



THEATER 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.

Theater Security Decision Making (TSDM) is focused at the theater-strategic level where students intensively study one region of the world and analyze how US government foreign policy decisions impact theater security. Through TSDM, students develop the ability to assess a regional security environment, develop theater military strategy, and identify capability gaps to advance and defend national interests.

OBJECTIVES

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

Guidance

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

Required Readings (13 Pages)

- [Jones, James L. "Foreword: U.S. National Security for the Twenty-First Century" in The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security, 2018.](#)
- [Turner, Stansfield. \(1998\). Convocation address. Naval War College Review, 51\(1\), 72-80.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Putnam, Robert D. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games." International Organization 42, no. 3 \(1988\): 427-460.](#)



THEATER SECURITY DECISION MAKING (TSDM) COURSE

1. COURSE OVERVIEW AND ADMINISTRATION

The National Security Affairs (NSA) Department's course in Theater Security Decision Making (TSDM) is designed to engage intermediate-rank students in the complexities of today's national and international security environment with a strong emphasis on regional security issues. The course offers a broad interdisciplinary curriculum in contemporary security studies that encompasses a diverse spectrum of regional and global issues and perspectives, but with particular emphasis on U.S. decision making challenges and processes at the theater-strategic level through the geographic combatant commands. Because of the theater-strategic focus of the course, each TSDM seminar will concentrate on a specific geographic region.

a. Course Objectives. Our goal is to provide an educational experience that combines conceptual rigor and professional relevance in order to prepare students to be more effective participants in the decision making environment of a major national security organization such as a combatant command. The intended outcome of this graduate-level course is to foster the regional awareness, strategic perspectives, critical thinking, and analytic rigor that are needed by national security professionals in command or working in a complex staff environment. Our course learning outcomes include:

- i. Communicate an executive-level strategic assessment of regional challenges, an outline of a theater strategy, and identify a geographic combatant command's means to advance and defend U.S. national interests.
- ii. Evaluate regional security issues to develop theater strategy.
- iii. Analyze factors involved in the national security policymaking processes that influence U.S. interests in regional affairs.

b. Learning Outcomes. The TSDM course supports the following Naval War College CNC&S program learning outcomes:

- i. Apply doctrine, theory, history, and strategy to operational decisionmaking.
- ii. Demonstrate the ability to think critically and creatively through reasoned argument and professional communication.
- iii. Demonstrate preparedness as a seapower-minded warfighter capable of enhancing joint military planning in an interagency and international environment.
- iv. Recognize and apply appropriate decision-making based on the political, organizational, legal, and ethical context.

- v. Develop theater strategies across all domains that are informed by the regional security environment, innovations, and the evolving character of war.

Course Approach. TSDM is focused at the theater-strategic level where students intensively study one region of the world and analyze how U.S. government foreign policy decisions impact theater security. The course follows logic of analyzing national security through two sub-courses: *Security Strategies* (providing the international strategic context with a strong regional focus) and *Policy Analysis* (focusing on U.S. national and organizational decision making environments with particular attention to the staff environment of a geographic combatant command).

At the end of the course, each seminar acts as a geographic combatant command working group during the capstone event known as the Final Exercise (FX). Each seminar will develop an executive-level strategic estimate of the security environment over the next eight years, an outline of a theater strategy, an integrated priority list (IPL) of DoD capabilities necessary to advance the strategy, implementation details on one aspect of the strategy or the IPL to describe how the innovation or idea would be executed, and performance measures.

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

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| i. TSDM (lecture and seminar) | 1 Session |
| ii. Security Strategies (seminars) | 22 Sessions |
| iii. Policy Analysis (seminars) | 22 Sessions |
| iv. Force Planning (lectures and seminars) | 4 Sessions |
| v. TSDM Final Exercise (FX) (course-wide capstone) | 10 Sessions |

e. Course Requirements

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

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

iii. *Required and Foundational Readings.* All required readings must be completed prior to class since they serve as a basis for informed and lively seminar discussion. Foundational

readings may also be listed to provide background for those who do not possess adequate knowledge to understand the required readings.

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

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

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

vi. *Summative Assignments.* * An overall TSDM grade will be assigned to CNC&S students based on the grades earned on individual graded requirements, individual seminar preparation and contribution, and a group grade for the FX. Any collaboration between students on individual graded assignments is strictly prohibited. Graded assignments, due dates, and weights assigned for the overall TSDM grade are as follows:

Sub-course	Requirement	Type/Basis of Evaluation	Due Date	Weight
Policy Analysis	Mid-Term Exam	Individual. Ability to comprehend course topics.	09 Sep 19	10%
Security Strategies	Mid-Term Exam	Individual. Ability to comprehend course topics.	16 Sep 19	10%
Policy Analysis	Final Exam	Individual. Ability to apply course concepts in a logical and concise way to a case study. Time-limited assignments.	9 Oct 19	27.5%
Security Strategies	Analytic Research Paper	Individual. Ability to explore in-depth a dimension of strategy and theater security. This is the only research paper of the TSDM course.	15 Oct 19	27.5%
TSDM	Seminar Preparation and Contribution*	Individual. Preparedness and individual contributions in the seminar.	Cumulative	10%
FX	Capstone Group Exercise	Seminar. Ability of seminar to apply all three sub-course concepts and present a coherent, professional presentation reflecting the seminar's theater strategic guidance.	5 Nov 19	15%

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

In addition to grades for individual assignments and seminar contribution, all students will receive a group grade for their seminar's performance in the TSDM FX. This grade will be determined by a three-member faculty team and assigned to the seminar as a group. Each seminar will be given the opportunity to grant additional credit to a limited number of students whom the seminar believes contributed disproportionately to the seminar's performance. A detailed description of this process will be provided in FX guidance.

vii. *Return Dates.* The NSA Department uses a modified "double-blind" grading system in which students complete end-of-course surveys before receiving grades on the Policy Analysis final exam and Security Strategies Analytic Research Paper graded assignments and faculty turn in grades before receiving student feedback from these surveys. This system is intended to optimize the fairness of the grading process. Grades will be returned to students by close of business as follows:

Policy Analysis Mid-term	24 Sep 19
Security Strategies Mid-term	01 Oct 19
Policy Analysis Final Exam	30 Oct 19
Security Strategies Paper	29 Oct 19
FX Grade Assigned	5 Nov 19
TSDM Seminar Contribution Grade	Cumulative

f. Grading Standards. Grades for all TSDM assignments are based on the standards set forth in the *U.S. Naval War College Faculty Handbook 2013* (chapter 3, section 7), which in part states:

"Historical evidence indicates that a grade distribution of 35%-45% 'As' and 55%-65% 'Bs' and 'Cs' can be expected from the overall War College student population. While variations from this norm might occur from seminar to

seminar and subject to subject, it would rarely if ever be expected to reach an overall 'A' to 'B/C' ratio of greater than or equal to an even 50/50 distribution."

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

<i>Letter Grade</i>	<i>Numeric Range</i>	<i>Description</i>
A+	97-100	Work of very high quality. Clearly above the average graduate level.
A	94-96	
A-	90-93	
B+	87-89	Expected performance of the average graduate student.
B	84-86	
B-	80-83	
C+	77-79	Below the average performance expected for graduate work.
C	74-76	
C-	70-73	
D+	67-69	Well below the average performance expected for graduate work.
D	64-66	
D-	60-63	
F	0-59	Unsatisfactory work.

Common standards for numeric and associated letter grades for individual seminar preparation and contribution are as follows:

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

- Evidence of preparation for class
- Positive impact on seminar environment
- Listening to and engaging with classmates
- Quality and originality of thought
- Clear and concise communication of relevant ideas

A+ (97-100): Contributions provide a wholly new understanding of the topic, expressed in a clear and concise manner. Demonstrates exceptional preparation for each session as reflected

in the quality of contributions to discussions. Strikes an outstanding balance of “listening” and “contributing,” engaging with classmates in a way that elevates the overall level of seminar discourse.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

h. Plagiarism. Occasional incidents of plagiarism require that we bring this matter to your attention. Plagiarism is defined in both the U.S. Naval War College Student Handbook and Faculty Handbook as follows:

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

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

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

i. Seminar Assignments and General Schedule. Each student is assigned to a seminar group representing a balanced distribution of services/agencies and functional expertise. Sub-course seminar sessions generally meet in the morning on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays. Individual class sessions are normally 90 minutes long, except on rare days when certain topics require an extension of class time. A course planning schedule containing meeting dates and times for all sessions is available on Blackboard. This is updated at least weekly to reflect schedule revisions.

j. Faculty Office Hours. The faculty will be available to assist in mastering the course material, to review progress, and for individual academic counseling as required. Faculty office hours also provide an excellent opportunity to review assigned tasks, to discuss general problems, and to make recommendations for improvement of the course. Students are urged to use this opportunity. Faculty members are available throughout the week when not teaching, however, many also teach electives and perform other professional activities. Therefore, students are encouraged to arrange appointments.

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

NSA Department Chair

Dr. Derek Reveron
Room: C-318
Tel: 841-3540

NSA Department Deputy Chair

Prof. Dana Struckman
Room: C-318
Tel: 841-3540

NSA Department Academic Coordinator

Mrs. Denise Murphy
Room: C-315
Tel: 841-4746

TSDM Security Strategies Sub-course Director

Dr. Paul Smith
Room: C-313
Tel: 841-1096

TSDM Policy Analysis Sub-course Director

Dr. Mary Thompson-Jones
Room: C-305A
Tel: 841-6301

TSDM Final Exercise (FX) Coordinator

Dr. Lindsay Cohn
Room: C-309
Tel: 841-2033



SECURITY STRATEGIES-01

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Focus

The Security Strategies subcourse emphasizes regional studies and the role combatant commands (CCMD) play in advancing and defending national interests. Grounded in the international level of analysis, students are grouped in CCMD-specific seminars to explore a region's political geography, economic challenges, socio-cultural challenges, security challenges and diplomatic challenges. With an understanding of U.S. strategic guidance, students examine the challenges of translating national strategy into theater strategy. To ensure students improve their appreciation of global security challenges and U.S. national interests, the course concludes with dedicated sessions to all regions of the world. Writing is a key component of the security strategies subcourse. Students will conduct research and then write an analytic research paper of 2500-3000 words (10 to 12 pages). Given the complexity of developing and executing a theater strategy, the paper challenges students to explore, in depth, an issue confronting a CCMD. A good rule of thumb is that the paper topic must be relevant to a CCMD's theater strategy.

OBJECTIVES

- Introduce the objectives and scope of the Security Strategies subcourse.
- Comprehend the importance of strategy and regional awareness in the development of a geographic combatant commander's theater strategy.
- Review the purpose and procedures for writing the required Security Strategies analytic research paper
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1d, 3a, 3c, 3e, 3g, 4a, 4f, and 4g.

Guidance

- In his opening statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee on January 25, 2018, Henry Kissinger observed that "the international situation facing the United States is unprecedented. What is occurring," Kissinger continued, "is more than a coincidence of individual crises across various geographies. Rather, it is a systemic failure of world order which, after gathering momentum for nearly two decades, is trending towards the international system's erosion rather than its consolidation, whether in terms of respect for sovereignty, rejection of territorial acquisition by force, expansion of mutually beneficial trade without geoeconomic coercion, or encouragement of human rights." Based on the readings offered in this session (and your own experience and perceptions), do you agree with Kissinger's statement? Do you believe that François Heisbourg, the author of the first reading, would agree with Kissinger?
- Much of the Security Strategies subcourse covers ideas, issues and concepts that are associated with the field of international relations, or IR. Concepts include (1) the state, including its historical origins, legal status and obligations to its citizens; (2) the concept of sovereignty (including juridical vs. empirical statehood); and (3) the concept of globalization. The chapter briefly touches on such IR theories as realism and liberalism, although these are explored in greater depth in the next session. What is the significance of distinguishing juridical vs. empirical statehood? What are the challenges associated with "quasi-states"? How does a combatant command engage effectively with such states?

Required Readings (40 Pages)

- [Heisbourg, François. "War and Peace After the Age of Liberal Globalisation." *Survival* 60, no. 1 \(2018\): 211-228.](#)
- Jackson, Robert and Georg Sorensen. "Why Study IR?" Chap. 1 in *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*. Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 1-26. [Accessed via E-Reserves]

Foundational Resources

- [Feickert, Andrew. "The Unified Command Plan and Combatant Commands: Background and Issues for Congress." *Congressional Research Service*, January 3, 2013\) \[pp. 1-13 \(read\) and scan remainder \(particularly sections that pertain to your CCMD assignment\).\]](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-02

GLOBAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT

Focus

Although every geographic combatant command is regionally situated, each occupies a particular space within the larger international security environment. The spectrum of global security challenges is never static and increasingly more diffuse. Geopolitics and competition between states has made a comeback, but globalization continues to point out the salience of transnational threats such as crime, terrorism, climate change, cyber-attacks, pandemics, weapons proliferation, and human trafficking, among many others. The purpose of this session is to examine the world's chief security challenges and to become familiar with the three major theories of international relations: realism, liberalism, and constructivism.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify and assess future security challenges in the international system.
- Examine and evaluate the differences in scope and impact between threats emanating from state actors versus non-state actors.
- Assess the concept of human security and the role it plays in the international system.
- Comprehend the major theories of international relations.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 3a, 4f, 4g, and CJCS SAE 1.c.1.

Guidance

- What do you think of the assessments in the DNI Coats assessment? Do you see any missing trends or issues? If yes, what are they and why are they important?
- When you compare the National Intelligence Council assessment to the DNI threat assessment, are there any differences? Both readings highlight a multitude of security challenges – which ones do you think are of greatest concern? What are the best approaches/solutions to these challenges?
- Which of the international relations theories provides the best explanation for how the international system works? What are the strengths and weaknesses of each theory? What assumptions underpin each theory? Which theory best explains U.S. behavior in the international system?

Required Readings (47 Pages)

- [Coats, Daniel. Director of National Intelligence. "Statement for the Record - Worldwide Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community." 13 February 2019. \[pp. 4-17 and regional section as assigned\].](#)
- [National Intelligence Council. "Global Trends: Paradox of Progress." January 2017. \[pp. 6-28 and pp. 215-221. For the regional 5-year assessments, read the section that applies to your seminar:](#)
 - [INDOPACOM \(pp. 91-99\).](#)
 - [CENTCOM \(pp. 103-106 and pp. 109-114\).](#)
 - [AFRICOM \(pp. 117-122\).](#)
 - [EUCOM \(pp. 125-128 and pp. 131-134\)](#)
 - [SOUTHCOM \(pp. 145-148\).\]](#)
- [Snyder, Jack. "One World, Rival Theories," Foreign Policy, No. 145, November/December, pp. 53-62.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Norton, Richard. "NWC Talks: Feral Cities" \[Video\].](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-03

INTERSTATE RIVALRY

Focus

In recent years, U.S. officials have used increasingly grim and foreboding language to characterize the international security environment. For instance, the 2017 National Security Strategy paints a picture of a world filled with increased competition and geopolitical rivalry, particularly among the United States, China and Russia. It argues, among other things, that "China and Russia challenge American power, influence, and interests, attempting to erode American security and prosperity." Similarly, the 2018 National Defense Strategy asserts that the United States is facing "increased global disorder" and that "inter-state strategic competition, not terrorism, is now the primary concern in U.S. national security." It also characterizes China and Russia as "revisionist powers" that want "to shape a world consistent with their authoritarian model." These sentiments are confirmed by the 2018 Nuclear Posture Review, which argues that "Russia and China are contesting the international norms and order" that the United States, its allies and others have sought to build and sustain. As reflected in these official statements, the growing sense of inter-state rivalry has profound implications for the future of peace or conflict. This session seeks to explore the dynamics of interstate rivalry and their implications and to assess factors that both exacerbate and mitigate this phenomenon.

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the concept of interstate rivalry and competition and relate this to current U.S. strategy.
- Identify the putative causes of interstate rivalry.
- Comprehend the concept of geopolitics and understand how geographical factors influence international politics
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1d, 3a, 3e, 4a, 4f, 4g and CJCS SAE 1.c.1, 2, and 3.

Guidance

- Interstate rivalries have existed throughout history. What are the major causes of rivalries and how do they typically end? In some cases, territorial disputes may lie at the heart of a rivalry (e.g., the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan). To what extent do territorial disputes act as root causes of rivalries (as opposed to being byproducts of the same)?
- Some argue that the character of rival states (i.e., states governed by authoritarian or democratic regimes, etc.) can shape the contours and outcome of the rivalry. Does it matter that the United States and China—two countries engaged in perhaps the most significant rivalry of the early 21st century—have very different types of governing systems? Does this portend inevitable conflict? How does trade affect the relationship?
- Some others believe that interstate rivalries can be assuaged through normative constraining mechanisms. What role do institutions, norms and rules have in constraining or dampening rivalries? What is the role of trust or mistrust in promoting or reducing rivalries? How do perceptions of relative rise / decline affect the dynamics of rivalries? What other factors might reduce or exacerbate rivalries?
- What do we mean by "geopolitics"? How does geography affect interstate competition or rivalries?

Required Readings (93 Pages)

- [DiCicco, Jonathan M. and Brandon Valeriano. "International Rivalry and National Security." Chap. 30 in 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.](#)
- [Mazarr, Michael J., Jonathan Blake, Abigail Casey, Tim McDonald, Stephanie Pezard, and Michael Spirtas. "Understanding the Emerging Era of International Competition: Theoretical and Historical Perspectives." RAND Corporation, 2018.](#)
- [Scholvin, Sören. "Geopolitics: an Overview of Concepts and Empirical Examples from International Relations." The Finnish Institute of International Affairs, April 2016, pp. 1-25.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-04

INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY

Focus

The state and future direction of the international economy is a crucial element of the security environment. One obvious reason is that national economies provide the resources that can be converted into defense and internal security capabilities. The wealth, distribution of wealth, and composition of a nation's economy and its participation in international trade do much to shape a nation's priorities and interests. It is also important to note that politics, not just market exchanges in the narrowest sense, matter in international economic relations. Different states and leaders have different ideas about how national and global economies should be structured, and states may pursue goals that strictly speaking, economists would find "irrational." In this lesson we cover international economic theory as well as a discussion of how the United States uses its economic strength as leverage in security matters and how the current administration's major economic initiatives are being received by other countries.

OBJECTIVES

- Assess the advantages and disadvantages of global trade and considerations that drive state decision making with respect to international trade policy.
- Comprehend the major economic trends shaping the global economy and the relative economic power of different nations.
- Analyze how global economic competition can both strengthen as well as damage relations among global economic actors.
- Support CJCS Learning Areas 1a, 1d, 3a, 3e, 4a, 4f, and CJCS SAE 1.c.3.

Guidance

- What is the global rules-based economic order? How did it function in the past? What challenges does it face now? What are the security implications of these changes in the international order?
- What are the security implications of increased globalization? In what ways does globalization advance American security interests? In what ways does it serve as an obstacle?
- Who benefits and loses from free trade? What are the political implications of this?
- How does the U.S. Government implement sanctions? How effective are sanctions? When should this tool be used?

Required Readings (67 Pages)

- [Cohn, Lindsay P. 2019. "Introduction to Political Economy," pp. 1-14.](#)
- Wheelan, Charles. "Trade and Globalization – The Good News About Asian Sweatshops." Chap. 12 in *Naked Economics*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2010. pp. 270-293. [Accessed via E-Reserves]
- [Posen, Adam S. "The Post-American World Economy: Globalization in the Trump Era." *Foreign Affairs* 97, no. 2 \(2018\): 28-38.](#)
- [Zarate, Juan C. "Sanctions and Financial Pressure: Major National Security Tools." U.S. House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, Financial Integrity Network, 10 JAN 2018, pp. 1-19.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Cohn, Lindsay P. "Introduction to Political Economy Part I: Comparative." pp. 1-16](#)
- [Dalio, Ray. "How the Economic Machine Works." YouTube, posted September 22, 2013. <https://youtu.be/PHe0bXAluk0>.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-05

STRATEGY AND YOUR THEATER

Focus

Strategy can be understood as the steps taken to advance and to defend national interests during peace and war. In general, strategy provides a framework for establishing priorities, choosing a strategic approach, and allocating the resources necessary to achieve national ends. In the absence of such a framework, responses are often incoherent and reactive, and resources are allocated on the basis of short-term, parochial interests rather than long-term, national ones. This lesson will explore strategy as a concept and its effect on developing the appropriate tools to advance and defend national interests in your assigned region.

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the meaning of strategy and its relation to policy, current goals, challenges, and interests of the United States.
- Comprehend the various levels of strategy and how they relate to each other.
- Identify the tenets of theater strategy in your assigned region.
- Comprehend the essential elements of the geographic combatant commander's theater posture statement
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 3a, 3e, 3g, 4a, 4f, and 4g.

Guidance

- What is the relationship between strategy and security? How does national-level strategy influence theater strategy?
- In an era of interstate competition, what steps should the United States take in order to formulate a successful strategy?
- When reading the command posture statement, consider the combatant commander's answers to the following questions: How does the combatant command perceive the security environment given threats, challenges, and opportunities? What policy objectives does the combatant command want to achieve (ends)? How does the combatant command plan to execute its strategy (ways)? What resources are available to achieve the policy objectives (means)? What are the mismatches (risk)?

Required Readings (60 Pages)

- [Reveron, Derek S. and James L. Cook. "From National to Theater: Developing Strategy." Joint Force Quarterly : JFQ no. 70 \(2013\): 113.](#)
- [Brands, Hal. "The Lost Art of Long-Term Competition." The Washington Quarterly 41, no. 4 \(2018;2019;\): 31-51.](#)
- 2019 Theater Posture Statement. Read only the posture statement for the region you are assigned:
 - [U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee. "Statement of General Thomas D. Waldhauser, Commander, United States Africa Command", February 7, 2019, pp. 3-38.](#)
 - [U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee. "Statement of General Joseph L. Votel, Commander, United States Central Command", February 5, 2019, pp. 2-41.](#)
 - [U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee. "Statement of General Curtis M. Scaparrotti, Commander, United States European Command", March 5, 2019, pp. 2-20.](#)
 - [U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee. "Statement of Admiral Philip S. Davidson, Commander, United Indo-Pacific Command", February 12, 2019, pp. 3-41.](#)
 - [U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee. "Statement of Admiral Craig S. Faller, Commander, United States Southern Command", February 26, 2019, pp. 1-20.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [The Joint Staff. Joint Doctrine Note 1-18: Strategy. 25 April 2018.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-06A: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 1

U.S. AFRICA COMMAND

Focus

One of the key elements of U.S. security planning is the way the Department of Defense has apportioned the regions of the world and made geographic combatant commanders components of national security. This session is the first in a series that will focus on your assigned region while viewing it from different perspectives. The first step in understanding your theater or region is to see it from a broad point of view – learn the essentials of the geography, history and culture to place it within a context from which security issues and challenges can be better analyzed and understood. As the sub-course progresses, future sessions will examine political, economic and security dynamics and challenges.

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend how major political and geopolitical trends affect the security of countries in Africa.
- Comprehend how history and geography matter within Africa.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- How have security challenges in the AFRICOM been shaped by geography and history? Why must strategists and planners understand contemporary regional political, economic, and security dynamics and their geographic, historic, and cultural contexts?
- How do gaps between where maps depict political power and where actual control exist affect regional politics and security and in turn how the United States should approach addressing security challenges and undertaking security cooperation in Africa?

Required Readings (70 Pages)

- Binns, Tony, Alan Dixon, and Etienne Nel. "Africa: Continuity and Change," Chapter 2 in Africa Diversity and Development, (New York: Routledge, 2012), pp. 1-22. [Hardcopy textbook issued to students in the AFRICOM regional seminars.]
- [Englebert, Pierre. "The 'Real' Map of Africa." Foreign Affairs Snapshot. November 8, 2015.](#)
- Williams, Paul. "Terrain of Struggle," Chap. 2 in War and Conflict in Africa 2nd edition (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016), pp. 42-63. [Hardcopy textbook issued to students in the AFRICOM regional seminars.]
- Williams, Paul. "Neopatrimonialism," Chap. 3 in War and Conflict in Africa 2nd edition (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016), pp. 67-81. [Hardcopy textbook issued to students in the AFRICOM regional seminars.]

Foundational Resources

- Binns, Tony, Alan Dixon, and Etienne Nel. "African Environments." Chap. 3 in Africa Diversity and Development. New York: Routledge, 2012. [Hardcopy textbook issued to students in the AFRICOM regional seminars.]





SECURITY STRATEGIES-06B: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 1

U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND

Focus

One of the key elements of U.S. security planning is the way the Department of Defense has apportioned the regions of the world and made geographic combatant commanders components of national security. This session is the first in a series that will focus on your assigned region while viewing it from different perspectives. The first step in understanding your theater or region is to see it from a broad point of view – learn the essentials of the geography, people, economics, culture, and society and to place them into a context from which security

issues and challenges can be better analyzed and understood. As the sub-course progresses, future sessions will examine socio-economic challenges, security challenges and diplomatic challenges.

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend how major political and geopolitical trends affect the security of the Middle East and Central Asia.
- Comprehend how history and geography matter within the Middle East and Central Asia
- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- How do the colonial map and its legacy affect U.S. policy relative to the Middle East today?
- How do current crises like the Syrian civil war, the war against ISIS, the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, the Persian Gulf countries' internal and regional issues, and Iran's nuclear program and regional ambitions affect U.S. foreign policies? How do they affect CENTCOM's theater strategies?
- From your perspective, how has the United States shaped the geopolitics of the Middle East?
- How does the Iran-Saudi Arabian rivalry affect U.S. interests?

Required Readings (59 Pages)

- [Scheinmann, Gabriel. "The Map that Ruined the Middle East." The Tower Magazine, July 2013, pp. 1-9.](#)
- [Ahmadian, Hassan. "Iran and Saudi Arabia in the Age of Trump." Survival, Vol. 60, No. 2 \(April-May 2018\), pp. 133-150.](#)
- [Staniland, Paul. "Whither ISIS: Insights From Insurgent Responses to Decline." Washington Quarterly, Vol. 30, No. 3 \(Fall 2017\), pp. 29-43.](#)
- [Laruelle, Marlene \(Ed.\). "Russia's Policy in Syria and the Middle East," CAP paper no. 212, January 2019. \[READ pp. 35-54\]](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Cordesman, Anthony. "A War in Crisis! Afghanistan in Mid-2019." CSIS August 8, 2019.](#)
- [SIGAR. "Stabilization: Lessons From the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan," Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, May 2018.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-06C: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 1

U.S. EUROPEAN COMMAND

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

- How do Europe and the United States coordinate and work together to advance common global security objectives?
- 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 theater security strategies?
- How successful have the European Union and other European structures been in coping with the different internal and external security challenges confronting Europe? Is European integration necessary for European security and to advance U.S. national security goals?
- 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?

Required Readings (47 Pages)

- Mattox, Gale A. "The Transatlantic Security Landscape in Europe." Chap. 32 in *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. [Accessed via E-Reserves].
- [Archick, Kristin. "The European Union: Ongoing Challenges and Future Prospects." Congressional Research Service, December, 2018.](#)

Foundational Resources

- ["The North Atlantic Treaty \(1949\)." Washington D.C., April 4, 1949.](#)
- [North Atlantic Treaty Organization. "Wales Summit Declaration." September 5, 2014.](#)

OBJECTIVES

- Understand the structural and institutional factors that impact European security.
- Understand the strategic importance of the Euro-Atlantic region to U.S. security.
- Understand the principal challenges and issues facing the European theater
- CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-06D: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 1

U.S. INDO-PACIFIC COMMAND

Focus

One of the key elements of U.S. security planning is the way the Department of Defense has apportioned the regions of the world and made geographic combatant commanders components of national security. This session is the first in a series that will focus on your assigned region while viewing it from different perspectives. The first step in understanding your theater or region is to see it from a panoramic point of view, or, in other words, through its broad geopolitical context. To achieve this, this session will focus on two major themes: U.S. strategy toward the Indo-Pacific (and how this strategy has evolved since the last administration) and the role of China and the related question of U.S.-China relations.

OBJECTIVES

- Understand the basic geopolitical structure of the Indo-Asia Pacific and U.S. strategy as applied to this region.
- Comprehend how economic, trade, and humanitarian issues affect countries and populations within the Indo-Pacific region.
- Understand how history and geography matter within the Indo-Pacific region.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- What changes, if any, do you see in terms of U.S. strategy toward the Indo-Pacific region (compared to the previous administration, which had as its hallmark the 'rebalance (or pivot) to the Asia-Pacific.')? Is the U.S. strategy (and associated alliance structure) sustainable—why or why not?
- 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? (and for relations with the United States?)
- What role does the People's Liberation Army have in shaping Chinese Government actions in the region? What is the longer-term impact of the 'big chill' in U.S.-China military-to-military exchanges and relations? Would enhanced U.S.-China military confidence-building interaction help alleviate growing tensions in the relationship?
- What is the significance of Taiwan in the larger U.S.-China relationship? Is it in the U.S. national interest to defend Taiwan?

Required Readings (48 Pages)

- [Fly, Jamie. "Trump's Asia Policy and the Concept of the 'Indo-Pacific.'" SWP Working Paper \(October 2018\): 1-10.](#)
- [Economy, Elizabeth C. "China's New Revolution: The Reign of Xi Jinping." Foreign Affairs 97, no. 3 \(2018\): 60-74.](#)
- [Liu, Yawei and Justine Zheng Ren. "An Emerging Consensus on the U.S. Threat: The United States According to PLA Officers." Journal of Contemporary China 23, no. 86 \(2014\): 255-274.](#)
- [Smith, Paul. "How the Taiwan Travel Act Could Start a U.S.-China War." National Interest \(March 29, 2018\): 1-2.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Statement of David Stilwell. Nominee to be Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, March 27, 2019.](#)
- [Defense Intelligence Agency. "China Military Power: Modernizing a Force to Fight and Win." \(2019\): 1-125.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-06E: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 1

U.S. SOUTHERN COMMAND

Focus

One of the key elements of U.S. security planning is the way the Department of Defense has apportioned the regions of the world and made geographic combatant commanders components of national security. This session is the first in a series that will focus on the U.S. Southern Command Area of Responsibility (AOR) while viewing it from different perspectives. The first step in understanding this diverse and strategically important region is to see it from a broad point of view – learn the essentials of the geography, people, economics, culture, and society and to place them into a context from which security issues and challenges can be better analyzed and understood. As the sub-course progresses, future sessions will examine socio-economic challenges, security challenges and diplomatic challenges.

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend how major political and geopolitical trends affect the security of countries in Latin America and the Caribbean.
- Identify how history, culture and geography matter within Latin America and the Caribbean
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

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?
- Taking U.S. - Latin American history into consideration, how might the United States modify its Latin American policy to obtain more influence in the region?

Required Readings (53 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," Chap. 1-3 in Latin American Politics and Development. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 2017. [Accessed via E-Reserves]
- [Arias, Oscar. "Culture Matters." Foreign Affairs, Vol. 90, No. 1 \(February 2011\), pp. 2-6.](#)
- [Anonymous. "Regional Threat Overview: Latin America and the Caribbean." Special Warfare 31, no. 3 \(2018\): 12.](#)

Additional Foundational Resources

- [Sullivan, Mark P. "Latin America and the Caribbean: Issues in the 115th Congress." Congressional Research Service, January 29, 2019](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-07A: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 2

U.S. AFRICA COMMAND

Focus

This session examines governance and politics in Africa. AFRICOM partners with African governments, and therefore the context in which U.S. Africa Command operates is highly shaped by the nature of these partners and the political challenges that they face. This session introduces the idea of neopatrimonialism and how it shapes political relationships in many African states, whether democratic or undemocratic. It also explores how patronage is used and the challenges that opposition political parties face. Lastly, it examines African political attitudes about democracy at an individual level. Democratic governments exist in Africa, but (just as elsewhere in the world) they face a variety of different challenges, and the process of extending democracy and effective governance remains an ongoing struggle.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify significant political dynamics in Africa and examine how this shapes U.S. engagement with Africa.
- Assess the political challenges present in the Africa Command theater from both the regional and U.S. points of view
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Area 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- What is neopatrimonialism? How does it shape African politics? What relevance does it have for security?
- How do governments use patronage as a political tool to increase their security?
- What challenges to African democracies face? What strengths do they have?
- How do Africa's political strengths and challenges relate to African security? How do these factors impact AFRICOM's job?

Required Readings (68 Pages)

- Williams, Paul. "Neopatrimonialism." Chap. 3 in *War & Conflict in Africa*, 2nd ed., Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016. [Hardcopy textbook issued to students in the AFRICOM regional seminars.]
- [Rakner, Lise and Nicolas van de Walle. "Opposition Weakness in Africa." *Journal of Democracy* 20, no. 3 \(2009\): 108-121.](#)
- [Mattes, Robert. "Democracy in Africa: Demand, Supply and the 'Dissatisfied Democrat'." *Afrobarometer Policy Paper No. 54* \(2019\).](#)
- Arriola, Leonardo R. "Patronage and Political Stability in Africa." *Comparative Political Studies* 42, no. 10 (2009): 1339-1349, 1358-1359. [Accessed via E-Reserves]

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-07B: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 2

U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND

Focus

After World War II, the United States was instrumental in creating with its allies an international economic system that spurred unparalleled growth and transformation around the world. Globalization, open international trade, rapidly increasing capital flows, and new technologies have benefited many nations. This is important for individuals' human security and national and international security. Many believe the key to global security lies with advancing global economic development, yet it is difficult to enhance economic prosperity in an insecure environment hampered by socioeconomic challenges. This session will look at the full range of socioeconomic challenges in your theater and weigh their impact on regional stability, security and prosperity

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend key elements of the international political economy and examine the role economic power can play as an engagement tool in your theater.
- Comprehend the economic challenges present in the CENTCOM area of responsibility from both the regional and the combatant commander's points of view.
- Comprehend the complex relationships among economic factors and their effects on stability, security, and prosperity
- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- What is the economic outlook for the CENTCOM area of responsibility?
- What are the main socioeconomic challenges in the AOR?
- What is the outlook of the oil economy in the region?
- What are the "white/black swans" in the region?
- What are primary U.S. national interests relative to the socioeconomic issues in the AOR?

Required Readings (79 Pages)

- [IMF "Middle East and Central Asia Economic Survey – Regional Economic Outlook, World Economic and Financial Surveys." IMF, November 2018. \[READ pp. xi-xiv; 1-12; 25-35\]](#)
- [Nin-Pratt, Alejandro, Hoda El-Enbaby, Jose Luis Figueroa, Hagar Eldidi, and Clemens Breisinger. "2018 Agriculture and economic transformation in the Middle East and North Africa: A review of the past with lessons for the future." Food Policy Report Washington, DC and Rome, Italy: International Food Policy Research Institute \(IFPRI\) and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations \(FAO\). \[READ pp. 8-33; 42-58; 88-91\].](#)
- [Daniel Kliman, Abigail Grace. "China Smells Opportunity in the Middle East's Crisis." Foreign Policy, June 14, 2018.](#)
- Suhail, Reumah. "Developing Alliances: Emerging Trade Routes in the Arabian Sea." Middle East Policy 25, no. 4 (2018): 77-85. [Accessed via E-Reserves]

Foundational Resources

- [Votel, Joseph. "U.S. CENTCOM Posture Statement." February 5, 2019.](#)
- [Thomas, Clayton. "Afghanistan: Background and U.S. Policy in Brief." Congressional Research Service, February 26, 2019.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-07C: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 2

U.S. EUROPEAN COMMAND

Focus

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is America's oldest operating multilateral alliance. The European Union (EU) is the world's most ambitious attempt to promote regional integration. This session will focus on NATO and the EU and how the United States relies both on its membership in NATO and its partnership with the EU to advance both European and global security.

OBJECTIVES

- Understand the structure and roles of NATO and the EU
- Analyze the dynamics of NATO-EU relations especially in matters of security
- Assess the U.S. approach to NATO and the EU
- CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- NATO is often used as shorthand for describing a "trans-Atlantic" community. How does the alliance enable the United States to remain a factor in European affairs?
- What are the tensions between viewing NATO as a European defense alliance versus the security agency of the trans-Atlantic community globally?
- Why would a country seek to be a member of the EU but not NATO (or vice versa)? How do NATO-EU relations navigate the reality of countries which are not members of both institutions?
- Do the EU and NATO have a competitive relationship when it comes to security matters? Are U.S. interests threatened if the EU assumes more of the responsibility for European security?

Required Readings (35 Pages)

- [Howorth, Jolyon. "EU-NATO Cooperation: The Key to Europe's Security Future." European Security 26, no. 3 \(2017\): 454-459.](#)
- [Smith, Julianne. "Strains on the European Union: Implications for American Foreign Policy." Hampton Roads International Security Quarterly \(2016\): 60.](#)
- [Benitez, Jorge. "U.S. NATO Policy in the Age of Trump: Controversy and Consistency." The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs 43, no. 1 \(2019\): 179-200.](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas. "NATO Has a Future." The National Interest 161, \(May/June 2019\): 38-52.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [European External Action Service. "EU-NATO cooperation - Factsheet." November 22, 2018.](#)
- [Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and OECD. "Euro Area: Economic Challenges and Policy Recommendations." Paris: OECD Publishing, 2014.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-07D: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 2

U.S. INDO-PACIFIC COMMAND

Focus

Traditionally, national security has been viewed through a state-centric lens in which preservation of territorial integrity and government survival are prioritized. In recent decades, some have argued that the definition of national security should be expanded to include human security with an emphasis on health, the environment and crime. With both of these approaches in mind, this session seeks to assess contemporary dangers through a regional lens and from the perspective of the United States and its national interests.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify significant states, sub-national and transnational groups, and transnational trends that pose security challenges to U.S. interests in the U.S. INDOPACOM theater.
- Comprehend the security challenges through a regional lens and a U.S. perspective.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- What have been the chief changes to Japan's defense posture over the past decade and how significant are they? Are the changes evolutionary or revolutionary? What impact will they have on Japan's regional and global position along with its alliance with the United States?
- What are North Korea's long-term goals? Is North Korea willing to give up its nuclear weapons program? What is the correct strategy for dealing with North Korea?
- What benefits does the alliance with South Korea provide for the United States? How has the alliance changed over the years and is it time to revise the relationship? If so, what changes would you suggest?

Required Readings (73 Pages)

- Hughes, Christopher W. "Japan's Grand Strategic Shift: From the Yoshida Doctrine to an Abe Doctrine?" in *Strategic Asia 2017-18: Power, Ideas, and Military Strategy in the Asia-Pacific*. Edited by Ashley J. Tellis, Alison Szalwinski, and Michael Wills. National Bureau of Asian Research, 2017, pp. 72-105. [Accessed via E-Reserves]
- [Wertz, Daniel. "Issue Brief: The U.S., North Korea, and Nuclear Diplomacy." *The National Committee on North Korea*, October 2018, pp. 1-24.](#)
- [O'Hanlon, Michael. "The Long-Term Basis for a U.S.-Korea Alliance." *The Washington Quarterly* 41, no. 4 \(2018;2019\): 103-116.](#)

Foundational Resources

- ["Chapter Six: Asia." *The Military Balance* 119, no. 1 \(2019\): 222-319.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-07E: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 2

U.S. SOUTHERN COMMAND

Focus

After World War II, the United States was instrumental in creating with its allies an international economic system that spurred unparalleled growth and transformation around the world. Globalization, open international trade, rapidly increasing capital flows, and new technologies have benefited many nations. This is important for both individuals' human security as well as, more broadly, national and regional security in the SOUTHCOM AOR. Historically, Latin America has experimented with a variety of economic systems with some providing prosperity while others, for various reasons, resulted in economic hardship. Many believe the key to global security lies with advancing global economic development, yet it is difficult to enhance economic prosperity in an insecure environment hampered by socio-economic challenges. This session will look at the full range of economic systems and socio-economic challenges in Latin America and weigh their impact on regional stability, security and prosperity.

OBJECTIVES

- Assess and comprehend the socio-economic challenges present in the SOUTHCOM theater from both the regional and U.S. points of view.
- Comprehend the complex relationships among socio-economic factors and their effects on stability, security, and prosperity in Latin America and the Caribbean
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- What socio-economic factors have contributed to or detracted from economic development and prosperity in Latin America? In what way does government corruption affect the security, social, and economic development of a country? What steps do you believe a country should take to reduce the level of corruption in the government and the economy?
- What role have international trade regimes had in the economic development of the SOUTHCOM AOR? Should the Pacific Alliance or the MERCOSUR trade regime model be the future of Latin America trade policy?
- How should the United States react to increased foreign investment activity and influence in Latin America? From a strategic perspective, does it matter what region of Latin America (South America, Central America, or the Caribbean) China or another foreign power chooses to engage?

Required Readings (39 Pages)

- [Johnson, Keith. "How Venezuela Struck It Poor." Foreign Policy, July 2018, pp. 49-55.](#)
- [Villarreal, M. Angeles. "The Pacific Alliance: A Trade Integration Initiative in Latin America." Congressional Research Service, March 29, 2016, pp. 1-12.](#)
- [Yu, Lei. "China's Strategic Partnership with Latin America: A Fulcrum in China's Rise." International Affairs, September 16, 2015, pp. 1047-1068.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-08A: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 3

U.S. AFRICA COMMAND

Focus

The African continent is home to some of the poorest people in the world. While there is considerable variation in the level of economic development across and within African countries – from gleaming glass skyscrapers in many cities to simple mud houses in the countryside – on average African countries rank among the less developed in the world. The purpose of this session is to explain the roots of this lack of development, in terms of geography, colonial experience, social structure, post-independence policy and treatment by the outside world. This session also seeks to explore the recent economic boom of the last two decades, explaining its causes and consequences. Both the long term lack of development and the recent growth have consequences for security in the continent and for the role that AFRICOM can play in developing partner capacity.

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend key elements of the international political economy and examine the role economic power can play as an engagement tool in Africa.
- Assess the economic challenges present in the Africa Command theater from both the regional and the U.S. points of view.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Area 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- What factors explain Africa's relative lack of economic development?
- What are the security implications associated with Africa's poverty?
- What are the reasons behind the economic boom of the last two decades?
- What are the security implications associated with recent economic growth?

Required Readings (57 Pages)

- [Radelet, Steven. "Africa's Rise-Interrupted?" Finance & Development 53, no. 2 \(2016\): 6.](#)
- [Devarajan, Shantayanan and Wolfgang Fengler. "Africa's Economic Boom: Why the Pessimists and the Optimists are both Right." Foreign Affairs 92, no. 3 \(2013\): 68-81.](#)
- [Collier, Paul and Jan Willem Gunning. "Why has Africa Grown Slowly?" The Journal of Economic Perspectives 13, no. 3 \(1999\): 3-22.](#)
- Tony Binns, Alan Dixon and Etienne Nel. "Developing Africa." Chap. 9 in Africa: Diversity and Development. London: Routledge, 2012. [pp. 312-332. Hardcopy textbook issued to students in the AFRICOM regional seminars.]

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-08B: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 3

U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND

Focus

The CENTCOM region is volatile with a number of security challenges that include inter-state rivalries, sectarian tensions, human security issues, transnational threats, and external powers striving for regional influence. Moreover, the 2018 National Defense Strategy's focus on geopolitical competition makes it clear that CENTCOM "will not be the main effort of our nation's scarce resources in perpetuity." To more fully appreciate the complexities and implications for the combatant command, this session seeks to assess contemporary dangers through a regional lens and from the perspective of the United States and its national interests.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify significant states, sub-national and transnational groups, and transnational trends that pose security challenges to U.S. interests in the CENTCOM theater.
- Understand the security challenges through a regional lens and a U.S. perspective
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Area 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- Would a less active U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East advance its national interests? What are the benefits? What are the risks?
- Can the Iran-Saudi Arabia rivalry be resolved? How does the influence of external powers such as Russia affect the regional balance of power?
- How does the Syrian crisis end and what are the prospects for reconstruction? What are the implications for CENTCOM, its partners and other key actors in the region?
- Do you think negotiations with the Taliban will result in a viable agreement that ensures long-term stability and political reconciliation? How will Pakistan respond? How would a reduced U.S. military footprint affect the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces?

Required Readings (45 Pages)

- [Kamrava, Mehran. "Multipolarity and Instability in the Middle East." Orbis, Volume 62, Issue 4, October 2018, pp. 598-616.](#)
- [Karlin, Mara and Tamara Cofman Wittes. "America's Middle East Purgatory: The Case for Doing Less." Foreign Affairs, Volume 98, Number 1, January/February 2019, pp. 88-100.](#)
- [Ghosn, Faten, "The Hard Road Ahead for Syrian Reconstruction." Current History, December 2018, pp. 331-337.](#)
- [Thomas, Clayton. "Afghanistan: Background and U.S. Policy in Brief." Congressional Research Service, February 26, 2019, pp. 2-11](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session





SECURITY STRATEGIES-08C: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 3

U.S. EUROPEAN COMMAND

Focus

The Russian Federation is the largest power in the European theater—a major regional actor with some global reach—that is neither part of the EU nor of NATO. Russia's efforts to revise and in some cases forcibly change the post-Cold War security order in Europe makes it the principal challenge to European security and U.S. policy.

Guidance

- Is European security a zero-sum game? Can Russian concerns be reconciled with those of the United States and its allies in Europe?
- How much of the current crisis in Europe is a product of the Vladimir Putin administration? Would a change in administration in Russia lead to changes in Russian policy? To what extent does encouragement of democratic reform in Europe's east threaten the Kremlin?
- 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?

OBJECTIVES

- Understand the role of Russia in European affairs
- Understand the Russian strategic outlook and points of contention with U.S. preferences
- Understand the dynamics of Russian involvement in the post-Soviet space
- Understand differing perspectives within Europe on Russia
- Understand the impact of the Ukraine crisis on Russia's relations with the West
- CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Required Readings (95 Pages)

- [Euronews. "Putin unveils new Russian foreign policy," YouTube.com video. 26:20. July 1, 2014. <https://youtu.be/yzNL-rRF7FI>](https://www.euronews.com/en/russia/putin-unveils-new-russian-foreign-policy)
- [Rumer, Eugene. "Russia and the Security of Europe." Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2016, 3-55.](#)
- [Pezard, Stephanie, Andrew Radin, Thomas S. Szayna, and F. Stephen Larrabee. "European Relations with Russia: Threat Perceptions, Responses, and Strategies in the Wake of the Ukrainian Crisis." RAND Corporation, 2017. \[READ the summary \(ix-xviii\) and chapters 2 and 3 \(5-52\).\]](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Gerasimov, Valery. "The Value of Science is in the Foresight." Military Review 96, no. 1 \(2016\): 23.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-08D: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 3

U.S. INDO-PACIFIC COMMAND

Focus

After World War II, the United States was instrumental in creating with its allies an international economic system that spurred unparalleled growth and transformation around the world. Globalization, open international trade, rapidly increasing capital flows, and new technologies have benefited many nations. This is important for both individuals' human security as well as, more broadly, national and international security. Many believe the key to global security lies with advancing global economic development, yet it is difficult to enhance economic prosperity in an insecure environment hampered by socio-economic challenges. This session will look at the full range of socio-economic challenges in your theater and weigh their impact on regional stability, security and prosperity.

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend key elements of the international political economy and examine the role economic power can play as an engagement tool in the Asia-Pacific.
- Assess the socio-economic challenges present in the Indo-Pacific Command theater from both the regional and the U.S. points of view.
- Comprehend the complex relationships among socio-economic factors and their effects on stability, security, and prosperity in the Indo-Pacific.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- How have the United States and China differed in their approaches to Southeast Asia? What interests does the United States have at stake in Southeast Asia and how important are these interests? What is the best strategy to achieve those interests?
- 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 is the best strategy for the United States in dealing with this clash of interests?
- What is the "ASEAN Way" and how has it impacted Southeast Asia? What are the chief human security challenges facing the region and why has ASEAN become more concerned with these issues in recent years?

Required Readings (67 Pages)

- [Cronin, Patrick M, et. al. "Contested Spaces: A Renewed Approach to Southeast Asia." Center for a New American Security, March 2019, pp. 1-22](#)
- [O'Rourke, Ronald. "China's Actions in South and East China Seas: Implications for U.S. Interests – Background and Issues for Congress." Congressional Research Service, January 31, 2019, pp. 1-27.](#)
- [Howe, Brendan and Park, Min Joung. "The Evolution of the 'ASEAN Way': Embracing Human Security Perspectives." Asia-Pacific Social Science Review 16:3 \(2017\), pp. 1-15.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Clarke, Michael. "The Belt and Road Initiative: China's New Grand Strategy?" Asian Policy \(24\), National Bureau of Asian Research, July 2017, pp. 71-79](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-08E: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 3

U.S. SOUTHERN COMMAND

Focus

Traditionally, national security has been viewed through a state-centric lens in which preservation of territorial integrity and government survival are prioritized. In recent decades, some have argued that the definition of national security should be expanded to include human security with an emphasis on health, the environment and crime. With both of these approaches in mind, this session seeks to assess contemporary dangers in the SOUTHCOM AOR through a regional lens and from the perspective of the United States and its national interests.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify significant states, sub-national and transnational groups, and transnational trends that pose security challenges to U.S. interests in Latin America and the Caribbean.
- Comprehend the security challenges through a regional lens and a U.S. perspective
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- What do you see as the root cause of the high violent crime rate in the SOUTHCOM AOR? What is your prognosis of the region's long-term viability? Is increased policing or improved social and economic programs the answer to reducing crime in the region?
- What are the economic implications of violent crime and transnational organized crime in the SOUTHCOM AOR? What are the societal and developmental implications of the increasingly problematic increase in transnational organized crime in the region?
- In what ways have foreign external actors contributed to insecurity in the SOUTHCOM AOR?

Required Readings (49 Pages)

- Ellis, R. Evan. "Transnational Organized Crime and Violence in the Americas." Chap. 10 in Violence in the Americas. Edited by Hanna S. Kassab and Jonathan D. Rosen. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2018. [Accessed via E-Reserves]
- [Gurrola, George. "China-Latin America Arms Sales: Antagonizing the United States in the Western Hemisphere?" Military Review, July-August 2018, pp -131.](#)
- [Martinez, Jason. "Protecting the Southern Approaches - Whole-of-SOF Application to a Strategic Chokepoint." Special Warfare, July-September 2018, pp 62-67.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Sullivan, Mark P. and June S. Beittel. "Latin America: Terrorism Issues." Congressional Research Service, December 15, 2016](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-09A: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 4

U.S. AFRICA COMMAND

Focus

Traditionally, national security has been viewed through a state-centric lens in which preservation of territorial integrity and government survival are prioritized. In recent decades, some have argued that the definition of national security should be expanded to include human security with an emphasis on health, the environment and crime. With both of these approaches in mind, this session seeks to assess contemporary dangers through a regional lens and from the perspective of the United States and its national interests.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify significant states, sub-national and transnational groups, and transnational trends that pose security challenges to U.S. interests in the AFRICOM theater.
- Comprehend the security challenges through a regional lens and a U.S. perspective.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Area 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- What are the limitations of applying a state-centric perspective to Africa's internal conflicts and transnational security challenges? What other factors need to be considered?
- How are security challenges examined in this session such as terrorism, civil war, illegal fishing, etc. shaped by interrelated geographic, political, cultural, economic and other factors ranging from the local to the global?

Required Readings (53 Pages)

- Williams, Paul. "Terrain of Struggle." Chap. 2 in War & Conflict in Africa, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016. [pp. 42-63. Hardcopy textbook issued to students in the AFRICOM regional seminars.]
- [Mobjork, Malin and Sebastian van Baalen. "Climate change and violent conflict in East Africa – implications for policy." Policy Brief, April 2016, pp. 1-3.](#)
- [Cilliers, Jakkie. "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.](#)

Foundational Resources

- Williams, Paul. "Counting Africa's Conflicts," Chap. 1 in War & Conflict in Africa, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016. [pp. 15-34. Hardcopy textbook issued to students in the AFRICOM regional seminars.]





SECURITY STRATEGIES-09B: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 4

U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND

Focus

This session examines the key diplomatic relationships and associated challenges in the region. These relationships may include bilateral ties between states, or ties between states and key intergovernmental organizations. The challenges may involve or derive from shifting regional distributions of power, persistent threats from non-state actors, and diplomatic tensions both within the region and between regional actors and the United States. A detailed understanding of these diplomatic factors is crucial for a complete appreciation of regional dynamics.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify significant diplomatic dynamics in the CENTCOM theater, including the relations between states, transnational or subnational groups and regional organizations.
- Comprehend the diplomatic dynamics using both regional perspectives and the U.S. perspective to assess their impact on U.S. interests in the Greater Middle East and Central Asia
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- Will the Trump administration's 'maximum pressure' work against Iran? How has the United States withdrawal from the JCPOA impacted its relationship with regional and European allies and partners?
- What is the future of U.S.-Saudi Arabia relations? How much influence does the United States wield? In what ways do the two countries converge and diverge in their regional goals and interests?
- Do you agree that diplomacy is the best approach to resolve the Yemen crisis and does CENTCOM have a role? How does the proxy nature of this conflict and the Sunni-Shia divide complicate finding a political solution in Yemen?

Required Readings (51 Pages)

- [Pompeo, Michael R. "Confronting Iran: The Trump Administration's Strategy." U.S. Department of State, October 15, 2018, pp. 1-4.](#)
- [Brewer, Eric, et al. "A Realistic Path for Progress on Iran: 12 Guiding Principles to Achieve U.S. Policy Goals." Center for a New American Security, January 2019, pp. 3-33.](#)
- [Gause, Gregory F. III. "After the Killing of Jamal Khashoggi: Muhammed Bin Salman and the Future of Saudi-U.S. Relations." Center for Strategic and International Studies, December 2018, pp. 1-9.](#)
- [International Crisis Group. "Crisis Group Yemen Update #3." February 8, 2019, pp. 1-5.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-09C: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 4

U.S. EUROPEAN COMMAND

Focus

Beyond the question of Russia, the European region is facing a series of challenges—resulting from a variety of factors including environmental change, economic and political pressures, the impact of terrorism and migration, and technological evolution. These factors can exacerbate instability within U.S. partners and create problems with the cohesiveness and responsiveness of NATO and the EU to regional and global issues. This session is designed to provide an overview of the principal issues for which EUCOM must grapple.

Guidance

- The European theater is beset by a series of simultaneous regional and functional threats to its security. What criteria should NATO and the EU use to determine priorities and responses?
- How does the rise of populism and nationalism threaten European regional integration? What are the implications for the trans-Atlantic relationship?
- How do disagreements on trade, migration and the environment between European states and between Europe and the United States affect trans-Atlantic security cooperation?
- To what extent does the rise of illiberal and authoritarian tendencies in European politics impact European security? How cohesive can the EU and NATO remain if member states disagree on questions of values?

Required Readings (24 Pages)

- Issue papers in European Security (Loisach Group Notes):
 - [Clarke, Jack. "Defeating the Russian Information Operations Challenge." \(LG Note 3\)](#)
 - [Vann, Joseph. "A Call for a Comprehensive Arctic Strategy." \(LG Note 4\)](#)
 - [Münchow, Sebastian von. "Terrorism Policy." \(LG Note 9\)](#)
 - [Clarke, Jack and Andreas Geuckler. "Cyber Security Policy." \(LG Note 6\)](#)
 - [Geuckler, Andreas. "Missile Defense Policy." \(LG Note 8\)](#)
- [Krastev, Ivan. "Eastern Europe's Illiberal Revolution: The Long Road to Democratic Decline." Foreign Affairs 97, no. 3 \(2018\): 49-0 1.](#)
- [Cader, David. "How Populism Spills Over Into Foreign Policy." Strategic Europe, January 10, 2019.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Archick, Kristin, and Rhoda Margesson. "Europe's Refugee and Migration Flows." Congressional Research Service In Focus, March 20, 2019.](#)
- [BBC News. "Fact sheet: Europe and Nationalism: A country-by-country guide." September 10, 2018. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-36130006>.](#)
- [Roberts, Peter. "Will the Alliance Discover Navies Again?" NATO Review, April 30, 2018.](#)

OBJECTIVES

- Understand how changes in demographics and environment impact European security
- Understand the interrelationship between external developments (migration, etc.) and internal political and economic developments
- Understand the economic underpinnings of the trans-Atlantic relationship
- Understand the challenges to European economies and networks from cyber threats
- Understand the maritime dimension of European security
- CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-09D: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 4

U.S. INDO-PACIFIC COMMAND

Focus

The region of Oceania consists of island states. Australia and New Zealand are the largest states, and the region also includes several smaller Pacific Island states, including Fiji, Papua New Guinea, and the Solomon Islands. Common issues include the rise of China as a strategic and economic actor in the region, environmental vulnerabilities linked to climate change, and, among the Pacific island states, limited developmental progress. Oceania's states also face an enduring challenge of how to articulate and defend their interests in a context of more powerful regional actors, especially China. Oceania's strongest state, Australia, is described by experts as only a global "middle power," while New Zealand joins the Pacific Island members as "small states." This session will focus on the political and security challenges facing Oceania, and how these can impact and shape U.S. strategy in the Indo-Pacific

OBJECTIVES

- Understand the core political and security challenges and U.S. interests in Oceania.
- Evaluate how DoD can assist regional states in addressing these issues, while also recognizing the risks of U.S. overreach and mission creep in doing so.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, and 6b.

Guidance

- Australia is a significant U.S. Indo-Pacific partner, yet sits within a regional context of dense geopolitical competition. What does Canberra identify as Australia's national interests and major threats, as articulated in its 2017 Foreign Policy White Paper? How important is Australia as an Indo-Pacific theater actor to the United States? Are there areas for closer U.S. partnership with Australia that Washington can pursue?
- The Pacific island states, as represented in the Pacific Islands Forum, include fourteen small states and two French territories in the Western Pacific. Their collective GDP in 2016, estimated by the CIA as \$32 billion, was similar to that of Albania. How is the rise of China affecting these states? What other common political, economic, and security challenges do these small states face? In a context of limited U.S. resources, should Washington devote additional resources toward deepening its strategic relationship with these states? Alternately, should it prioritize building its relationship with Australia as Oceania's strongest actor, and permit a leading role for Australia in engaging these smaller Pacific island states?
- New Zealand has a close security partnership with the United States, but China is playing an increasingly larger role in its economy. This presents difficult challenges for Wellington, as this small state politically and economically sits within the broader U.S.-China theater geopolitical competition, and cannot presently afford to exclusively align with one of these two actors. How is New Zealand attempting to advance its foreign policy interests in this context? Are there opportunities for the United States and DoD to supplant Chinese influence over Wellington?

Required Readings (56 Pages)

- [McDougall, Derek. "Australia's 2017 Foreign Policy White Paper: Deconstruction and Critique." *The Round Table* 107, no. 3 \(2018\): 279-290.](#)
- [Lum, Thomas and Bruce Vaughn. "The Pacific Islands - Policy Issues." *Congressional Research Service*, February 7, 2017, pp. 1-22.](#)
- [Steff, Reuben and Francesca Dodd-Parr. "Examining the Immanent Dilemma of Small States in the Asia-Pacific: The Strategic Triangle between New Zealand, the U.S. and China." *The Pacific Review* 32, no. 1 \(2019\): 90-112.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-09E: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 4

U.S. SOUTHERN COMMAND

Focus

After addressing issues such as political geography, socio-economic factors and security threats, this session examines the key diplomatic relationships and associated challenges in the region. These relationships may include bilateral ties between states, or ties between states and key intergovernmental organizations. The challenges may involve or derive from shifting regional distributions of power, institutional corruption, persistent threats from non-state actors, and diplomatic tensions both within the region and between regional actors and the United States. A detailed understanding of these diplomatic factors is crucial for a complete appreciation of regional dynamics.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify significant diplomatic dynamics in the SOUTHCOM theater, including the relations between states, sub-national or transnational groups, regional organizations, and transnational trends.
- Comprehend the diplomatic dynamics using both regional perspectives and the U.S. perspective to assess their impact on U.S. interests in Latin America and the Caribbean
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- How might the United States overcome biases against and negative perceptions of the United States when crafting foreign policy for the Latin American region? How does corruption impact economic and social development in Latin America?
- What tool of U.S. power do you think will be most effective in day-to-day engagement with Latin America? What military missions should SOUTHCOM prioritize to promote security and prosperity in the region?
- What policies and actions might the United States take early on to help the region avoid another catastrophe like Venezuela?

Required Readings (46 Pages)

- [Farah, Douglas and Kathryn Babineau. "Extra-Regional Actors in Latin America: The United States is Not the Only Game in Town." Prism : A Journal of the Center for Complex Operations 8, no. 1 \(2019\): 96-112](#)
- [Naím, Moisés and Francisco Toro. "Venezuela's Suicide." Foreign Affairs 97, no. 6 \(2018\): 126-138.](#)
- [Lynch, Edward A., "Corruption and Corrosion in Latin America." Military Review, January - February 2019, pp 115-128.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-10A: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 5

U.S. AFRICA COMMAND

Focus

African countries have never existed in isolation; this session describes some of the international relationships between non-African countries and the countries on the continent and explores the security implications of those relationships. Because of U.S. concerns with China, the greatest attention is paid to China's activities in Africa, but the readings also engage with the United Nations Peacekeeping efforts in the region and very slightly with the United States as well.

Guidance

- What is "peacekeeping" and how does it differ – or does it differ – from "military intervention"? When is peacekeeping more effective or less effective? Who is involved and why?
- What is China doing in Africa and why? What are the security implications of China's actions?
- What efforts are the U.S. government as a whole -- and AFRICOM in particular -- currently engaged in with regards to security in Africa?

Required Readings (49 Pages)

- Williams, Paul. "Peace Operations." Chap. 10 in *War & Conflict in Africa*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016. [pp. 232-252. Hardcopy textbook issued to students in the AFRICOM regional seminars.]
- [Duchâtel, Mathieu, Richard Gowan, and Manuel Lafont Rapnouil. "Into Africa. China's Global Security Shift." European Council on Foreign Relations, June 2016.](#)
- [Watts, Stephen, Kimberly Jackson, Sean Mann, Stephen Dalzell, Trevor Johnston, Matthew Lane, Michael J. McNerney, and Andrew Brooks. "Reforming Security Sector Assistance for Africa." RAND Corporation, 2018.](#)
- [Eom, Janet, Jyhjong Hwang, Lucas Atkins, Yunnan Chen, and Siqi Zhou. "The United States and China in Africa: What does the data say?" Policy Brief, Johns Hopkins, School of Advanced International Studies \(2017\).](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session

OBJECTIVES

- Identify significant diplomatic dynamics in Africa including the relations between states, sub-national or transnational groups, regional organizations, and transnational trends.
- Comprehend the diplomatic dynamics using both regional perspectives and the U.S. perspective to assess their impact on U.S. interests in the Africa.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Area 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-10B: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 5

U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND

Focus

As Washington considers policy options toward Asia, geopolitical rivalries among major powers influence the prospects for future cooperation, growth, and stability in the region. Central Asia faces significant regional and transnational challenges such as terrorism, inter-ethnic tension, territorial disputes, resource constraints, and the specter of a volatile neighbor to the South, in Afghanistan. Due to its key location, Central Asia is re-emerging as a fulcrum of great power rivalry, particularly among Russia, China, and the United States, amid competition over energy supplies, trade routes, and a reassertion of traditional spheres of influence. It also borders in the two rivaling nuclear powers (Pakistan and India) and a Middle East regional power, Iran. Despite these challenges, some countervailing opportunities are emerging in the form of regional trade, energy, and security arrangements such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), in which China and Russia are the dominant founding members. With renewed efforts to link resource-rich regions with fast-growing markets, echoing the ancient Silk Road, South and Central Asia are positioned to play a significant role in the evolving geopolitics of the 21st century.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify and assess the U.S. and regional actors' interests in Central Asia.
- Identify and analyze threats, challenges, and opportunities to the United States and other nations in Central Asia.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- Why should (or shouldn't) the United States care about Central Asia given its remote location?
- How does the Silk Road fit into the broader geopolitics of the CENTCOM AOR?
- How should the Trump Administration partner with other great powers in region of Central Asia?
- How important is the Central Asian region diplomatically, and more importantly, as an access point, for the United States and for CENTCOM?
- What would the United States lose if it withdrew entirely from Central Asia? What would the strategic implications of this withdrawal be for U.S. interests in Central Asia?

Required Readings (66 Pages)

- [Omelicheva, Mariya. "U.S. Security Assistance to Central Asia: Examining Limits, Exploring Opportunities." PONARS Eurasia Policy Memo No. 487, October 2017 pp. 1-6.](#)
- [International Crisis Group. "Central Asia's Silk Road Rivalries." Europe and Central Asia Report, July 27, 2017, N°245 pp. 1-32.](#)
- [International Crisis Group. "Rivals for Authority in Tajikistan's Gorno-Badakhshan." Crisis Group Europe and Central Asia Briefing, March 14, 2018, No. 87, pp. 1-11.](#)
- [Matveeva, Anna and Antonio Guistozzi. "The Central Asian Militants: Cannon Fodder of Global Jihadism or Revolutionary Vanguard?" Small Wars and Insurgencies, March 20, 2018, pp. 189-206.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Dubnov, Arkady. "Reflecting on a Quarter Century of Russia's Relations with Central Asia." Carnegie Endowment for International Peace: Russia Insight, April 2018, pp. 1-10.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-10C: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 5

U.S. EUROPEAN COMMAND

Focus

U.S. strategic plans for both European as well as global security assume that Europe itself will remain reasonably stable, that the trans-Atlantic partnership will remain intact, and are predicated on the long-term stability and viability of both NATO and the EU. Will these assumptions remain valid as we move into the mid-21st century?

Guidance

- Does it make sense to continue to speak of “Europe” as a defined economic, political and security entity? Could major European institutions fracture in the coming years?
- Are U.S. assumptions that, in order to cope with the perceived authoritarian challenge posed by Russian and China, the United States must focus on Asia-Pacific while Europe should be able to secure itself, realistic?
- Based on readings for this and previous sessions, how important will Europe be for U.S. security in coming years? Will the U.S. pivot “back” to Europe or rebalance its commitments to other parts of the world? How will European states rebalance their own relations with Washington?

Required Readings (56 Pages)

- [Joffe, Josef. "Europe does Not Exist." Commentary 147, no. 2 \(2019\): 14-18.](#)
- [Ellehuus, Rachel and Andrei Zagorski. "Restoring the European Security Order." Center for Strategic and International Studies, \(2019\): 1-7.](#)
- [Matthijs, Matthias. "Europe After Brexit: A Less Perfect Union." Foreign Affairs 96, no. 1 \(2017\): 85.](#)
- [Breedlove, Philip and Alexander Vershbow. "Permanent Deterrence: Enhancements to the U.S. Military Presence in North Central Europe: Atlantic Council, 2018.](#)
- [Koru, Selim. "The Resiliency of Turkey-Russia Relations" Foreign Policy Research Institute, 2018.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.

OBJECTIVES

- Understand drivers for future tensions within NATO and the EU
- Understand factors which could complicate trans-Atlantic security cooperation
- Identify challenges for European cohesion in the next decade
- Identify security gaps which may emerge in the European theater
- CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-10D: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 5

U.S. INDO-PACIFIC COMMAND

Focus

The region of South Asia consists of the states of Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burma, India, the Maldives, Pakistan, Nepal, and Sri Lanka. While Afghanistan and Pakistan fall under the CENTCOM AOR rather than that of INDOPACOM, developments in those states unavoidably affect those in the broader South Asian region. This region holds a quarter of the world's population, is located in the center of the Indian Ocean. Political and security developments in this area are therefore of core concern to U.S. interests. Regional issues range from nuclear instability, to unresolved territorial disputes, to limited state capacities with regard to managing internal security. With India as the leading power of the region, this session will focus on the security challenges facing South Asia, and how these can impact and shape U.S. strategy in the Indo-Pacific.

OBJECTIVES

- Understand the core security challenges and U.S. interests in South Asia.
- Evaluate how DoD can assist regional states in addressing these issues, while also recognizing the risks of U.S. overreach and mission creep in doing so.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- While U.S.-India relations have often been distant, since 2000, there has been a sustained bilateral effort since by Washington and New Delhi to build a strategic partnership. What are the key shared interests, policy differences, and challenges in the U.S.-India relationship? How can the DoD assist in strengthening the strategic partnership?
- The limited ability of South Asia's states to ensure domestic security and defeat terrorist and insurgent groups is a long-running policy concern. What are the main causes of the persistence of these non-state actor threats in South Asia? How does this context affect U.S. national and theater interests? How can the DoD best partner with South Asian governments to address these threats?
- India and Pakistan are nuclear rivals, who have fought one war and experienced several crises since becoming overt nuclear weapons states in 1998. Their unresolved disputes include disagreement over mutually acceptable boundaries for military naval projection. New Delhi and Islamabad are now developing seaborne nuclear weapon platforms, further complicating their rivalry. How does the prospect of Indo-Pakistan naval nuclear competition impact U.S. theater interests? What elements of their history of hostile interactions make this development especially concerning?

Required Readings (66 Pages)

- [Singh, Sinderpal. "The Indo-Pacific and India-U.S. Strategic Convergence: An Assessment." Asia Policy 14, no. 1 \(2019\): 77-94.](#)
- Paul, T.V. "State Capacity and South Asia's Perennial Insecurity Problems." Chap. 1 in South Asia's Weak States: Understanding the Regional Insecurity Predicament. Edited by T. V. Paul. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010, pp. 3-19. [Accessed via E-Reserves]
- [Rehman, Iskander. "Drowning Stability: The Perils of Naval Nuclearization and Brinkmanship in the Indian Ocean." Naval War College Review 65, no. 4 \(2012\): 64-88.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-10E: REGIONAL ASSESSMENT 5

U.S. SOUTHERN COMMAND

Focus

Despite the near proximity of Central America and the Caribbean to the United States, both regions have often been overlooked when thinking about security and economic prosperity in the Western Hemisphere. Ironically, in the 19th and 20th century the United States has often intervened in both regions to protect both economic and security interests. The United States is once again focused on Central America and the Caribbean region as thousands of citizens migrate north from Central America to escape criminal violence and economic disparity while large quantities of illegal narcotics once again are moving north through the Caribbean to consumption markets in the United States. Past attempts and policy solutions have not succeeded in stemming the illegal flow of people or drugs into the United States. Once again SOUTHCOM is confronted with the challenge of working with NORTHCOM and other government agencies to protect the southern border of the United States.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify significant states, sub-national and transnational groups, and transnational trends that pose security challenges to U.S. interests in Central America and the Caribbean.
- Comprehend the security challenges through a regional lens and a U.S. perspective
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 3g, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- What are the primary reasons thousands of Central American migrants travel to the United States? What can SOUTHCOM do to help reduce the flow of migrants?
- How has a history of U.S. military intervention in Central America affected the ability of the United States to formulate an effective foreign policy for this region?
- How can the United States reduce the level of violence, smuggling and crime in the Caribbean region?

Required Readings (32 Pages)

- Skidmore, Thomas E. "Central America: Within the U.S. Orbit." Chap. 4 in Modern Latin America. Edited by Peter H. Smith and James N. Green. New York: Oxford Press, 2019. [Accessed via E-Reserves]
- [Clayton, Anthony. "The Threat Environment in the Caribbean." University of the West Indies, May, 2019.](#)
- [Cone, Jason and Marc Bosch Bonacasa. "Invisible War: Central America's Forgotten Humanitarian Crisis." The Brown Journal of World Affairs 24, no. 2 \(2018\): 225-239.](#)

Foundational Resources

There are no additional resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-11

DETERRENCE

Focus

The United States was the first nation to develop nuclear weapons and is the only state (so far) to have used them in war. Throughout the Cold War, nuclear weapons and theories of nuclear deterrence were central to U.S. strategy and defense planning. This was a paradox: nuclear weapons were unlikely to be used, but their destructive power demanded continual thinking and planning about their role in protecting American national security. In the years following the Cold War, both civilian and military analysts gave far less thought to 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

- Comprehend and assess the workings of deterrence and the role deterrence plays in protecting U.S. interests.
- Assess, evaluate, and apply the tools available for implementing deterrence in the individual AORs.
- Evaluate the role and composition of the U.S. nuclear force in the 21st century.
- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1d, 3a, 3c, 3g, 4a, 4f, 4g, and 6b and CJCS SAE 3.b.1, 2, 3, and 4.

Guidance

- What are the basic concepts of deterrence and how do states construct a credible deterrence commitment? 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? Should certain parts of the force be adjusted – 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." Chapter 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. \[READ pp. 1-9 and pp 43-52.\]](#)
- [Nichols, Tom. "NWC Talks: Preventive War in the 21st Century." YouTube video, 12:51, May 29, 2019.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Department of Defense. "Nuclear Posture Review." 2018.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-12

NATIONAL STRATEGIC GUIDANCE

Focus

Congress mandates that the Executive Branch submit several strategy documents that are produced in classified versions with unclassified summaries or with classified annexes. The presidential National Security Strategy (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 Secretary of Defense produces the National Defense Strategy (NDS), justifying the military's major missions and how these relate to force structure. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff creates the National Military Strategy (NMS), explaining joint force employment to meet NDS objectives.

The strategy documents serve many purposes. They generate internal coherence on foreign and defense policy within the executive branch. They ensure that Congress is informed of U.S. national security efforts and assist in aligning the budget with national efforts. They also provide guidance for subsidiary strategies and plans. For example, associated regional and functional strategies must support and be consistent with the broader national strategy documents. Additionally, the strategy documents function as a strategic communications tool, for both domestic and foreign audiences.

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the purpose of National Strategic Guidance documents and how current strategies define U.S. security concerns and efforts to address them.
- Assess the opportunities and challenges the strategies presents for the CCMDs
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1d, 3a, 3e, 4a, 4f, and 4g.

Guidance

- How well do the strategy documents assist the planning needs of Combatant Commands? What utility do they provide to Congress?
- Do the strategy documents meet the requirements of a balanced strategy? In what ways do they dilute or detract from national and combatant command efforts?
- How does the 2017 NSS define the primary (vital) national interests of the United States and what concepts does it include to address them? How well does the 2017 NSS capture what we know of this administration's strategic vision? Is the 2018 NDS consistent with the 2017 NSS? What are some of the challenges to implementing the NDS?

Required Readings (61 Pages)

- [Trump, Donald J. "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America." The White House, December 2017. \[READ I-II; 1-4; Skim 7-42; 45-53 \(your assigned region\); 55.\]](#)
- [Mattis, James. "Summary of the 2018 National Defense Strategy of the United States of America." The Office of the Secretary of Defense, January 2018.](#)
- [Lissner, Rebecca Friedman. "The National Security Strategy is Not a Strategy." Foreign Affairs, Dec. 19, 2017, pp. 1-4.](#)
- [Schake, Kori. "Mattis's Defense Strategy is Bold." Foreign Policy, January 22, 2018, pp. 1-4.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [The Department of Defense. "INDO-Pacific Strategy Report: Preparedness, Partnerships, and Promoting a Networked Region." June 2019.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-13

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, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3a, 3e, 4a, 4h, 6b, and CJCS SAE 1.c.

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?
- The CNO's "Design for Maintaining Maritime Superiority" sets out the Navy's current vision of future challenges and how the Navy plans to evolve to meet them. Do you agree with the list of challenges -- what is missing or mischaracterized? What would you recommend to the CNO?
- An important defense planning debate is "forward presence" versus 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? If your combatant commander had to make do with significantly less naval presence forces, how would strategy and posture adapt to compensate?
- The term maritime security includes a broader range of challenges than traditional naval threats -- what does it encompass? What maritime security threats loom in your region? Who is responsible for dealing with maritime security challenges?
- What do "hybrid warfare" and "gray zone" mean in a maritime context? What are major examples around the world, and can you think of examples in your region? It is often suggested competitors like China and Russia can more effectively exploit "gray zone" strategies than the United States -- why, and do you agree? How should the United States respond to hybrid / gray maritime challenges?

Required Readings (57 Pages)

- [Richardson, John M. "A Design for Maintaining Maritime Superiority, ver 2.0." Washington D.C., December 2018 pp. 1-16.](#)
- [Rubel, Robert C. "Straight Talk on Forward Presence." United States Naval Institute. Proceedings 141, no. 3 \(2015\): 24.](#)
- [Bueger, Christian and Timothy Edmunds. "Beyond Seablindness: A New Agenda for Maritime Security Studies." International Affairs 93, no. 6 \(2017\): 1293-1311.](#)
- [Murphy, Martin and Gary Schaub Jr. "SEA OF PEACE OR SEA OF WAR: Russian Maritime Hybrid Warfare in the Baltic Sea." Naval War College Review 71, no. 2 \(2018\): 122.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-14

CYBER SECURITY AND DEFENSE

Focus

The Defense Department defines cyberspace as "a global domain within the information environment consisting of the interdependent networks of information technology infrastructures and resident data, including the Internet, telecommunications networks, computer systems, and embedded processors and controllers." Increasingly individuals, subnational groups, and intelligence services harness cyberspace to advance economic and political interests. Likewise, militaries have been developing cyber commands, which are being integrated into traditional military planning efforts. To appreciate the national security challenges within cyberspace, the session considers how states compete in cyberspace and the implications for strategy.

OBJECTIVES

- Understand cyber power and analyze its role in security strategies
- Apply concepts of deterrence to cyberspace
- Support CJCS Learning Areas 3a, 3d, 4a, 4e, 4h, 5c, and 6b.

Guidance

- When is cybersecurity national security? How would you apply deterrence in the cyber domain? What role can norms play in improving cybersecurity?
- With respect to competing great powers, what challenges face U.S. national security in cyberspace? How should the United States respond?

Required Readings (63 Pages)

- [Nye, Joseph S. Jr. "Deterrence and Dissuasion in Cyberspace." International Security, Vol. 41, No. 3 \(Winter 2016/17\), pp. 44-71.](#)
- [Deibert, Ronald J. "Toward a Human-Centric Approach to Cybersecurity." Ethics & International Affairs, Vol. 32, No. 4 \(December 2018\), pp. 411-424.](#)
- [Jensen, Benjamin, Brandon Valeriano, and Ryan Maness. "Fancy Bears and Digital Trolls: Cyber Strategy with a Russian Twist." Journal of Strategic Studies \(2019\), pp. 1-23.](#)
- [Video: Botti, David, Sameen Amin, Aaron Byrd, and Jonah M. Kesel, "Cyberconflict: Why the Worst is Yet to Come." New York Times, January 8, 2019.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [White House. "National Cyber Strategy of the United States of America." September 2018.](#)
- [Department of Defense. "Summary: Department of Defense Cyber Strategy." 2018.](#)
- [An Interview with Paul M. Nakasone." Joint Force Quarterly : JFQ no. 92 \(2019\): 4-9.](#)
- [Nakasone, Paul M. "A Cyber Force for Persistent Operations." Joint Force Quarterly : JFQ no. 92 \(2019\): 10-22.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-15

SECURITY COOPERATION

Focus

The U.S. military has a longstanding tradition of international engagement designed to shape the security environment and advance national security and foreign policy objectives. Security cooperation encompasses all Department of Defense interactions, programs and activities with foreign security forces. Geographic Combatant Commanders (GCCs), in coordination with the Department of State, develop security cooperation programs to build enduring relationships, enhance U.S. access to partner territory and resources, and strengthen partner capacity in line with U.S. national security objectives. These programs support our national security and theater strategies, advance prioritized theater campaign objectives, and flow from specific legal authorizations. In a fluid security environment, security cooperation gives GCC's the ability to invigorate and expand regional networks of allies and partners.

OBJECTIVES

- Understand the strategic foundations of security cooperation.
- Consider how regional combatant commanders use security cooperation activities to advance and defend U.S. interests.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 3a, 3e, 4a, 4f, 4g, and 4h.

Guidance

- The expanding scope of security cooperation programs and the evolving range of tools to implement them have generated concerns that military cooperation is eclipsing traditional diplomatic and developmental elements of statecraft, resulting in a militarization of U.S. foreign policy. Is this a legitimate concern and, if so, how should GCC's seek to address it?
- Why have some security cooperation efforts succeeded while others failed? How are the goals of security assistance established, implemented and assessed in widely varying regional and domestic circumstances? Do we do enough to adapt programs to local political, economic, social and cultural factors? What can the military practitioner learn from past failures to avoid potential pitfalls to ensure future success?
- Recognizing that military assistance in weak states is not a panacea for broader problems within a country, what can theater commanders and interagency partners do to better align security cooperation programs with larger political purposes of U.S. support for a country or region?

Required Readings (79 Pages)

- Reveron, Derek S. "Security Cooperation." Chap. 5 in *Exporting Security: International Engagement, Security Cooperation, and the Changing Face of the U.S. Military*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2016. [Accessed via E-Reserves]
- [Watts, Stephen, Trevor Johnston, Matthew Lane, Sean Mann, Michael J. McNerney, and Andrew Brooks. *Building Security in Africa: An Evaluation of U.S. Security Sector Assistance in Africa from the Cold War to the Present*. RAND Corporation, 2018. \[READ pp. 1-4, 23-46, 83-86\]](#)
- [Karlin, Mara. "Why Military Assistance Programs Disappoint: Minor Tools Can't Solve Major Problems." *Foreign Affairs* 96, no. 6 \(2017\): 111-1120.](#)
- [Pollack, Kenneth M. "The U.S. Has Wasted Billions of Dollars on Failed Arab Armies." *Foreign Policy*, January 31, 2019.](#)
- [Munson, Peter, "The Limits of Security Cooperation." *War on the Rocks*, September 10, 2013.](#)
- [Reveron, Derek. "NWC Talks: Military Partnerships." YouTube video, 11:44. April 8, 2019. <https://youtu.be/OC4OCxi4RX8>.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Serafino, Nina M. "Security Assistance and Cooperation: Shared Responsibility of the Departments of State and Defense." Congressional Research Service, May 26, 2016, pp. 1-64.](#)
- [Joint Chiefs of Staff. "Joint Publication 3-20 Security Cooperation." 23 May 2017.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 16

U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND

Focus

U.S. Central Command encompasses a broad and diverse region where religion, culture, and changing demographics intersect in a historically contested geographic space. This volatile region is also home to vast natural wealth and key U.S. partners. The last several years in the region 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, 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

- Comprehend the roles that factors such as geopolitics, geo-strategy, culture and religion play in planning and executing security and cooperation activities in the Middle East and Central Asia.
- Comprehend the complex relationships between the concepts of security and national interests, while comprehending the political and military challenges facing the nations in the CENTCOM region.
- Comprehend the strategic alternatives available to U.S. Central Command.
- Support JCS Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 3a, 3e, 4a, 4f, 4g, 4h, and 6b.

Guidance

- What is the geopolitical significance of the CENTCOM AOR?
- Why is the CENTCOM AOR fraught with conflicts and violence?
- What is the role of state and non-state actors in the conflicts/violence in the region?
- What are the "white/black swans" in the region?
- What are primary U.S. national interests relative to the CENTCOM AOR?
- 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 (48 Pages)

- [Votel, Josph. "U.S. CENTCOM Posture Statement." 5 February 2019](#)
- [Ghosn, Faten. "The Hard Road Ahead for Syrian Reconstruction." Current History, December 2018, pp. 331-337.](#)
- [SIGAR. "Stabilization: Lessons From the U.S. Experience in Afghanistan." Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, May 2018. \[READ: Executive Summary and Chapter 1.\]](#)
- [Alvi, Hayat, "NWC Talks: U.S. Interests in the Middle East." YouTube video, 13:23, July 2, 2019.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-17

U.S. AFRICA COMMAND

Focus

Non-state and irregular security threats (both local and transnational) in concert with human security threats predominate within the African security landscape. Issues of poverty, food, water, and energy security, natural disasters, and health challenge the security of individuals and communities as well as the stability and viability of states. On land and at sea, crime, gangs, vigilantism, sub-state conflict and insurgency, terrorism, and piracy are the primary security threats that confront African security forces and continental stability on a day-to-day basis. There is general agreement that security sector reform and capacity building are needed to help combat and contain these threats. However, there are formidable challenges posed by political, financial, geographic, conceptual, and human resource factors to boosting the effectiveness and capability of African security forces and institutions.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify key security challenges as articulated in the 2018 AFRICOM posture statement.
- Comprehend the roles that factors such as geopolitics, geo-strategy, culture and religion play in planning and executing security cooperation activities in Africa.
- Comprehend the complex relationships between the concepts of security and national interests, while comprehending the political and military challenges facing the nations in Africa.
- Comprehend the strategic alternatives available to U.S. Africa Command.
- Support CJCS Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 3a, 3e, 4a, 4f, 4g, 4h, and 6b.

Guidance

- What challenges do Africa's geography and history pose for U.S. strategists and the conduct of security cooperation in Africa? How do they influence current regional security threats?
- What do you think should be the most important strategic concern for U.S. planners and strategists in Africa- geopolitical competition, transnational security threats or other threats?
- Explain how geopolitics and economics at the international level, regional issues such as politics, borders and resources and local issues such as culture, combine to influence African security challenges.

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.](#)
- [Duchâtel, Mathieu, Richard Gowan and Manuel Lafont Rapnouil. "Into Africa: China's Global Security Shift." Policy Brief, European Council on Foreign Relations, June 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]





SECURITY STRATEGIES-18

U.S. EUROPEAN COMMAND

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

- How do Europe and the United States coordinate and work together to advance common global security objectives?
- What contributions do Europe and the United States 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 theater security strategies?
- How successful have the European Union and other European structures been in coping with the different internal and external security challenges confronting Europe? Is European integration necessary for European security and to advance U.S. national security goals?
- 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?

OBJECTIVES

- Understand the structural and institutional factors that impact European security.
- Understand the strategic importance of the Euro-Atlantic region to U.S. security.
- Understand the principal challenges and issues facing the European theater
- CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 3a, 3e, 4a, 4f, 4g, 4h, and 6b.

Required Readings (47 Pages)

- Mattox, Gale A. "The Transatlantic Security Landscape in Europe." Chap. 32 in *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. [Accessed via E-Reserves]
- [Archick, Kristin. "The European Union: Ongoing Challenges and Future Prospects." Congressional Research Service, December, 2018.](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas. "NWC Talks: Will NATO Live to 75?" YouTube video, 21:26. May 17, 2019.
https://youtu.be/pb04TOWbllk.](#)

Foundational Resources

- ["The North Atlantic Treaty \(1949\)." Washington D.C., April 4, 1949.](#)
- [North Atlantic Treaty Organization. "Wales Summit Declaration." September 5, 2014.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-19

U.S. INDO-PACIFIC COMMAND

Focus

U.S. Indo-Pacific Command (INDOPACOM), which was established as a unified command on 1 January 1947, is the oldest and largest of the U.S. unified commands. INDOPACOM's AOR extends from the west coast of the United States to the Indian Ocean. Comprised of 36 countries, the INDOPACOM AOR encompasses more than 50 percent of the world's population. Annual U.S. two-way trade in goods and services with countries in the region, is well in excess of \$1 trillion and includes five of our top ten trading partners.

Guidance

- In ADM Davidson's Posture Statement, do you agree with his assessment and prioritization of the chief challenges to the region? Would you propose any changes to this assessment? What are the implications of the U.S. commitment to a "Free and Open Indo-Pacific"? Has the United States provided sufficient resources to support this vision?
- 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? (and for relations with the United States?)
- What are North Korea's long-term goals? Is North Korea willing to give up its nuclear weapons program? What is the correct strategy for dealing with North Korea?
- What are the key shared interests, policy differences, and challenges in the U.S.-India relationship? How can the DoD assist in strengthening the strategic U.S.-India partnership?

Required Readings (72 Pages)

- [Davidson, Philip. Statement Before the Senate Armed Service Committee on U.S. Pacific Command Posture, 12 February 2019. \[READ pp. 1-13; scan remainder.\]](#)
- [Economy, Elizabeth C. "China's New Revolution: The Reign of Xi Jinping." Foreign Affairs 97, no. 3 \(May/June 2018\), pp. 60-74.](#)
- [Wertz, Daniel. "Issue Brief: The U.S., North Korea, and Nuclear Diplomacy." The National Committee on North Korea, October 2018, pp. 1-24.](#)
- [Singh, Sinderpal. "The Indo-Pacific and India-U.S. Strategic Convergence: An Assessment." Asia Policy 14, no. 1 \(2019\): 77-94.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [O'Rourke, Ronald. "China's Actions in South and East China Seas: Implications for U.S. Interests – Background and Issues for Congress." Congressional Research Service, January 31, 2019, pp. 1-27.](#)

OBJECTIVES

- Identify and comprehend key security challenges as articulated in the 2019 INDOPACOM posture statement.
- Comprehend the complex relationships between the concepts of security and national interests, while assessing the political and military challenges facing the nations in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.
- Comprehend the strategic alternatives available to U.S. Indo-Pacific Command.
- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 3a, 3e, 4a, 4f, 4g, 4h, and 6b.





SECURITY STRATEGIES-20

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 issue of importance to your assigned geographic combatant commander. 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 CJCS Learning Area 6e.

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](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-21

U.S. SOUTHERN COMMAND

Focus

U.S. Southern Command's area of responsibility encompasses more than 30 countries and international jurisdictions. The region represents about one-sixth of the land mass of the world assigned to regional unified commands, accounts for almost 25% of the U.S. export market, and is a major petroleum exporter. Though NORTHCOM works with the militaries of Mexico, Bahamas and Canada, SOUTHCOM is "organized to support homeland defense and is focused on achieving regional partnerships that are committed to democratic values and principles, demonstrate respect for human rights, are capable of security territories and defending borders, ensure regional stability and hemispheric security, and deter, dissuade and defeat transnational threats to the stability of the region." The principal security threats in the region are not state specific, but challenges include: criminal networks, narco-terrorism, drug trafficking, transnational crime, terrorism, social and political exclusion, poor governance, structural power, natural disasters, and anti-American populism.

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the key security challenges as articulated in the 2018 SOUTHCOM posture statement.
- Comprehend the roles that factors such as history, geopolitics, strategy, culture and religion play in planning and executing security cooperation activities in Latin America and the Caribbean.
- Assess the complex relationships between the concepts of security and national interests, while comprehending the political and military challenges facing nations in Latin America and the Caribbean.
- Comprehend the strategic alternatives available to U.S. Southern Command, and the realistic limitations
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 3a, 3e, 4a, 4f, 4g, 4h, and 6b.

Guidance

- In his 2019 SOUTHCOM posture statement, Admiral Craig S. Faller asserts that "Six state actors and a system of interrelated threats challenge the security of our partners and the region." Which state actor(s) and interrelated threat(s) do you consider to be of most concern to U.S. national security?
- How does U.S. history of military intervention in the region complicate contemporary U.S. foreign policy execution in the SOUTHCOM AOR?
- What factors have contributed to the increased migration from Central America to the United States? How should the United States respond to the security and humanitarian challenge?
- How do you think the United States should respond to China's increasingly aggressive economic and diplomatic recruitment of the region?

Required Readings (59 Pages)

- ["Senate Armed Services Committee Issues Testimony from U.S. Southern Command." Targeted News Service, February 7, 2019. \[READ pp. 1-9; scan remainder\]](#)
- Wiarda, Howard J. and Harvey F. Kline. "The Context of Latin American Politics." Chap. 1 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.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Sullivan, Mark P. "Latin America and the Caribbean: Issues in the 115th Congress." Congressional Research Service, January 29, 2019](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES-22

U.S. NORTHERN COMMAND

Focus

Until the 9/11 attacks, the continental United States (and Canada) had not been covered by any geographic command. NORTHCOM was created in 2002 as lead organization for defending the U.S. homeland from direct attack, providing U.S. military assistance to civil authorities in the event of natural disasters, major attacks, or border security, and for security cooperation with Canada and Mexico. More recently it took responsibility for the entire Arctic region. Support to U.S. civil authorities is an important aspect of NORTHCOM, but best fits the domestic/bureaucratic level of analysis. This session will focus on NORTHCOM's external activities, regional environment, and military defense of the United States.

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the roles that factors such as geopolitics, changing environmental conditions, and state capacity play in planning and executing security and cooperation activities in North America and the Arctic.
- Assess the complex relationships between the concepts of security and national interests, while comprehending the political and military challenges facing the states in North America and the Arctic.
- Comprehend the strategic alternatives available to U.S. Northern Command.
- Support CJCS Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 3a, 3e, 4a, 4f, 4g, 4h, and 6b.

Guidance

- NORTHCOM's missions include long-range military defense, responsibility for the Arctic, counter-terrorism, border security, and support to federal and state authorities during disasters. What military threats might North America face in coming years, including from state and non-state actors? Do you believe we are prepared to deal with those threats?
- NORTHCOM is responsible for ballistic missile defense (BMD) of the United States, through the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense system deployed in California and Alaska. How useful are BMD systems for protecting the U.S. homeland and U.S. allies? How might program expansions planned in the 2019 Missile Defense Review impact our strategic rivalries with China and Russia?
- The Arctic was long a neglected geographic space, but is becoming more accessible as climate change reduces ice coverage. What are the principal and secondary U.S. interests in the Arctic? Are there any security challenges for the United States (or U.S. allies) in the Arctic? What role should the U.S. Department of Defense play in the Arctic, and what capabilities should the U.S. military develop?
- Mexico has a difficult history with the United States, including losing 1/3 of its territory to the United States in the Mexican-American War (1846-1848). Historically, interaction between the U.S. and Mexican militaries has been very limited and recent mutual concern about transnational criminal organizations and violence have led to more cooperation. Is drug trafficking and cartel violence a national security threat for the United States? What role should NORTHCOM play in dealing with transnational criminal organizations? How are U.S.-Mexico relations changing under the Trump Administration?

Required Readings (54 Pages)

- [U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee. "Statement of General Terrence J. O'Shaughnessy, Commander, United States Northern Command." February 26, 2019, pp. 1-15.](#)
- [Rose, Frank A., "The Trump Administration's New Missile Defense Review is a Mixed Bag." Brookings Institution, January 25, 2019, pp. 1-7.](#)
- [Rosenberg, Elizabeth, David Titley, and Alexander Wiker. "Arctic 2015 and Beyond: A Strategy for U.S. Leadership in the High North." Center for a New American Security, December 2014, pp. 1-13.](#)
- [Olson, Eric. "Where Do We Go From Here? Merida 2.0 and the Future of Mexico-United States Security Cooperation." Wilson Center Mexico Institute, December 2018, pp. 1-19.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS-01

POLICY ANALYSIS AND DECISION-MAKING APPROACHES

Focus

We launch the Policy Analysis sub-course by examining some of the theories of foreign policy analysis as well as providing an overview of the domestic and bureaucratic forces that shape the many organizations involved in national security policy making. This session lays out themes that will be discussed in more detail in subsequent sessions, and explores ways in which the study of decision-making can be a valuable lens through which to view foreign policy actions at the national level. Given the enormous complexity and large number 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 must take actions under tight deadline pressure and without complete information. This session examines some of those types of decisions and provides a brief introductory look at various decision making models which will be examined in more depth in later sessions.

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 1b, 1c, 3a, 3b, 3e, 4a, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

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?
- The Rational Actor Model is based on the premise that governments act as single unified entities and chose foreign policy options that reflect their national interest. The concept, sometimes called "the unitary state," clashes with an opposing view that a country's foreign policies are, "simply a kludged-together assemblage of the competing parochial interests of different agencies, departments, and personalities jostling within the government." Which model best characterizes U.S. foreign policy? Can you think of any advantages to the competing interests model?
- 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 (52 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. 14-41. \[AVAILABLE ONLINE ONLY\]](#)
- [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. \[AVAILABLE ONLINE ONLY\]](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session





POLICY ANALYSIS-02

9/11 AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Focus

How does the National Security System determine what threats face the United States, how to prioritize those threats, deter and defend against those threats, and if needed, defeat those threats? In this session, we start to answer these questions by examining the attacks of September 11, 2001. The attacks revealed serious disconnects between departments and agencies, a lack of preparedness on the part of some to respond to emergencies, institutional complacency and a host of other problems. Some of these problems related to procedures and others to culture. We will examine these issues in detail during the rest of the Policy Analysis course.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze and explain a complex National Security Case.
- Understand the domestic and international influences on both senior policymakers and as well as national security organizations in the assessment and prioritization of national security threats and challenges.
- Identify the major organizational issues that may have contributed to the failure of the United States to prevent the 9-11 attacks.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 3e, 4a, 4f, 4g, and 6b.

Guidance

- During the first half of this seminar we will watch a Public Broadcasting System documentary. As you watch use the readings to consider reasons for how and why decisions were made before and after the attack. How did different branches and agencies interact? Where and why did things go wrong?
- To what degree did organizational procedures, processes and culture contribute to the failure to detect and prevent the attacks?
- What were the roles of international and domestic actors in influencing U.S. actions prior to and during the attacks?
- Osama Bin Laden was on the radar before 9-11. Some agencies proposed ways to deal with him, but ran into resistance. Why did this happen? Could it happen now?
- It has been nearly twenty years since the 9-11 attack. Is the United States better prepared to deal with something similarly unexpected?

Required Readings (48 Pages)

- [Chapter 9, "Case Study: We Have Some Planes," in "Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise, pp. 171-218.](#)
- [Clarke, Richard A. "Presidential Policy Initiative/Review - The Al-Qida Network." Memorandum for Condoleezza Rice \(Declassified, January 25, 2001.\)](#)
- ["Bin Laden Determined to Strike in US," President's Daily Brief \(Declassified, August 06, 2001.\)](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS-03

COGNITIVE FACTORS

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

- Interpret 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.
- Identify the role of risk and uncertainty in cognitive processes that impact decision making in policymaking.
- Recognize 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 6b, 6c, 6e, and CJCS SAE 6.d.2.

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?
- 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 (70 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.](#)
- [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.](#)

Foundational Resources

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





POLICY ANALYSIS-04

ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR AND CULTURE

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

- Identify the behavioral characteristics and limitations of organizations, such as major staffs, in formulating and implementing effective policies.
- Identify the behavioral characteristics of, and competing cultures inside, different types of military and civilian organizations.
- Examine the possible cascading and reinforcing effects of organizational behavior on mission accomplishment
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 2b, 3e, 3g, and 4f.

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 a department, agency, service, or staff—develops its own culture. How do these different cultures and sub-cultures impact the way in which organizations operate internally and externally? Can you think of examples in your own career of instances where organizational behavior affected decision making, processes or practices?
- In reviewing the 9/11 case study, do you see any examples of types of organizational behavior? How did these behaviors affect real-world outcomes? Similarly, do organizational culture and routines help you understand the different ways the State Department and Department of Defense communicate with the public? Which do you believe is more effective, and why?
- 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 (59 Pages)

- Halperin, Morton H. and Priscilla Clapp, with Arnold Kanter. "Organizational Interests," Chapter 3 in *Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy*, 2nd edition, pp. 25-27, 38-40, 49-61. [Accessed via E-Reserves]
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Organizational Process Perspective," Chapter 5 in *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 125-160. \[AVAILABLE ONLINE ONLY\]](#)
- [Atomic Heritage Foundation. "Nuclear Close Calls: Able Archer 83." 2018.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Review Chapter 9, "Case Study: 'We Have Some Planes,'" in *Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise*, pp. 171-218.](#) This case was assigned previously; re-read it to apply the lessons of the first two readings in locating examples of organizational behavior.





POLICY ANALYSIS-05

BUREAUCRATIC POLITICS

🔍 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

- Identify 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.
- Explain how bureaucratic bargaining among senior agency leaders shapes the outcome of national security decisions.
- Identify the extent to which lower-level officials can influence decisions and how bargaining and coalition building is different at subordinate bureaucratic levels.
- Analyze the interplay of organizational processes and cultures, bureaucratic politics, and subordinate bureaucratic politics.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 2b, 3a, 4a, 6b, and CJCS SAE 6.d.2.

🔧 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 (80 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. \[AVAILABLE ONLINE ONLY\]](#)
- [Zimmerman, S. Rebecca, Kimberly Jackson, Natasha Lander, Colin Roberts, Dan Madden, and Rebeca Orrie. Movement and Maneuver: Culture and Competition for Influence Among the U.S. Military Services. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, pp. xi-xxi, 3-15. \(CHROME, FIREFOX or SAFARI only, IE/EDGE do not work\)](#)

🖥️ Foundational Resources

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





POLICY ANALYSIS-06

PALACE POLITICS

Focus

Previous sessions introduced 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 "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.

OBJECTIVES

- Understand 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.
- Understand how the palace politics approach differs from but builds upon other approaches studied in the sub-course.
- Analyze 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, 3a, 4a, 4g, 6b, and CJCS SEA 6.d.2.

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 (85 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. \[AVAILABLE ONLINE ONLY\]](#)
- [Mintz, Alex and Carly Wayne. "The Polythink Syndrome and Elite Group Decision-Making." Political Psychology 37, no. S1 \(2016\): 3-21. \(CHROME or SAFARI only, IE/EDGE do not work\)](#)
- 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

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS-07

THEATER SECURITY ESTABLISHMENT

Focus

This session provides an overview of the key executive branch departments that play a major role in determining both national security policy and theater security policy. The Department of Defense (DoD) is the best-funded of these departments. Major elements of DoD include the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the Services, the Combatant Commands (both geographic and functional) and the various agencies within DoD. This session will also address the structure and mission of the Department of State, the oldest of the Executive Branch departments. The State Department's various functional and geographic divisions will be explored, as well as State's lead role in guiding and monitoring the country team in each particular state where the United States has diplomatic representation.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify the responsibilities of different elements of the Department of Defense and their role in theater security.
- Interpret and assess the Department of Defense's role in theater security.
- Understand the structure of the Department of State and how it compares and contrasts with the Department of Defense.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 1c, 1d, 3a, 3e, 3g, 4a, 4f, 4g, 4h, and 6b.

Guidance

- How are the different elements of the Department of Defense assigned responsibilities, given authority, and granted resources to pursue DoD's mission?
- What is the culture and structure of the Department of State? What role does it play in theater security?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of the structure of the executive branch as it pertains to theater security decisions? How much has this structure changed since the end of the Cold War?

Required Readings (75 Pages)

- McMillan, Joseph and Franklin C. Miller, "The Office of the Secretary of Defense," in Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof, *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2017), Chapter 6, pages 120-141. [Hardcopy Textbook Issued]
- Grossman, Marc, "The State Department: Culture as Interagency Destiny?" in Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof, *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2017), Chapter 4, pages 81-96. [Hardcopy Textbook Issued]
- [Pickering, Thomas R. "Anatomy of Plan Colombia," *The American Interest*.. Vol. 5, No. 2 Nov. 1, 2009. \(CHROME, FIREFOX or SAFARI only, IE/EDGE do not work\)](#)
- [Murray, Shoon, and Antonny Quinaton, "Combatant Commanders, Ambassadorial Authority, and the Conduct of Diplomacy, in *Mission Creep: The Militarization of U.S. Foreign Policy* \(Washington, D.C. Georgetown University Press, 2014\), pp 166-191. \(CHROME, FIREFOX or SAFARI only, IE/EDGE do not work\)](#)
- [Pierce, Adam, "How Hard Is It to Get Rid of a Cabinet Department? Pretty Hard," *New York Times*, December 22, 2016.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS-08

THE PRESIDENCY AND THEATER 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.

OBJECTIVES

- Explore 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.
- Describe how theater level problems rise to the level of the presidential agenda.
- Discuss lessons learned from how presidents handled specific foreign policy making challenges.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 1c, 1d, 3e, 4a, and 4g.

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 does the long-established practice of "multiple advocacy" (encouraging debate rather than groupthink) within the NSC and Interagency play out in the formulation of national security policy? Can you think of examples where lack of debate limited presidential choices?
- 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)

- [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-Reserves]
- [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.](#)
- [Knott, Stephen. "NWC Talks: Presidential Power and National Security \[Video\]"](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS-09

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS

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 theater 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 and theater 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.
- Identify the roles of the various congressional committees that oversee different parts of the national security enterprise.
- Identify how Congress works with the Executive Branch, especially the Department of Defense, to establish effective national security policies, institutions, and processes.
- Identify and understand the role of the professional committee staff and Members' personal staff in setting the congressional agenda.
- Understand how military officers and other national security professionals interact with the Legislative Branch.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 3e, 4a, 4f, 6a, and 6b.

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 role does staff play in providing expertise and counsel? How do staff filter information from the wider national security policy community to the Members?
- 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.)





POLICY ANALYSIS-10

THE U.S. JUDICIARY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

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 and 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 AUMF to accommodate legal rulings.

OBJECTIVES

- Discuss the role of the judiciary as a key player in adjudicating national security policy questions.
- Discuss 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.
- Examine recent Supreme Court decisions regarding detentions in Guantanamo.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 3e, 4f, 6a and 6c.

Guidance

- How have Presidential Executive Orders evolved since 9/11 to cover detention and detainee 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 its 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force (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-Reserves]
- [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

- [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](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS-11

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.

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the relationships among the U.S. military, American society at large, and the nation's civilian leadership.
- Define the meaning of civilian control of the military and why it is important in a democratic society.
- Identify 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 1a, 1b, 1c, 3e, 4a, 4g, 6a, 6b, 6c, 6e and CJCS SAE 6.d.2.

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 (90 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.](#)
- Gates, Robert Michael, "Waging War on the Pentagon," Chapter 4 in Duty: Memoirs of a Secretary at War. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2014. [Accessed via E-Reserves]

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS-12

THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL AND THE INTERAGENCY PROCESS

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 National Security Council is tasked with advising the President on national security and the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies that promote and protect U.S. national interests in the security environment. The NSC policy formulation process is supported by subordinate committees that provide analysis, decision support and coordination of the execution of U.S. policy implementation by departments and agencies of the federal government.

The session analyzes the characteristics of the interagency process and environment, which includes representatives for U.S. government departments and federal agencies tasked with a common mission or objective. The interagency environment is heavily influenced by the effects of statutory authority, organizational interests and culture, as well as institutional proprietary process. The preferred interagency approach for operations and execution employs all instruments of national power in the accomplishment of national objectives. Often interagency collaboration is labeled as a “whole of government” effort.

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.
- Identify 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.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 1c, 3e, 4a, 6a, and 6b.

Guidance

- What elements of a formal decision making structure and process are attractive to organizations and decision makers?
- How does statutory authority effect 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 (45 Pages)

- [Presidential Memorandum: Organization of the National Security Council, the Homeland Security Council and Subcommittees, White House, April 4, 2017.](#)
- [Hooker, R.D. Jr. “The NSC Staff: New Choices for a New Administration.” \(Washington, DC: INSS Strategic Monograph, November 2016\)](#)
- [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.](#)
- [Center for Excellence in Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance \(CFE-DM\). A Review of OPERATION UNITED ASSISTANCE: The U.S. Military’s Response to the 2014 Ebola Outbreak in Liberia \(Honolulu, HI 2019\).](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS-13

DIPLOMACY

Focus

Diplomacy is the foremost instrument of statecraft to manage foreign relations, reduce external risks, defuse crises and exploit opportunities to advance security and prosperity in the global arena. It is rooted in the art of managing human interactions with friends and foes alike to find common ground and advance national interests. Diplomatic success is often measured by crises resolved or conflicts avoided; while diplomatic failures may lead to war or loss of influence. Diplomats serve in remote outposts, warzones, and bustling capitals, representing the American people and the president to foreign people and governments, building enduring relationships to manage global challenges, and providing unique understanding and insights to policymakers on emerging threats and opportunities.

This session offers two related case studies from the immediate post-Cold War era where U.S. diplomacy addressed two complex but critical European security challenges: the reunification of Germany and the expansion of NATO. These cases highlight how skillful diplomatic engagement, drawing on diverse instruments of statecraft, achieved U.S. goals in preserving European stability, expanding the reach of democratic governance, and reinforcing our most vital military alliance and economic partnerships.

OBJECTIVES

- Explore the complexities of two national security cases by examining the international and domestic influences at work in the policy-making environment.
- Apply what you have learned about organizational behavior and domestic and international influences to these cases to identify the factors that influenced decision makers with regard to German reunification and NATO expansion.
- Analyze the key factors that influenced the decision(s).
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 3a, 3c, 3e, 3g, 4a, 4f, and 4h.

Guidance

- How did key influences shape the decisions on both German reunification and NATO enlargement? What approaches were advocated by executive branch departments, key decision-makers, foreign states, think tanks, public opinion, the media, and Congress? Which agencies and players proved most decisive?
- What were the implications for NATO and its member countries in shifting from an alliance based on collective defense against a specific threat into an alliance committed to projecting democracy and enhancing stability and security? From an organizational process perspective, how is this accomplished? What diplomatic, informational and economic instruments of power are used to further the expansion of the NATO military alliance?
- What role did the proponents of NATO enlargement see for Russia in European security? How has this worked out? Can the policy process anticipate all possible future outcomes when evaluating choices?

Required Readings (59 Pages)

- [Burns, William J., "The Lost Art of American Diplomacy: Can the State Department be Saved," Foreign Affairs, \(May/June 2019\).](#)
- Hutchings, Robert. "American Diplomacy and the End of the Cold War in Europe," in Hutchings, Robert and Suri, Jeremi. *Foreign Policy Breakthroughs: Cases in Successful Diplomacy*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 148-168. [Accessed via E-Reserves]
- [Hutchings, Robert. "The German Question," National Security Council memorandum, November 20, 1989.](#)
- Goldgeier, James M. "NATO Expansion: The Anatomy of a Decision," Chapter 21 in *The Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy*, ed. James M. McCormick, (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2012), pp. 383-398. [Accessed via E-Reserves]

Foundational Resources

- [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.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS-14 INTELLIGENCE

Focus

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

Guidance

- What role(s) does the Intelligence Community play in advising and supporting U.S. theater and national security policy, defense strategy, military operations?
- How does the IC advise and support the U.S. military, particularly at the theater level?
- How do changes in the international political system impact the Intelligence Community and how it advises and supports national and theater security policy?
- How and why did U.S. Intelligence miss the fall of the Soviet empire among other surprises, and what lessons might that hold for understanding how intelligence is collected, analyzed and provided to policy decision makers in the 21st Century?

OBJECTIVES

- Identify 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 1a, 1b, 3a, 4a, 4c, 4f, and 4h.

Required Readings (49 Pages)

- [Helgerson, John. "Concluding Observations," Chapter 8 in Getting to Know the President, Second Edition: Intelligence Briefings of Presidential Candidates, 1952-2004, pp. 177-192.](#)
- George, Roger Z. "Central Intelligence Agency: The President's Own," Chapter 10 in The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth, 2nd edition, eds. Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2017, pp. 204-222. [Hardcopy Textbook Issued]
- [DeVine, Michael E. "Defense Primer: Intelligence Support to Military Operations," Congressional Research Service In Focus \(7-5700 IF10574\), updated December 20, 2018.](#)
- [Kennedy School of Government Case Program. "CIA and the Fall of the Soviet Empire: The Politics of 'Getting it Right'" \(C16-94-1251.0\), pp. 1-17, 20-24, 29-31.](#)

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]





POLICY ANALYSIS-15 ECONOMIC STATECRAFT

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 theater or regional security 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.
- Identify how economic and security matters are integrated in the interagency process.
- Understand the economic tools at the disposal of the president (such as sanctions) and those which require the active concurrence of the Congress (such as trade agreements).
- Discuss the international and the domestic economic systems and how they seek to impose limits on the U.S. agenda.
- Analyze some of the costs and benefits of trade barriers.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 1c, 3a, 3e, 4a, 4f, and 4h.

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-Reserves]

Foundational Resources

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





POLICY ANALYSIS-16

DECIDING WAR: EXECUTIVE-LEGISLATIVE TENSIONS

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 and 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) have been decided in their name. 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?

OBJECTIVES

- Understand 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.
- Discuss the use of drones and other new or innovative approaches to waging war and how policymakers decide their use in military conflicts.
- Understand 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, 1d, 3e, 4a, 4f, 6a, and 6b.

Required Readings (50 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-Reserves]
- [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 \(“draft” AUMF\).](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS-17

CONGRESS AND THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Focus

Civilian control of the U.S. military is split between the President – Commander in Chief – and Congress, which has responsibility to “raise and support” and to establish regulations for the military services. You considered Congress’ general role in the policymaking system, but this session goes deeper into how and why Congress determines budgets, supports, cancels or imposes programs on DoD, and otherwise provides oversight and regulation of the military. The Final Exercise will cover more about the DoD’s internal strategy-to-budget process and the role of CCMDs in that effort.

Guidance

- Formally, how does Congress set budgets for national defense? Be sure you understand authorization vs budgeting vs appropriation, and how the "President's Budget" relates to the Congressional process.
- In practice, how would you characterize recent Congressional budget politics? How have uncertainty, brinkmanship, and polarization affected DoD? Are the budget politics and economics likely to become easier in coming years?
- To what extent do U.S. weapons purchases reflect DoD’s own strategic choices vs Congressional influence? What factors make Congress more or less likely to fund particular programs?
- What military issues attract Congressional attention? Why might Congress be less deferential with pay than procurement? What tools can members or committees use to influence the Defense Department?
- What issues do you think Congress finds important regarding your theater? What might your combatant commander want to request from Congress, and what tough questions might they face when they testify?

Required Readings (64 Pages)

- Adams, Gordon, and Cindy Williams. "Resource Allocation & Budgeting in Congress" (Ch 9) in *Buying National Security: How America Plans and Pays for its Global Role and Safety at Home*. New York: Routledge, 2010. [Accessed via E-Reserves]
- [Jones, Christopher M., and Kevin P. Marsh. "The Politics of Weapons Procurement: Why Some Programs Survive and Others Die." *Defense & Security Analysis* 27, no. 4 \(2011\): 359-373](#)
- Ross, Alexis, "Legislating “Military Entitlements” A Challenge to the Congressional Abdication Thesis" (Ch 6) in Campbell, Colton C., 1965 and David P. Auerswald. *Congress and Civil-Military Relations*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2015. [Accessed via E-Reserves]

Foundational Resources

- [Heniff, Bill et al. *Introduction to the Federal Budget Process*, Congressional Research Service, Report 98-721, December 3, 2012.](#)
- [Congressional Budget Office, "Budget and Economic Outlook, 2019-2029", January 2019.](#)
- [Department of Defense, "Defense Budget Overview, FY2020 Budget Request", March 2019.](#)

OBJECTIVES

- Identify the process for Congressional authorization and appropriation of funds for the DoD and other agencies.
- Identify the contemporary fiscal and economic context in which defense budget decisions take place.
- Analyze political and other considerations in Congress that may cause legislative priorities for DoD to differ from executive branch preferences.
- Discuss Congressional oversight of DoD and contextualize in terms of broader civil-military relations concepts.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1d, 4a, 4h, 6a, 6b, 6e, and CJCS SAE 6.d.2.





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 (PCC) meeting in real time. While only an approximation, it illustrates the challenges and difficulties of developing a policy that can encompass and support the agendas 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.

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 1a, 1b, 1c, 3e, 3g, 4a, 4f, 6a, 6b, 6e, and CJCS SAE 6.d.2.

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.](#)
- Mintz, Alex and Karl DeRouen, Jr. “Negotiation and Mediation Decisions,” Chapter 7 in Understanding Foreign Policy Decision Making, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 139-141. [Accessed Via E-Reserves]

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS-19

MEDIA AND PUBLIC OPINION

Focus

Mass media and public opinion are important influences on the policy-making process and theater security, but they can also influence each other and be influenced by policy elites. The relationship 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 session 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.
- Discuss the impact of media coverage on both the development and the execution of theater security.
- Analyze the role of public opinion in democratic policy-making and civil-military relations, and what influences can affect it.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 3a, 3e, 4f, 6b, and 6e.

Guidance

- Do the U.S. military and the American news media have an adversarial relationship? Has it varied over time?
- 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 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. [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

- [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](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS-20

LOBBYISTS, INTEREST GROUPS & THINK TANKS

Q 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 theater 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, particularly at the theater level?

☰ Required Readings (59 Pages)

- Holyoke, Thomas T. Excerpts from *Interest Groups and Lobbying: Pursuing Political Interests in America*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2014, pp. 1-5; 133-149; 169-173; and 272-276. [Accessed via E-Reserves]
- [Chapter 6, “Deploying Influence and Expertise: Think Tanks, Interest Groups and Lobbyists in the Theater Security Enterprise,” in *Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise*, pp. 97-116 \(section on think tanks\).](#)
- [Haass, Richard. “Think Tanks and US Foreign Policy: A Policy-Maker’s Perspective,” Washington, DC: US Department of State, 2002.](#)
- [Wiarda, Howard J. “Think Tanks and Foreign Policy in a Globalized World: New Ideas, New ‘Tanks,’ New Directions” in *International Journal*; Toronto Vol. 70, Iss. 4, \(Dec 2015\): 517-525.](#)

👤 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.
- Understand 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 3a, 3e, 4a, and 6b.





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. However, government is not the only player. In addition to 20-some agencies with a role in foreign assistance, corporate investment and private voluntary philanthropy are key players in the United States 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.
- Give examples where goals of the USG and private philanthropic organizations do not align.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1d, 3a, 3e, 4a, 4g, 6b, and 6c.

Guidance

- Why does the U.S. government authorize approximately \$40 billion of foreign assistance every year?
- How do 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 countries in which it operates; and religious organizations ranging from Catholic 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 (59 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.](#)
- [Gates, Bill and Melinda Gates. "We Didn't See This Coming," Annual Letter, Feb. 12, 2019.](#)

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 \(CHROME or SAFARI only, no IE/Edge\)](#)





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, 3a, 3c, 3e, 4a, 4f, 4g, 4h, 6a, 6b, and 6e.





TSDM CAPSTONE-01

THINKING LIKE A STRATEGIST

Focus

The purpose of this session is to bring the threads together from the two TSDM 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.

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

Foundational Resources

- [Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe. A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign And Security Policy \(June 2016\)](#)
- [Olga Oliker, Unpacking Russia's New National Security Strategy, CSIS, January 7, 2016.](#)

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend how national interests are determined and prioritized.
- Comprehend the process by which abstract end states are translated into concrete achievable objectives.
- Comprehend how strategic objectives are matched with instruments of national power and used for force planning.
- Identify how risk and trade-offs are assessed.
- CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 3a, 3d, 3e, 4a, 4f, 4g, 4h, 6b, and 6e.





TSDM CAPSTONE-02

COMBATANT COMMANDS AND CAPABILITIES-BASED PLANNING

Focus

This session examines force planning and the role of the Combatant Command in the process. In 2003, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld shifted the force planning approach within DoD from threat-based to capabilities-based planning. Capabilities-based planning is guided by national strategy and focuses on the development and employment of forces that have the capabilities to operate effectively in the future security environment to achieve strategic goals.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), Joint Staff and service force planners assess the future security environment to identify the challenges and opportunities that are likely to affect the execution of national strategy. These force planners make strategic estimates about the future security environment and project potential adversaries, threats, risk, and the character of potential conflicts. In consideration of the future security environment and national strategy, defense leadership evaluates the range of anticipated missions and determines how the military will operate in the future security environment during the execution of these missions. Joint Concepts describe the methods or ways that the Joint Force will operate in the future security environment and help identify required capabilities and future force attributes. However, capabilities are also identified by Combatant Commands, DoD agencies and other actors, and their input must be incorporated into the process.

Capabilities are validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) and the validated capabilities are assigned to the services or agencies as Sponsors. These Sponsors consider existing and anticipated future technology in creating acquisition program proposals, which field the capability within the force. When the decision is made to field a validated capability using a material solution, an acquisition program is developed to deliver the capability to the force.

OBJECTIVES

- Understand the logic of force planning.
- Comprehend the principles of capabilities-based planning.
- Understand how capabilities are identified, validated and fielded in the Joint Force.
- Assess the role and impact of the Combatant Command in U.S. force planning.
- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 2c, 4a, 4g. CJCSI 1800.01E, pages E-C-1 through E-C-3.

Guidance

- Why did DoD shift from a threat-based to a capabilities-based force planning approach?
- How does the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff engage with the Combatant Commanders in U.S. Force Planning?
- How are capabilities expressed in U.S. force planning?
- How does a Combatant Command's Integrated Priority List (IPL) influence force planning?
- How are Joint Concepts used to identify required capabilities in the Joint Force?

Required Readings (42 Pages)

- [Sean Sullivan, "U.S. Force Planning – The Decision to Apply a Capabilities-based Approach, \(Newport: RI\) 30 September 2012.](#)
- [James Cook, "The Importance of Concepts in Strategic Planning," \(Newport RI\) 15 May 2019.](#)
- [Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Charter of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council \(JROC\) and the Implementation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System \(JCIDS\). CJCSI 5123.01H. \(Washington D.C.\) 31 August 2018 and the Manual for the Operation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System. 31 August 2018. \(With Appendix 1 Glossary of Terms and Definitions\).](#)
- [Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Concept for Entry Operations, \(Washington D.C.\) 7 April 2014.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





TSDM CAPSTONE-03

STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION AND ASSESSMENT

Focus

It is not enough to construct a strategy. Once developed, the strategy must be implemented, which requires the strategic planner to understand the structures and processes through which their ideas must pass. Furthermore, policy-makers and Congress-members will want to know whether the strategy was successful. It is necessary for the strategic planner to choose appropriate assessment tools to determine the extent to which the plan was implemented successfully, and the extent to which it produced the desired outcomes.

OBJECTIVES

- Understand how the political structures and processes you have learned about can facilitate or impede the implementation of a strategic plan
- Understand the purposes of measurement and its potential undesirable/unintended consequences
- Understand the full array of assessment tools available and be able to choose those appropriate to your purposes.

Guidance

- Every Naval War College student has, in their career, been part of an implementation effort. Review some of the efforts you have been part of and identify the challenges and obstacles to implementation, as well as the metrics and measures used to track progress and ensure correct implementation. Were these efforts successful? Why or why not?
- How should the team determine which individuals/organizations will have responsibility for implementation of the strategy?
- What resources and boundaries (time, area, people) constrain implementation efforts?
- Who is responsible for interpreting measurements/evaluation data related to implementation? Who are the audiences for those evaluations?
- Choosing the wrong measures and metrics can have disastrous results. Perhaps the most famous example of this problem was the use of "body counts" in Vietnam to gauge whether or not the war was being won. How can a team mitigate the risks/side effects of the assessment metrics?
- As you develop your implementation plan, ensure that you are including metrics, measures, key performance indicators and control systems, as appropriate.
- As you listen to the practitioner panel discussion following this session, be attentive to issues involving the implementation of strategy and measuring success or failure of strategy and policy.

Required Readings (<40 Pages)

- [Ratcliff, Ron, and Mackubin T. Owens \(Revised 2016 by Jessica Blankshain\). "Implementation: the Art of Execution," Newport, RI: Naval War College Faculty Paper, revised 2016.](#)
- [Ratcliff, Ron, "Assuring Organizational Excellence," Newport, RI: Naval War College faculty paper, May 2012.](#)
- [Ross, Ronald G & Gladys S.W. Lann, "Strategy-Based Metrics for Measuring Business Performance," excerpt from "Building Business Solutions: Business Analysis with Business Rules," by Ronald G. Ross and Gladys S.W. Lann.](#)
- [Simon, Robert "Control in an Age of Empowerment," Harvard Business Review article 95211, March/April 1995.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Cook, James, "NWC Talks: The Logic of Force Planning." YouTube video, 13:30, August 19, 2019.](#)





TSDM CAPSTONE-4

THE COMBATANT COMMAND AND STRATEGIC PLANNING

Focus

Since Goldwater-Nichols, the combatant commander has played a key role in U.S. military and national security policy. Nonetheless, the combatant commander sits in a precarious position. While s/he works for the Secretary of Defense and the President, s/he is very dependent on the Services for the forces committed to that area of responsibility as well as budget and procurement. In addition, in the past decade, Secretaries of Defense and Congress have pressed the combatant commanders to encroach on the turf of the Services (man, train, and equip) to ensure that the forces being provided are relevant to the battle at hand. Former Defense Secretary Gates, in his book, *Duty*, complained about how he was "[w]aging [w]ar on the Pentagon" and the Services in his efforts to provide the warfighters what they need. This panel will have participants representing various components of the combatant commands to discuss how the regional combatant commanders and their staffs balance these competing demands.

OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the competing demands faced by the regional combatant commander;
- Identify the time horizon of a regional combatant commander;
- Analyze the focus of combatant commander's time and types of issues that are worked directly.
- CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1d, 3a, 3b, 3e, 3g, 4a, 4f, 4g, 4h, 6a, and 6b.

Guidance

- What is the fundamental role of the regional combatant commander? How active is s/he on strategy and force planning? How active is the planning staff on these issues?
- How does a combatant commander relate to the Service chiefs? How do the combatant command responsibilities differ from those of the Service chiefs?
- The Service chiefs are responsible for manning, training, and equipping the force. What tools does the combatant commander have to influence these tasks?

Required Readings (0) Pages)

None

Foundational Resources

- None





TSDM FX-1

THE FINAL EXERCISE

Focus

The Final Exercise (FX) is the TSDM capstone event during which students must demonstrate that they understand and can use concepts from the Security Strategies and Policy Analysis sub-courses to engage in the whole sequence of strategic assessment, planning, operationalization, implementation, and performance assessment. Each seminar will play the role of a geographic combatant command theater strategic planning working group focused on its respective region.

OBJECTIVES

- Demonstrate understanding of a wide range of TSDM course concepts through this capstone exercise.
- Conduct a theater strategic assessment, develop a theater strategy, determine capability gaps, develop an implementation plan, and develop appropriate assessment measures
- CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2c, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a, 4f, 4g, 4h, 5a, 6b, 6e, 6f, and CJCS SAE 1-6.

Guidance

- Your working group is assigned to produce and present a strategic estimate of the future security environment in the theater over the next eight years, an outline of a theater strategy that advances and defends U.S. national interests, and an Integrated Priority List (IPL) of Defense Department capabilities necessary to advance the strategy. The group must also choose one aspect of the strategy or one line item from the IPL and describe how the initiative would be executed. Finally, the group must explain how the implementation and effectiveness of their initiative would be measured.
- The output will be a 40-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 TSDM FX is a collective team effort, the seminar receives one grade that applies to all seminar members.
- All seminars focusing on the same region will be graded by the same faculty panel. One seminar from each regional competitive group will be selected to present to the TSDM Combatant Command Representatives (CCMD) Panel.
- One of these five finalist seminars presenting to the CCMD Panel will be selected to receive the College's Stavridis Award for Excellence in Theater Strategic Planning. This award-winning seminar will also receive two additional points for their group FX grade.
- Since certain individuals in a seminar might contribute to the TSDM 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, Donald J. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, the White House, December 2017.
- Mattis, James. "Summary of the 2018 National Defense Strategy of the United States of America," Office of the Secretary of Defense, January 2018



SECURITY STRATEGIES WRITING GUIDE (Fall 2019)

Analytic Research Paper Instructions, Proposal Format, and Writing Primer

The enormous irony of the military profession is that we are huge risk takers in what we do operationally -- flying airplanes on and off a carrier, driving a ship through a sea state five typhoon, walking point with your platoon in southern Afghanistan -- but publishing an article, posting a blog, or speaking to the media can scare us badly. We are happy to take personal risk or operational risk, but too many of us won't take career risk.¹

Admiral Stavridis was not the first admiral to encourage military officers to conduct research and write about subjects of relevance to their profession. Rear Admiral Stephen B. Luce described the Naval War College as “a place of original research on all questions relating to war and the statesmanship connected with war, or the prevention of war.” Accordingly, you will conduct research and then write an analytic paper of 2500-3000 words on a topic related to subjects discussed in the security strategies sub-course, within the context of your assigned geographic combatant command.

1. DESCRIPTION:

There are several types of writing and styles of writing. You are already familiar with many of them. In terms of types of writing, for example, here are three.

- a) Research papers. When writing a research paper, you gather information and present it to the reader, sometimes drawing a conclusion, other times leaving it to the reader to draw their own conclusion. Research papers are often largely descriptive in the information conveyed.
- b) Opinion papers. Opinion papers or essays often convey strong feelings, which may or may not be backed by information or fact. Personal thoughts and feelings are being expressed so words and expressions like “I think” or “we ought” are often used.
- c) Analytic papers. In an analytic paper, the author has drawn a conclusion about a question or problem based on research, then conveys and defends that conclusion to the reader. Description is used to present the problem and as evidentiary support for the analysis provided, but *original* analysis is key.

When writing, different styles are used to convey the intended message.

- d) Journalistic writing is very “punchy,” as the writer wants to draw the reader into the story and move it along at a pace to hold the reader’s interest. Consequently, short – one or two line – paragraphs are sometimes used, as well as hyperbole and vivid description.
- e) Writing without the use of full sentences has also become very popular due to mediums such as PowerPoint slides and texting. Brevity becomes key.

¹ Admiral James Stavridis, “Professionals Write,” *Marine Corps Gazette*, May 2011, p. 83.

- f) Expository Writing is writing to inform or explain. Examples include directions for traveling from Point A to Point B, or instructions for performing a task. The writer's view or opinion is completely absent from the text.
- g) Novelistic writing is, as it sounds like, characteristic of novels. Vivid descriptions and conversational language are common, and hyperbole is often used to make a point.
- h) Academic writing is formal and largely impersonal; it focuses on providing a clear, unbiased message based on evidence and neutral assessment. Academic writing uses full sentences, full paragraphs, and structure, largely avoids personal pronoun use and follows standard rules of grammar. It should be written in the third person, avoid "I think" and "we ought," and not include any second person writing (you, your, yours, yourself), other than in direct quotes.

You are writing an **analytic** paper with **research** aspects using an **academic** style of writing.

2. SOURCES OF PAPER TOPICS AND GOAL:

Given the complexity of developing and executing a theater strategy, the paper challenges you to explore, in depth, an issue confronting a geographic combatant command. You may select from a wide variety of topics covered by this sub-course; the table of contents in the syllabus may provide a starting point to identify topics you might select to research. Each session provides an overview of the subject, core questions to consider and a preliminary reading list. A good rule of thumb is that the paper topic must be relevant to a Combatant Command's theater strategy; re-reading the commander's posture statement can help identify relevant topics. Reviewing current issues of major journals focused on defense and security issues can also be an excellent source of topic ideas, as well as give you an idea of what an analytic paper looks like. *Joint Forces Quarterly*, *Parameters*, the Naval Institute *Proceedings*, *Foreign Affairs*, *Foreign Policy*, and *Orbis*, are all excellent sources that are available in the library and online. Once you have a general topic in mind, your Security Strategies faculty member can work with you toward refining it into an appropriate and viable question that you can address within the word limit. Identifying an appropriate and viable question is critical to forming a working thesis.

It is crucial that your paper answer the central question of how your paper topic connects with broader questions of theater security **in the future**. The Security Strategies sub-course is forward-looking: while the past and present can provide inspiration for your paper, the paper must have an important, future-looking element to it. Ask yourself, "Is this a paper the combatant commander would take the time to read?"

Your paper is expected to meet the standards of graduate-level analytical writing meaning that, at a minimum, it should be properly researched, cogently argued, and clearly written. Your seminar faculty member is available for consultation throughout the writing process including a mandatory tutorial to discuss your thesis (typically these meetings are held in the professor's office, but may also be convened in any convenient and mutually-agreed upon location). The student paper exchange is the primary source of feedback. Professors will provide "high level" (very brief) written feedback—focusing in particular on your thesis statement and the overall organization of your paper—to complement the more comprehensive feedback that you will receive from your peers.

While publication is not the primary goal of this assignment, student papers of particular excellence have evolved into articles published in professional journals such as the *Naval War College Review*, the Army journal *Parameters*, the *Marine Corps Gazette*, the *Joint Force Quarterly (JFQ)*, and the *Air and Space Power Journal*, among others. Your faculty advisor is available to advise and assist you should you wish to publish your paper, or to compete for the annual Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff essay contest or one of the many annual Naval War College paper competitions.

3. PAPER STRUCTURE:

The **introduction** to your paper should explain the question you will be addressing and why the question is important. The introduction should contain a clearly identifiable thesis and three or four clearly identifiable points in defense of your thesis. A clear thesis statement is critical; it is the backbone of your paper. The vaguer the thesis, the more trouble you will have defending it. A broad topic tends to generate a broad and generic defense.

Presentation of logic and evidence in support of your thesis, as well as your analysis, comprises the body of the paper. Your analysis will be based on your research and be presented to convince an uninformed reader. Because you are defending a position, you are not going to be giving “pros and cons” or “on the other hand” type arguments throughout the body. Knowing what to omit is as important as knowing what to include. You will need to include references, and may want to include quotations in this section as well. If you are directly quoting material from another source, you must include both the quotation marks and the reference (footnote or endnote).

Because your paper is addressing a question, and should be as unbiased as possible, you will also be required to provide a paragraph or two stating the potential **counterarguments** to your thesis. Certainly not everyone is going to share your view on the question posed or how a problem should be addressed. You should clearly state what the counterarguments are, and why you are not persuaded by those arguments. Keep in mind that the reader may well be aware of contradictory evidence you have discovered, and if you include it in your paper and address it, you may considerably strengthen your argument.

Your **conclusion** draws together the points that you have made in support of your thesis. It will also restate the importance of the question. New points, information, or parameters to your question or thesis should not be introduced in the conclusion. The readers should finish reading the paper with more than just information about a topic, but rather an understanding about how to deal with a problem and why.

Initially, you will be asked to select and hand in a research proposal to your Security Strategies professor. Based on the requirements outlined above, the following format should be used.

4. EXAMPLE PAPER PROPOSAL:

- a) **Research Question:** This is a question of a statement of a problem, which will be addressed in the paper.

- b) **Research Thesis:** This is a working statement that answers your research question or proposes a solution to your problem. This is the main “argument” or point of your paper. It should be open to modification as you conduct your research.
- c) **Research Importance:** This section, typically a paragraph or two in length, provides the context for your research and illustrates the relevance of your proposed line of research. It should squarely place your research question within the range of issues addressed by the Strategies curriculum.
- d) **Research Approach:** In a paragraph or two, please describe how you will answer your research question. Please do this by listing the arguments that support or defend your thesis (completing this at an early stage will help focus your research and prevent you from wasting time with irrelevant information).
- e) **Key References:** To be able to formulate a good research question, it is important to know what has been written previously about the subject. Once you conduct an initial review of the literature, identify at least three to five key references that you would use to begin your research. While it is easy to compile a long list of references on a subject, do your best to narrow the field to select the sources you think are most appropriate. Start with the syllabus and consult with the librarians and your professor.

Two research proposal examples are provided below. Please bear in mind that these are only examples and not school solutions. A good analytic research paper can take many forms, and there are literally thousands of solid, researchable topics and questions that can be considered.

A. Example TSDM Research Proposal (Model A)

Research Topic: US foreign policy in sub-Saharan Africa in the new era of great power competition

Research Thesis: The United States has become increasingly concerned over growing Chinese engagement in Africa, especially as China has emerged as a peer competitor for global influence. As the US considers its foreign policy in sub-Saharan Africa, increased Chinese engagement should certainly factor in the calculus for the United States as it determines engagement strategies. However, an outsized focus on China’s aims carries the risk of the U.S. reverting to a Cold War - and predominantly colonialist – mindset regarding Africa that runs counter to the reality of Africa today. Africa today is a more economically thriving, more democratic, and more demographically significant region than during the Cold War. By focusing on the economic and demographic trends that point to Africa’s growing influence in the world, building on lessons learned from nearly thirty years of post-cold war engagement on the continent, and tailoring approaches to the diverse strengths and challenges of each individual country rather than painting Africa with a single brush, the U.S. can develop meaningful and effective partnerships in sub-Saharan Africa, partnerships that may also counter-balance Chinese influence. Despite the return of great power competition, the U.S. should remember that Africa is not simply a malleable pawn in a Cold War strategy game.

Research Importance: The 2018 National Defense Strategy names the return of great power competition as one of the most important threats to U.S. national security. U.S. foreign policy engagement in all regions needs to be re-examined in this light. In consideration of Africa, it is easy to make an intellectual jump to the Cold War era of Africa as a pawn in the global battle between capitalism and communism. Yet to harken back to this time presents risk for U.S. policymakers. Africa is a different place than it was 50 years ago. Furthermore, China is a different type of competitor. The U.S. needs clear-headed thinking about its strategic engagement in sub-Saharan Africa that is informed by the reality of Chinese engagement but not clouded by its threat. This paper will be of interest to those interested in U.S.-Africa policy and its relation to the new era of great power competition.

Research Approach:

I will:

- Argue that the economic, demographic, and political changes in Sub-Saharan Africa over the last several decades, combined with the U.S. history of engagement since the end of the Cold War, should guide U.S. foreign policy toward Africa.
- Argue that the U.S. should not mimic China's engagement strategies in Africa, but instead offer a more complex model of partnership with key countries in the region.
- Address counter-arguments that the U.S. must compete with Chinese approaches at every turn.
- Offer recommendations for key areas of potential engagement that will strengthen U.S.-Africa ties, and in turn increase U.S. influence in the region.

Key References

Ado, Abdoukadre and Zhan Su. "China in Africa: A Critical Literature Review." *Critical Perspectives on International Business* 12, no. 1 (2016): 40-60, <https://search.proquest.com/docview/2083788153?accountid=322> (accessed November 30, 2018).

Ampiah, Kweku and Sanusha Naidu. 2008. *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon?: Africa and China*. Scottsville, South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Brown, David E. and Army War College Strategic Studies Institute. 2012. *Hidden Dragon, Crouching Lion: How China's Advance in Africa is Underestimated and Africa's Potential Underappreciated*. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College. <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/download.cfm?q=1120>.

Campbell, Horace. "China in Africa: Challenging US Global Hegemony." *Third World Quarterly*. Vol. 29, No. 1 (2008), pp. 89-105.

- French, Howard W. 2014. *China's Second Continent: How a Million Migrants are Building a New Empire in Africa*. First ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Hickey, Dennis and Kenneth C. Wylie. 1993. *An Enchanting Darkness: The American Vision of Africa in the Twentieth Century*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Jackson, Henry F. 1982. *From the Congo to Soweto: U.S. Foreign Policy Toward Africa since 1960*. New York: W. Morrow.
- Rotberg, Robert I. and World Peace Foundation. 1988. *Africa in the 1990s and Beyond: U.S. Policy Opportunities and Choices*. Algonac, Mich.: Reference Publications.
- Schraeder, Peter J. 1994. *United States Foreign Policy Toward Africa: Incrementalism, Crisis, and Change*. Vol. 31. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/samples/cam034/93021590.html>;
<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/description/cam025/93021590.html>;
<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/cam022/93021590.html>.
- Serges Masov. *A Distant Front in the Cold War: The USSR in West Africa and the Congo, 1956-1964*. (Woodrow Wilson Center Press, Washington DC), 2010.

B. Example TSDM Research Proposal (Model B)

Research Question: What are the domestic and international-level factors blocking resolution of the Senkaku/Diaoyu issue?

Research Thesis: The Senkaku/Diaoyu Island dispute is not simply a territorial controversy; the islands are powerful symbols of nationalism, honor and prestige for Japan and China, which complicates resolution via traditional regimes (such as UNCLOS mechanisms). In addition, the dispute has broader geostrategic implications in terms of reflecting fundamental changes in power dynamics between Japan and the People's Republic of China. This thesis is supported by 3 primary arguments:

1. **POWER TRANSITION PERCEPTIONS DRIVE THE DISPUTE:** Japan and China are undergoing a relative power transition phase; China, as the rising power (economically and militarily), must assert its growing hegemonic space, while Japan must defend its own (particularly in its southern maritime region, where it feels vulnerable). The Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands are at the crux of this “hegemonic competition.” For domestic political reasons, neither country finds it easy to compromise.
2. **THE SENKAKU ISLANDS ARE LOCATED IN THE CONTESTED EAST CHINA SEA:** The Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands are located in a much larger contested milieu—the East China Sea—which features multiple “contested spaces” between China and Japan, including the question of the general border (median line vs. continental shelf line) and competition over hydrocarbon resources. China's declaration of an Air Defense Identification Zone (ADIZ) covering the islands has exacerbated these competitive dynamics.

3. **THE SENKAKU DISPUTE INVOLVES THREE MAJOR POWERS:** The Senkaku/Diaoyu Island dispute involves three major powers (not just two). China and Japan are the primary disputants, but the United States looms as the third power, particularly as a result of its assurances to its ally (Japan) via Article 5 of the US-Japan Defense Treaty.

Research Importance and Conclusion: For the reasons described above, the Senkaku/Diaoyu Island issue will remain a diplomatic thorn in Japan-China relations for many years to come. More ominously, the island dispute could potentially erupt in a war involving China, Japan and the United States. Dispute “management” rather than resolution may be the best option.

Key References:

“Who Really Owns the Senkaku Islands?” *The Economist*, 3 December 2013.
<http://www.economist.com/blogs/economist-explains/2013/12/economist-explains-1>

Michael A. McDevitt and Catherine K. Lea, “Japan’s Territorial Disputes: CNA Maritime Asia Project-Workshop Three,” CNA, 30 June 2013. <http://www.cna.org/research/tags/senkaku-islands>

Alan D. Romberg, “American Interests in the Senkaku/Diaoyu Issue, Policy Considerations” 11 April 2013, http://www.stimson.org/images/uploads/research-pdfs/Romberg-ADR_paper_8-3-13.pdf

Mark Manyin, *Senkaku (Diaoyu/Diaoyutai) Islands Dispute: U.S. Treaty Obligations* (Washington DC: Congressional Research Service, 25 September 2012), pp. 1-10.

Emma Chanlett-Avery, Mark Manyin (et.al.) *Japan-U.S. Relations: Issues for Congress* (Washington DC: Congressional Research Service, 15 February 2013), pp. 1-36.

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

The Security Strategies paper will comprise **25 percent** of your overall TSDM grade. In general, the greatest weight is placed on your ability to think critically. Research is required to conduct analysis, but the most important factor in evaluating your work will be the quality and depth of your own analysis, not the extent or description of your research. The overall evaluation of your paper will be based on the following general criteria: a clear thesis statement, logical organization, effective evidence, sound analysis, original thinking and proper style and format. The following rubric is designed to provide you clarity regarding grading criteria.

Rubric for Strategies Analytic Research Paper

Performance Area	Exceptional	Acceptable	Unsatisfactory	Fail
Clear thesis statement	The thesis is clear, concise and to the point. It is found in the first or second paragraph. Successive arguments and evidence presented in the paper link back to or build upon the thesis.	The thesis is reasonably clear or adequate, but could be improved. Although the thesis may be clear and concise, it is not consistently referenced (or linked) subsequently in the paper.	The thesis is not particularly clear, or it is not developed (or referenced) throughout the paper.	The thesis does not exist or is too weak or inconclusive to be effective. The thesis is only rarely addressed in the subsequent sections of the paper.
Effective organization	The paper is well-organized. It has a logical flow that allows the reader to easily follow the author's logic and presentation of evidence.	The paper is reasonably well-organized, but it could be improved. The paper's logical flow is reasonably discernible, but improvements could be made.	The paper is poorly organized. The logic and presentation of evidence are difficult to follow or discern.	The paper is disorganized. It does not have an effective logical flow. It does not effectively present evidence to provide support for assertions.
Effective evidence	The paper relies on effective evidence (sources). It features high quality and (often) primary sources. In addition, all of the footnotes/ endnotes are properly formatted.	The paper relies on reasonably solid evidence, but more secondary than primary sources. The footnotes or endnotes are mostly well-formatted.	The paper relies on lower quality evidence, or the paper makes assertions that are often not backed up by evidence. The footnotes or endnotes have a number of errors (in terms of formatting).	The paper relies on very poor evidence, or the paper contains very few references at all. The references that do exist are not formatted correctly.
Sound analysis and original thinking	The paper consistently features sound analysis and original thinking. The thesis is supported by logic and facts and not mere assertions or opinion.	The paper has some good analysis and original thinking, but it could be strengthened.	The paper has minimal analysis or original thinking. Many of the assertions are opinion and are not backed by evidence.	The paper does not reflect sound analysis or original thinking. Its assertions are not logical nor backed by evidence.
Counterargument	The paper effectively considers (and overcomes) counterarguments to the thesis, either in body of the paper or as a separate section.	The paper mentions counter-arguments, but does not address them (or overcome them) in great depth.	The paper only barely addresses counter-arguments and does not overcome their challenge to the paper's thesis.	The paper does not mention or consider counter-arguments.
Effective style and format	The paper is written well (clear writing) and is free from significant grammatical or structural problems.	The paper is written reasonably well, but contains a few grammatical or structural flaws.	The paper is only marginally written well. It features many grammatical or structural errors.	The paper is not written well. The writing is not clear. The paper suffers from numerous grammatical and structural flaws.

Other Issues:

The title page should contain your name, paper title, seminar number, date and word count. You may use either footnotes or endnotes for citations, which will not count against the word limit. (You may also place short asides or minor clarifications in your footnotes or endnotes. Part of learning to write effectively is learning to write to a specified length.) A table of contents and an abstract are not necessary, and illustrations and tables should only be included if they are absolutely essential to the paper and are well explained in the text. A bibliography is not required.

Plagiarism is an issue that occurs from time to time at every institution (usually accidentally) and therefore requires this reminder. The Naval War College defines plagiarism as: 1) Duplication of an author's words without both quotation marks and accurate references and footnotes; 2) Use of an author's ideas in paraphrase without accurate references of footnotes.

6. MILESTONES:

August 15, 2019. How to choose a topic and write a thesis. Your Strategies professor will provide in-class instruction during Strategies-3 on how to choose a topic and write a thesis for the Strategies final paper.

August 28, 2019. Proposal submission due. Submit your research proposal using the format provided on page 4 of this document.

September 25, 2019. Draft Paper Due, Paper exchange day. Bring two copies of your draft essay to seminar (or as instructed by your professor) and submit one electronically to your professor. Two peers will read the draft, and provide comments using the feedback template in session 18. Each student, accordingly, will also receive a copy of two draft essays from two peers to provide feedback to them.

October 2, 2019. Paper Peer Review Day. Time will be provided in class for each student to both provide feedback to two peers and to receive feedback on his or her draft essay.

October 15, 2019. Final due date. Students should provide an electronic version of the final paper to his or her Security Strategies professor by close of business.

October 29, 2019. Paper return date. Graded papers will be returned to the students.