
- Implementation case
 - Identify one of the more challenging or ambitious aspects of your seminar's ideas that would require the supporting efforts of a senior leader to facilitate its successful implementation. This can be an element of your NSS or NMS, one of your operating concepts, or a feature of your force structure.
 - 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 your initiative. What are their interests? Why?
 - Address the full range of influences and obstacles associated with the implementation of your 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 your 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 in order to obtain necessary support.

Required Readings (0 Pages)

- None

Foundational Resources

- None





NSDM FX 7 SEMINAR PRESENTATION REVIEW

🔍 Focus

A required aspect of the Final Exercise is for the seminar to provide a practice presentation of their brief to their own faculty teaching team, receive critical feedback, and revise the presentation, as appropriate, before the graded presentation. This rehearsal may take place earlier than this date, but must be completed by this session at the latest.

☰ Guidance

- The seminar should be prepared to present the briefing in a format that closely resembles the final product that will be graded in FX-8. The faculty teaching team will review the presentation and executive summary and provide constructive feedback. The faculty team will provide guidance on the graded presentation, including specific time and location for the seminar's presentation to the faculty grading panel.
- The executive summary should explain the seminar's assessment of the future security environment, outline the NSS, briefly describe the operating concepts, outline the NMS and force structure (major changes to the base force), and briefly describe the implementation case. The executive summary should not exceed two pages, and each element should receive approximately equal treatment.
- By the end of this session, the seminar should have revised the presentation and executive summary as appropriate. After the final changes are made, the seminar will submit the electronic briefing, force structure matrix and executive summary via email to the faculty team and Professor Lindsay Cohn (lindsay.cohn@usnwc.edu) no later than 1400 hrs.
- No later than this session, the teaching team will distribute the Peer Grade Ballot. The students will return their ballot to the designated NSDM teaching team member by the close of business that day.

OBJECTIVES

- Create and effectively communicate a 45-minute final presentation on the seminar's assessment of the future security environment, proposed NSS, Operating Concepts, NMS and force structure, and an implementation case.
- Persuasively describe the seminar's analysis and conclusions by submitting a clear, concise written executive summary.
- Conduct a rehearsal of the seminar's product and receive feedback from the faculty teaching team.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1d, 1e, 2b, 2c, 2e, 2f, 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e, 4a, 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 1.c. (3), (4), (5), (6), (7). SAE 3.b. (2), (4), (7).

PRESENTATION REVIEW CHECKLIST

	Grading Rubric
CONTENT	Meets FX requirements Estimate, NSS, NMS, Operating Concept, Force Structure and Implementation Case are aligned, consistent and mutually supporting Innovative Well argued
STRUCTURE	Material logically presented Distinctly describes the six required elements Important ideas are evident and supported Strong concluding position





NSDM FX 7 SEMINAR PRESENTATION REVIEW

SUPPORT	Credibility of material Assumptions validated Verbal / Presentation synergy Clear discussion of risks
STYLE	Persuasively presented Professional, engaging Pace, tempo, delivery clarity Audience contact
SUPPLEMENTAL	Responds well to questions Managed discussion Considered strategic surprises (i.e., low-probability, high-impact events) Seminar participation in Q&A

Required Readings (0 Pages)

- None

Foundational Resources

- None





NSDM FX 8

SEMINAR PRESENTATION TO FACULTY GRADING PANEL

🔍 Focus

The seminar will present their brief and submit their executive summary to a grading panel made up of NSA faculty members (not the seminar's teaching team).

☰ Guidance

- The seminar is assigned a specific time and location to present their brief to the faculty grading panel. The seminar must provide three black & white copies of the presentation (handout format, two slides per page, pure black and white), force structure matrix and Executive Summary for use by the faculty panel. Since the NSDM FX is a team effort, it is important that all seminar members engage during the Q&A period. Grading will be based on both the presentation and Q&A as indicated by the grading rubric provided on the FX-7 syllabus page.
- At the completion of all briefings, the faculty grading panel will provide feedback to the seminar and assign a grade. Additionally, each faculty grading panel will select one seminar to advance to the Executive Panel presentation in FX-9. Members of these selected seminars will receive one additional point to their NSDM FX grade.
- Grading criteria:
 - Are the strategic estimate, national and military strategies, operating concepts, force structure, and implementation case in alignment and do they reflect consistent analysis? Does the presentation consider geography, culture, 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 United States? 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? Does the seminar's strategy address the issues identified in the security assessment?
 - Does the seminar link the force structure to the security assessment? To what extent does the force structure support the strategies? To what extent does the force structure reflect the 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?
 - 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 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?
 - Does the seminar present a force structure capable of executing strategic objectives within the prescribed resource constraints?
 - How well did the seminar interact with the faculty panel?

OBJECTIVES

- Compose and effectively communicate the seminar's national security analysis in a 45-minute presentation, including a strategic assessment, outline NSS, operating concepts, outline NMS and force structure, and an implementation case that describes how the seminar will effectively implement one aspect of its NSS, operating concepts, NMS, or force structure.
- Effectively answer questions asked by the faculty panel for 15 minutes.
- Persuasively explain the seminar's analysis and conclusions by submitting a clear, concise written executive summary.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1d, 1e, 2b, 2c, 2e, 2f, 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e, 4a, 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 1.c. (3), (4), (5), (6), (7). SAE 3.b. (2), (4), (7).

☰ Required Readings (0 Pages)

- None





NSDM FX 9

SEMINAR PRESENTATION TO EXECUTIVE FACULTY GRADING PANEL

Focus

Each faculty grading panel will choose one seminar to send forward to an executive faculty panel. These seminars will present their briefs and submit their executive summaries to this panel, also made up of NSA faculty members. This executive panel will choose two seminars to move forward to brief the national security professional panel.

Guidance

The faculty teaching team will provide additional guidance to the selected seminars on the conduct of FX-9, including specific time, sequence, and location.

Required Readings (0 Pages)

- None

Foundational Resources

- None

OBJECTIVES

- Effectively communicate a 45-minute final presentation.
- Persuasively explain and defend the seminar's conclusions by effectively answering questions posed by the panel members.
- Persuasively explain the seminar's analysis and conclusions by submitting a clear, concise written executive summary.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1d, 1e, 2b, 2c, 2e, 2f, 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e, 4a, 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 1.c. (3), (4), (5), (6), (7). SAE 3.b. (2), (4), (7).





NSDM FX 10

SEMINAR PRESENTATION TO SENIOR NATIONAL SECURITY PROFESSIONALS

Focus

This is the culminating session of the NSDM FX. Two finalist seminars will give presentations in Spruance Auditorium and engage in Q&A with a senior judging panel. This session is attended by the College of Naval Warfare, the Naval Command College, the NSA faculty, and invited guests. At the conclusion of the briefings, one of the seminars will be selected to receive the James V. Forrestal Award for Excellence in Strategy Development and Force Planning.

Guidance

The two selected seminars will present their brief in service dress uniform (business attire for civilians). All seminars in the College of Naval Warfare and the Naval Command College will attend this session (but need not be in uniform). All members of the winning seminar receive one additional point to their NSDM FX grade.

Required Readings (0 Pages)

- None

Foundational Resources

- None

OBJECTIVES

- Effectively communicate a 45-minute final presentation.
- Persuasively explain and defend the seminar's conclusions by effectively answering questions posed by the panel members.
- Persuasively explain the seminar's analysis and conclusions by submitting a clear, concise written executive summary.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1d, 1e, 2b, 2c, 2e, 2f, 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e, 4a, 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d. CJCSI 1800.01E, page E-E-1 through E-E-3. SAE 1.c. (3), (4), (5), (6), (7). SAE 3.b. (2), (4), (7).

