



NATIONAL SECURITY DECISION MAKING COURSE INTRODUCTION

Focus

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

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

OBJECTIVES

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

Guidance

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

Required Readings (70 Pages)

- [Mazarr, Michael J., Astrid Stuth Cevallos, Miranda Priebe, Andrew Radin, Kathleen Reedy, Alexander D. Rothenberg, Julia A. Thompson, and Jordan Willcox, Measuring the Health of the Liberal International Order. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2017, 1-25.](#)
- [Nye, Joseph S., Jr. "Will the Liberal Order Survive?: The History of an Idea." Foreign Affairs 96, no. 1 \(2017\): 10-16.](#)
- [Jones, James L. "Foreword: U.S. National Security for the Twenty-First Century" in The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security, 2018.](#)
- [Flournoy, Michèle, "How to Prevent a War in Asia. The Erosion of American Deterrence Raises the Risk of Chinese Miscalculation," Foreign Affairs 99, no. 44 \(July/August 2020\).](#)
- [Hardt, Brent. "NWC Talks: What on Earth is the Liberal International Order?" YouTube video. 18:03. Nov 13, 2019.](#)

Foundational Resources

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





POLICY ANALYSIS - 01

FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS AND THE UNITARY STATE PERSPECTIVE

Focus

We launch the Policy Analysis sub-course by examining some of the theories of foreign policy analysis (FPA) and providing an overview of the international, domestic, and bureaucratic forces that shape national security policy making with alternative perspectives. This session lays out themes that will be discussed in more detail in subsequent sessions and explores ways in which the study of decision-making can be a valuable way to evaluate foreign policy actions at the national level. 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. This session examines some of those types of decisions and provides a brief introductory look at various decision-making models.

OBJECTIVES

- Familiarize students with terms of art and examples of some of the more prevalent foreign policy analysis models.
- Distinguish, through examples and discussion, the various lenses through which foreign policy decisions and actions can be interpreted.
- Sets the stage for more in-depth examination of theories and frameworks in following sessions.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 2c, 3a.

Guidance

- The textbook chapters note that "a [foreign policy] decision may be less about what a president or other leaders want, and more about what options are possible given political and systemic constraints." What are some of those constraints? How might they affect the outcome of a foreign policy decision?
- What is the "Levels of Analysis" framework and how might focusing on explanations at different levels help to answer these types of questions?
- Decision makers inevitably must act with incomplete information. What information would be especially important in a foreign policy context, and what data is easiest to attain, harder to attain, and nearly impossible to attain?
- The Unitary State Perspective is based on the premise that governments act as single unified entities and choose 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 using each type of perspective?
- Does the Policy Analysis Framework help you to visualize and map the many interrelated influences on a foreign policy decision that are studied in the academic field of FPA? How can this be used to analyze case studies?

Required Readings (90 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. 1-12. \[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\]](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain, and David A. Cooper, "Foreign Policy Analysis," Chapter 2 in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 14-51. \[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\]](#)
- [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. 52-87. \[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\]](#)
- [Cooper, David A., et al., "The Policy Analysis Framework: An Introduction," USNWC Faculty Paper, April 2020.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 01

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Focus

The NSDM Security Strategies sub-course is designed to assist students in analyzing security issues at the international level including the development of national and military strategies that advance and defend U.S. interests in this international strategic context. This creates the ability to recognize change and lead transitions. The sub-course is intended to provide students with an appreciation of the international security environment overall to reduce surprise and uncertainty, how global political and economic systems work, the complex meanings of security, the sources of national power, and the relationship between the security environment and national strategy. In addition, students will explore various grand strategies rooted in international relations theory. Because the sub-course emphasizes the importance of being able to gather information, analyze data, and produce a clear articulation of one's ideas, the graded event for this sub-course will be an analytic research paper.

OBJECTIVES

- Introduce the objectives and scope of the NSDM Security Strategies sub-course.
- Analyze the relative position of the United States in the international system in light of recent trends.
- Examine key concepts related to the distribution of power in the international system.
- Understand the purpose and procedures for the research and writing of the NSDM Security Strategies paper.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, and 1c.

Guidance

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

Required Readings (52 Pages)

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

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS - 02

ORGANIZATIONAL PROCESS PERSPECTIVE

Focus

Level II of the levels of analysis framework focuses on state and societal-level explanations on the formulation and execution of national security policies. One lens with which to view these state-level explanations is the organizational process perspective. This perspective draws our attention to organizations as actors who process information and systematically provide outputs such as actions or decisions. 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 way 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 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.
- Analyze the behavioral characteristics of, and competing cultures inside, different types of military and civilian organizations.
- Assess the possible cascading and reinforcing effects of organizational behavior on mission accomplishment.
- Apply the organizational process perspective to a case study to evaluate a U.S. foreign policy decision.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1e, 2e, 3a, 4a, 5c.

Guidance

- Every government organization—whether a department, agency, service, or staff—develops its own culture. How do these different cultures and sub-cultures impact the way in which organizations operate internally and externally? Can you think of examples in your own career of instances where organizational behavior affected decision making, processes or practices?
- How might military officers and civil servants operating in the national security policy arena navigate the dynamics of organizational behavior to assure mission success?
- How does the organizational process perspective help us understand the mini case study on coronavirus testing?

Required Readings (55 Pages)

[Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Organizational Process Perspective," Chapter 5 in *Decision-making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, pp. 125-160 \[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\]](#)

- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Annex: Case Studies," in *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 378-382. \[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\]](#)
- [Kelly, Meg, Sarah Cahlan, and Elyse Samuels. "11 to 100,000: What went wrong with coronavirus testing in the U.S." *The Washington Post*, 30 Mar 2020.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [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. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\].](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 02

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY

Focus

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

OBJECTIVES

- Examine various theories of international relations to understand the different conceptions of how the world works.
- Assess linkages among the theories of international relations and begin to determine the implications for the development of grand strategy.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Area 1a and 1c.

Guidance

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

Required Readings (68 Pages)

- [Snyder, Jack. "One World, Rival Theories," Foreign Policy, November/December 2004, no. 145, pp. 1-10.](#)
- [Mearsheimer, John. "Anarchy and the Struggle for Power," Chapter 2 in The Tragedy of Great Power Politics \(WW Norton, 2014\), pp. 29-54. \[Accessed via E-Reserves.\]](#)
- [Morgan, Patrick. "Liberalism," Chapter 3 in Alan Collins \(ed\), Contemporary Security Studies, 5th ed. \(Oxford University Press, 2019\). \[Accessed via E-Reserves.\]](#)
- [Hurd, Ian. "Constructivism," Chapter 17 in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal \(eds\). The Oxford Handbook of International Relations \(Oxford University Press, 2008\), pp 298-305.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS - 03

BUREAUCRATIC AND SUB-BUREAUCRATIC POLITICS PERSPECTIVE

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 Level II perspectives that focus on the role of the various individuals who represent these organizations within the wider government: the bureaucratic and sub-bureaucratic politics perspectives. Bureaucratic politics focuses analysis on the bargaining that occurs among senior leaders of organizations arguing for policies that protect or promote the core interests of their specific agency or department. Decisions are therefore seen as the result of compromises among competing bureaucratic interests. 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.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify how bureaucratic interests can both intersect with and diverge from the unitary state perspective's "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.
- Apply the bureaucratic politics and sub-bureaucratic politics perspectives to a case study to evaluate a U.S. foreign policy decision.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1e, 3a, 3e, 4a.

Guidance

- How does the bureaucratic politics perspective challenge the common assumption that countries function as unitary actors that make foreign policy decisions 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?
- How do the bureaucratic politics and sub-bureaucratic politics perspectives help us understand mini case study on President Richard Nixon's decision to renounce the U.S. offensive biological weapons program?

Required Readings (96 Pages)

- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Bureaucratic Politics Perspective," Chapter 6 in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 162-191. \[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\]](#)
- [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. 238-241, 253-283. \[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\]](#)
- [Cooper, David, "NWC Talks: Understanding the Real 'Deep State.'" YouTube video, 13:36, July 1, 2019.](#)
- [Tucker, Jonathan B. and Erin R. Mahan. "President Nixon's Decision to Renounce the U.S. Offensive Biological Weapons Program," Case Study Series Center for the Study of Weapons of Mass Destruction, National Defense University, 2009.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Annex: Case Studies," in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 378-382. \[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\] \(Review as needed\).](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 03

NATIONAL INTERESTS AND DIMENSIONS OF POWER

Focus

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

OBJECTIVES

- Examine the dimensions of national power and their role in shaping strategy.
- Assess the role national interests play in strategic thinking.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, and 1d.

Guidance

- What are national interests and why are they important? How do vital, important and peripheral national interests affect a nation's strategic calculus?
- Why is there so much difficulty determining and prioritizing national interests?
- Do you agree with Walt's argument that alliances should be based on national interests? Is this the right question for U.S. leaders to answer when potential allies come calling "what's in it for us"?
- When designing strategy, how can a country achieve balance with the various tools of national power?
- How important is the information lever of power to grand strategy? How does overemphasizing one tool of national power place strain on the other tools?

Required Readings (38 Pages)

- [Reveron, Derek S. and Nikolas K. Gvosdev. "\(Re\)Discovering the National Interest: The Future of U.S. Foreign Policy and Defense Strategy," Orbis, Summer 2015, pp. 1-18.](#)
- [Walt, Stephen. "Would You Die For That Country?" Foreign Policy, March 24, 2014, pp. 1-6.](#)
- [Mead, Walter Russell. "America's Sticky Power," Foreign Policy, 29 October 2009, pp. 1-9.](#)
- [Walker, Christopher and Ludwig, Jessica, "The Meaning of Sharp Power," Foreign Affairs, 16 November 2017.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS - 04

PALACE POLITICS PERSPECTIVE

Focus

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

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze how palace politics can cause policy to intersect with or diverge from the unitary state perspective's "national interest" as agency leaders, White House staff, and other members of the president's inner circle jockey to gain access.
- Examine how the palace politics approach differs from but builds upon other approaches studied in the sub-course.
- Apply the palace politics perspective to a case study to evaluate a U.S. foreign policy decision.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 3a, 4a.

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 perspectives we have previously discussed, particularly the bureaucratic politics perspective?
- 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 palace politics perspective help us understand the mini case study on the Trump administration's 2017 Afghanistan policy?

Required Readings (56 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.192-237. \[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\]](#)
- [Rucker, Philip and Robert Costa. "'It's a hard problem': Inside Trump's decision to send more troops to Afghanistan," The Washington Post, 21 Aug 2017.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Annex: Case Studies," in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 378-382. \[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\] \(Review as needed\)](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES – 04

DETERRENCE THEORY AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Focus

The United States was the first nation to develop nuclear weapons and is the only state 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

- Examine the workings of deterrence and the role deterrence plays in protecting U.S. interests.
- Assess, evaluate, and apply the tools available for implementing deterrence today.
- Evaluate the role and composition of the U.S. nuclear force in the 21st century.
- Supports CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1c and 1e.

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? Could the United States make further cuts, have we cut too far, or is the current arsenal sufficient? 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 to strategic nuclear forces that are on currently on the table? If not, what should the priorities be?

Required Readings (40 Pages)

- [Freedman, Lawrence. "The Meaning of Deterrence." Chapter 2 in Deterrence, \(Cambridge, MA: Polity Press, 2004\), pp. 26-42. \[Accessed via E-Reserve\]](#)
- [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.](#)
- ["U.S. Strategic Nuclear Forces: Background, Developments, and Issues," Congressional Research Service, April 2020, pp. 1-9 and pp 48-57.](#)
- [Lupton, Danielle. "Trump thought escalating the Iran crisis would solve it. That's not how escalation works." Washington Post, January 8, 2020.](#)
- [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.](#)
- [Department of Defense, "Nuclear Deterrence: America's Foundation and Backstop for National Defense," April 6, 2020.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 05

COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE

Focus

In the “unitary state perspective,” we filter out the influence of individual human beings by treating the state as a single “rational actor.” Similarly, the organizational process perspective focuses on organizations as actors in their own right. But, as we began to see in bureaucratic politics, and even more so in palace politics, states and organizations are comprised 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. Continuing at the individual level of analysis, the cognitive perspective examines the way people, and in particular leaders, think, process information, and make decisions.

OBJECTIVES

- Examine how an individual decision maker can be affected by their experiences, expertise, biases, heuristics, emotions, belief systems, operational codes.
- Identify the role of risk and uncertainty in cognitive processes that impact decision-making in policymaking.
- Apply the cognitive perspective to a case study to evaluate a U.S. foreign policy decision.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 3a, 4a, 5a, 5b.

Guidance

- How does having an awareness of the natural limitations of the cognitive abilities of individual decision makers help us to understand 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 both the positive and negative effects associated with such heuristic shortcuts?
- Why do state leaders and their advisors 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?
- How does the cognitive perspective help us understand the mini case study on the 2017 military strike against Syria?

Required Readings (76 Pages)

- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Cognitive Perspective," Chapter 4 in Decision-making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 88-122. \[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\]](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Annex: Case Studies, Case No. 5: Military Strike against Syria \(2017\)," in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 406-410. \[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\]](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Annex: Case Studies," in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 378-382. \[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\] \(Review as needed\).](#)
- [Kelly, Anne. "Think Twice: Review of Thinking, Fast and Slow by Daniel Kahneman \(2011\)." Numeracy 10, Iss. 2 \(2017\): Article 15.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 05 POLITICAL ECONOMY

Focus

A strong economy is a prerequisite for national security. Economic activity must provide a basic quality of life for citizens, while simultaneously providing sufficient resources to support those functions for which the state is responsible. History provides numerous examples of how states and other political entities have managed the economic behavior of individuals and firms, and there is no consensus on which system is best. Some systems prioritize growth, while others prioritize stability, or a regime's ability to distribute patronage.

Political economy refers to the processes by which market activity is structured and regulated by the political unit or system. An idealized pure free market optimizes the values of efficiency and individual liberty (to dispose of property as the individual prefers), but still requires rules to function, and can create instability and inequality. Political processes determine which values a state will prioritize, and how it will adjust market mechanisms in order to produce those desired outcomes. Comparative political economy looks at how different states approach the issues of production and distribution of resources, and how the decisions those states make affect their security and relations with the rest of the world.

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

OBJECTIVES

- Understand alternative economic system theories and the advantages and disadvantages of each.
- Understand how to relate economic performance to national security and other political outcomes.
- Analyze what drives economic behavior among states and what motivates a state to adopt a specific set of international economic policies.
- Assess the advantages and disadvantages of global trade and considerations that drive state decision making with respect to international trade policy.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, and 1d.

Guidance

- Since World War II, the international economic system has been dominated by the United States, and the United States has until recently encouraged all states to pursue a free market approach. This has been a source of disagreement and sometimes conflict. But why? What are the other ways of organizing an economy, and why might different states prefer different systems? How do different systems affect things like state interests, state power, and state stability?
- What are the basic international institutions in the global economy, and how do they work?
- How do monetary and finance systems work, both domestically and internationally? How are these sources of power/weakness or stability/instability? How do crashes happen?
- How has globalization affected both security and economic prosperity? Are there alternatives?

Required Readings (91 Pages)

- [Cohn, Lindsay P. 2019 \(revised\). "Introduction to Political Economy Parts I & II: Comparative & International" U.S. Naval War College.](#)
- [Baldwin, Richard. 2016. "The World Trade Organization and the Future of Multilateralism" Journal of Economic Perspectives 30\(1\): 95-116.](#)
- [Farrell, Henry, and Abraham L. Newman. 2019. "Weaponized Interdependence: How Global Economic Networks Shape State Coercion" International Security 44\(1\): 42-79.](#)
- [Campbell, John L., and Ove K. Pedersen. "Institutional Competitiveness in the Global Economy: Denmark, the United States, and the Varieties of Capitalism" Regulation and Governance \(2007\): 230-246.](#)

Foundational Resources

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





POLICY ANALYSIS - 06

TWO LEVEL GAMES

🔍 Focus

In this session we transition from focusing inside the "black box" of the executive branch to explore its external dealings with domestic and international actors. To do so, we introduce the concept of "two-level games." First introduced by Robert Putnam, this paradigm integrates explanations across the levels of analysis, examining the linkages between domestic and international politics and foreign policymaking. We therefore examine how the executive branch interacts with both other players in the international political system (Putnam's Level 1) and players in the American domestic political system (Putnam's Level 2). This session completes our conceptual toolbox for understanding the influences on the "black box" of executive branch decision-making.

OBJECTIVES

- Examine "two-level games" as a foreign policy decision-making framework.
- Distinguish the decision-making processes within the Executive Branch to bargaining outside the "black box" with domestic and international actors.
- Apply the two-level games framework to a case study to evaluate a U.S. foreign policy decision.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 2c, 2e, 4a.

🔧 Guidance

- What is the "two-level games" framework? How does it fit with the "levels of analysis" framework and the analytical perspectives we have already covered? How does it help to explain how international and domestic political systems interact to influence policymaking?
- How do international rules, tools, and concepts, such as the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), help shape, influence, or constrain U.S. policy? What are the potential challenges to U.S. sovereignty, national power, and domestic politics given the technological advances and cyberspace tools in the modern era?
- Why is it important to understand the motivations of other countries? What about domestic political actors? How do they affect foreign policy decisions?
- How does the two-level game framework help us understand the negotiations preceding the Iran nuclear deal?

📖 Required Readings (49 Pages)

- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Domestic Politics," Chapter 9 in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 284-296 only. \[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\]](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Other Countries," Chapter 10 in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 334-345 only. \[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\]](#)
- [Hurst, Steven. "The Iranian Nuclear Negotiations as a Two-Level Game: The Importance of Domestic Politics." Diplomacy and Statecraft 27, no. 3 \(2016\): 545-567.](#)
- [Bjola, Corneliu and Ilan Manor. "Revisiting Putnam's two-level game theory in the digital age: Domestic digital diplomacy and the Iran nuclear deal." In the Long Run, Department of Politics and International Studies at the University of Cambridge, 19 July 2018.](#)

👤 Foundational Resources

- [Putnam, Robert D. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games." International Organization 42, no. 3 \(1988\): 427-460.](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., "The Regional and International Context for Theater Security" Chapter 7 in Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise, Newport, RI: Naval War College, 2017, pp. 125 - 151 \(Review as needed\).](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 06

TRANSNATIONAL AND NON-TRADITIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES

Focus

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

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze the difference between “traditional” and “non-traditional” security challenges.
- Examine how IR theory can elucidate the underlying dynamics of transnational security issues and perhaps aid in the development of effective strategies that can address these issues.
- Assess the basic dynamics that drive the severity and probability of process-based and actor-based transnational challenges.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a,1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2c, 3c, and 5c.

Guidance

- What are the differences between process-based and actor-based threats and how they can interact?
- Explain the global, historical, geographical and economic context in which non-traditional and transnational security challenges emerge and occur. How do these threats intersect with states and economies? How do these challenges create opportunities?
- Assess the value and utility of the three IR theories (introduced in Security Strategies 2) in describing, explaining, and predicting the effects of transnational challenges on the international system.
- How can the lessons observed from pandemic planning and response be applied to other transnational and non-traditional security challenges? How can they be mis-applied?

Required Readings (19 Pages)

- [McQuaid, Julia, Pamela G. Faber, and Zack Gold. “Transnational Challenges and U.S. National Security: Defining and Prioritizing Borderless Threats.” November 2017, pp.3-10, 15.](#)
- [Jay, A., D.R. Reidmiller, C.W. Avery, D. Barrie, B.J. DeAngelo, A. Dave, M. Dzaugis, M. Kolian, K.L.M. Lew- is, K. Reeves, and D. Winner. “Overview in ‘Fourth National Climate Assessment.’” Global Change Research Program. 2018, pp. 38-39.](#)
- [Hayhoe, K., D.J. Wuebbles, D.R. Easterling, D.W. Fahey, S. Doherty, J. Kossin, W. Sweet, R. Vose, and M. Wehner, “Our Changing Climate in ‘Fourth National Climate Assessment.’” Global Change Research Program. 2018, pp. 82-83.](#)
- [Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Center for Health Security. “CLADE X Exercise: Improving Policy To Prepare for Severe Pandemics - Executive Summary Document.” 15 May 2018, pp. 1-3.](#)
- [Davies, Benjamin, Kaitlin Rainwater Lovett, Brittany Card, and David Polatty. “Urban Outbreak 2019 Pandemic Response: Select Research & Game Findings.” 2020, pp. 1-3.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Conger, John, et al. “A Security Threat Assessment of Global Climate Change.” The Center for Climate and Security, February 2020.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 07

CASE STUDY ANALYSIS: BEIRUT 1983

Focus

The Reagan administration's decision to deploy Marines twice as a response to the growing violence in Lebanon in the early 1980s is an example of decision-making undertaken in a highly complex international environment. However, it was also profoundly affected by domestic U.S. factors, the interplay between national policy makers in Washington, front-line military and diplomatic organizations, as well as the particular interpersonal dynamic that shaped the first term of the Reagan presidency. This case, which has enduring relevance in the study of national security policy analysis, helps illustrate how the theoretical concepts used in this sub-course highlight the effects of multiple influences on the policymaking environment in order to gain a better understanding of how and why decisions are made. This is important to discern the military dimensions of a challenge affecting national interest; frame the issue at the policy level; and recommend viable military options.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze and explain a complex National Security Case.
- Analyze 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.
- Apply foreign policy analysis theories to evaluate a major foreign policy decision.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 2c, 3a, 5a and 5b.

Guidance

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

Required Readings (25 Pages)

- ["Case Study: Lebanon Revisited," Chapter 10 in Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise \(Newport, RI: Naval War College, 2017\), pp 219-246](#)
- [Frontline, Season 1985 Episode 7, "Retreat from Beirut". William H. Greider, aired Feb 26, 1985, PBS.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 07 GREAT POWER COMPETITION

Focus

In recent years, U.S. leaders have sought to shift America's military focus away from the post 9/11 missions of counterterrorism and state-building and toward the more traditional, high-end missions associated with state-on-state competition. The most recent National Security Strategy describes competitions and rivalries as "intertwined, long-term challenges" that are not merely "passing trends or momentary problems." The NSS specifically describes China and Russia in competitive terms: "China and Russia challenge American power, influence, and interests, attempting to erode American security and prosperity." Similarly, the National Defense Strategy (NDS) states that "inter-state strategic competition, not terrorism, is now the primary concern in U.S. national security." It also singles out China and Russia for their role in seeking to "shape a world consistent with their authoritarian model-gaining veto authority over other nations' economic, diplomatic, and security decisions."

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze the concept of great power competition and relate this to current U.S. strategy.
- Identify the putative causes of great power competition, especially with China and Russia.
- Evaluate how a renewed emphasis on great power competition might influence force planning and operational concept development.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2f and 3e.

Guidance

- How would you assess and differentiate U.S. competition dynamics with China and Russia? Are they the same? How are they different?
- The National Security Strategy states that "competition does not always mean hostility, nor does it inevitably lead to conflict." Describe some ways in which the U.S. can compete with China and Russia without resulting in conflict or war?
- What are the structural causes of U.S.-China competition? Can these structures be overcome? How?
- What are the structural causes of U.S.-Russia competition? Can these structures be overcome? How?

Required Readings (45 Pages)

- [Dobbins, James, Howard J. Shatz, and Ali Wyne. "Russia Is a Rogue, Not a Peer; China Is a Peer, Not a Rogue: Different Challenges, Different Responses." Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2019.](#)
- [Medeiros, Evan S. "The Changing Fundamentals of US-China Relations." The Washington Quarterly 42, no. 3 \(2019\): 93-119.](#)
- [Chekov, Alexander D., Anna V. Makarycheva, Anastasia M. Solomentseva, Maxim A. Suchkov, and Andrey A. Sushentsov. "War of the Future: A View from Russia." Survival 61, no. 6 \(2019\): 25-48.](#)
- [O'Rourke, Ronald. "Renewed Great Power Competition: Implications for Defense--Issues for Congress." \(Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, March 12, 2020\), pp. 1-15.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Wyne, Ali. "Examining the Construct of Great Power Competition." Institute of World Politics. YouTube video. 1:11:32. November 25, 2019.](#)
- [Harman, Jane, Et al. "A New Era of Great Power Competition," Aspen Security Forum. YouTube video. 59:45. July 18, 2019.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 08

INTRODUCTION TO THE DOMESTIC POLITICAL SYSTEM

Focus

This session provides an overview of the national security structure of the U.S. government, from the Constitution down to the Defense Department's Geographic Combatant Commands (CCMDs). It is important for national security professionals to understand the basic division of foreign affairs responsibility between the branches of government, and the spectrum of authorities available for carrying out these responsibilities. Highlighting concepts from earlier sessions, this session also looks in detail at the strategic implications of organizational choices for the Defense Department.

OBJECTIVES

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

Guidance

- Constitutionally, where does authority over U.S. foreign policy and national security reside?
- How do statutes, executive orders, regulations, memorandums of understanding, military orders, and other "ways" of exercising authority differ? Why might a national security professional need to consider the pros and cons of such authorities in recommending courses of action?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of the structure of the executive branch as it pertains to national security decisions? How much has this structure changed since the end of the Cold War?
- What is the role of the Geographic Combatant Commands in formulating and in executing U.S. national security policy? How do the Defense Department and State Department differ in basic organization?
- What problems was the Goldwater-Nichols Act meant to solve? Has it been successful? Applying the organizational theories studied so far, what problems might be created with the Goldwater-Nichols Act split between "force employers" and "force providers"?

Required Readings (77 Pages)

- [United States Constitution \[Annotated Version from the Library of Congress\]](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nicholas, et. al., "A Very Slim Reed: From the Phrases of the Constitution to the Theater Security Enterprise", in Gvosdev, ed., Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise, Newport, RI: USNWC National Security Affairs Department \(2017\), pp 25-43](#)
- [Rosenwasser, Jon, and Michael Warner., "History of the Interagency Process for Foreign Relations in the United States", in George and Rishikoff, eds., The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth, Georgetown University Press \(2017\), pp 13-30. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)
- [McInnis, Kathleen J., Goldwater Nichols at 30: Defense Reform and Issues for Congress, Washington DC: Congressional Research Service, June 2016, pp 1 - 23](#)
- [Freedberg, Sydney., "SecNav Spencer Seeks Repeal of Sen. Inouye Statute After Pacific Collisions", Breaking Defense, December 15, 2017.](#)
- [Oakley, Robert B., Jr Casey Michael, "The Country Team: Restructuring America's First Line of Engagement." \(Washington, DC: INSS Strategic Forum, Number 227, September 2007.\) p. 1-11\).](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Domestic Politics," Chapter 9 in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 296-333.\[NO INTERNET EXPLORER\]](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 08

STRATEGIC RESTRAINT

Focus

The first of the grand strategies we will consider, strategic restraint, has deep roots in American history, linked to Thomas Paine, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and John Quincy Adams, among others. The concept also may be labeled as one of its synonymous variants, including "neo-isolationism" "strategic disengagement" or "strategic independence." Advocates of strategic restraint define security threats and national interests narrowly, arguing that the United States need not play an active (let alone dominant) role in international affairs beyond those related to foreign trade. They hold that U.S. security is not affected by the vast majority of problems that occur beyond U.S. borders. Given the overall position of the United States today, the country is relatively safe. Indeed, restraint advocates say it is U.S. involvement that often causes anger directed against the United States, so that a less active foreign policy would actually generate fewer threats and win more goodwill abroad.

OBJECTIVES

- Assess the relative position of the United States in the international system and the role grand strategy plays in securing interests.
- Evaluate the utility of strategic restraint to advance and defend national interests.
- Support CJCS and OPMEP Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2c, and 3e.

Guidance

- Although the "Come Home America" article was written over 20 years ago, do you believe its primary arguments are still relevant today?
- Are the core assumptions that have underpinned U.S. grand strategy since the end of the Cold War still valid?
- Given the contemporary security environment that includes a return to geopolitics and "great power competition," is this a feasible grand strategy for the United States?
- What would a U.S. grand strategy of Strategic Restraint mean for U.S. influence within the international system? Why should we care?
- Would other nations provide for their own security if the United States adapted a less active foreign policy? What is the risk to U.S. national interests if they don't?
- How does Strategic Restraint affect the military instrument of power? What are the missions, capabilities and attributes of the Joint Force under this grand strategy?

Required Readings (30 Pages)

- [Posen, Barry and Andrew Ross, "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy", International Security, Winter 1996/1997, pp 3-14.](#)
- [Gholz, Eugene, Daryl G. Press, Harvey M. Sapolsky, "Come Home, America: The Strategy of Restraint in the Face of Temptation," International Security, Spring 1997 \(Vol. 2, No. 4\) pp. 5-17.](#)
- [Jennifer Lind and Press, Daryl G. "Reality Check: American Power in an Age of Constraints." Foreign Affairs, Volume 99, Number 2, March/April 2020, pp. 41-48.](#)
- [McMaster, H.R. "The Retrenchment Syndrome: A Response to 'Come Home, America?'" Foreign Affairs, August 2020.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS - 09

THE PRESIDENCY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Focus

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

OBJECTIVES

- Examine the role of the president, and tools available, in shaping and implementing foreign policy.
- Examine the constitutional powers vested in the executive and identify the changing relationship between the president and other branches of government, looking especially for stress points.
- Assess how foreign policy issues rise to the level of the presidential agenda.
- Evaluate lessons learned from how presidents handled specific foreign policy making challenges.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 1c, 1d, 2e, 3a, 4a, 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d.

Guidance

- Why does the president have the upper hand in the "invitation to struggle" between congress and the president? What powers are granted to the president in Article II of the Constitution dealing with national security? Is there anything about Article II that might contribute to the fact that the president has the advantage in formulating and implementing national security policy? What historical precedents contributed to the rise of what some call "the imperial presidency"?
- According to John Dickerson, what factors contributed to making the presidency a "broken office"? Does Dickerson still believe the job can be managed by one person? How does Dickerson account for the increased partisanship that afflicts legislative/executive relations? What steps does Dickerson propose in terms of repairing the modern presidency? Is it possible that essays such as this tend to appear during times of gridlock, and then disappear when occasions arise when the President succeeds in passing his legislative agenda (FDR, LBJ, Reagan)? If the presidency is broken, why do we still hear complaints about "the imperial presidency"?
- Brattebo and Lansford 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." From what you know from the Brattebo and Lansford reading and from contemporary news accounts, how would you characterize the relationship between President Trump and his APNSA(s), and between Trump and the NSC staff?
- 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? To what extent do you think Eisenhower's military background influenced his management of foreign and national security policy?

Required Readings (46 Pages)

- [Cormier, Daniel J. "Eisenhower Reconsidered: Policymaking Lessons for Today," Orbis, 2019](#)
- [Dickerson, John. "What if the Problem Isn't the President it's the Presidency?" The Atlantic 321, no. 4 \(2018\): 46.](#)
- [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. 1-16.](#)
- [Knott, Stephen, "NWC Talks: Presidential Power and National Security", YouTube Video 17:55, May 1, 2019](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 09

BALANCE OF POWER REALISM

Focus

This session will examine the realist-based grand strategies of offshore balancing and selective engagement. Both strategies are driven by realist logic but arrive at different answers to the question of optimum U.S. political involvement and military intervention in key areas of the world. The central difference is how – and from where – the United States employs its military power. Offshore balancers arrive from the sea and would avoid prolonged basing of U.S. troops abroad. They see a benefit in not being dependent on allies to defend the American national interest abroad. Selective engagers would advocate the use of forward bases to project military power. Consequently, selective engagement strategy would rely on the two primary pillars of the American security architecture since the end of World War II: NATO and the U.S.-Japan Alliance, and the U.S. bases associated with those alliances. Both strategies are “selective” in that neither sees every world region as a “vital” national interest.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify, and analyze the components of offshore balancing and selective engagement to include its underlying assumptions, key concepts, objectives, risks, and force requirements.
- Evaluate the utility of offshore balancing and selective engagement to advance and defend national interests.
- Assess the role of alliances in developing a successful security strategy.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2c and 3e.

Guidance

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

Required Readings (44 Pages)

- [Posen, Barry and Andrew Ross, “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy”, *International Security*, Winter 1996/1997, pp 15-21.](#)
- [Art, Robert J. “Selective Engagement in the Era of Austerity,” in Richard Fontaine and Kristin M. Lord \(eds\), *America’s Path: Grand Strategy for the Next Administration* \(Washington, DC: Center for a New American Security\), pp. 15-27.](#)
- [Mearsheimer, John J. and Walt, Stephen M., “The Case for Offshore Balancing”, *Foreign Affairs*, Volume 95, number 4, July-August 2016, pp. 70-83.](#)
- [Rapp-Hooper, Mira. “Saving America’s Alliances: The United States Still Needs the System That Put It on Top,” *Foreign Affairs*, Volume 99, number 2, March/April 2020, pp. 127-140.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS - 10

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS AND DOD INTERACTION

🔍 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 in crafting legislation dealing with national security and in providing oversight of the U.S. national security establishment. Law, like ethics and the shared values of the profession of arms, plays an important role in furthering U.S. national objectives.

≡ Guidance

- How do members of Congress seek to balance a strategic vision of the national interest with the need to focus on constituent service?
- What happens when there is misalignment between the military and Congress over laws, ethics, or the shared values of the profession of arms in furtherance of U.S. national security objectives?
- How much influence does Congress have on defense policy relative to the Executive Branch?
- How does Congress conduct oversight of the Executive Branch?
- What is the role of the Military and Combatant Commanders in relation to Congress and National Security?

📖 Required Readings (54 Pages)

- [Serafino, Nina M. and Eleni G. Ekmektsioglou, 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. 1-21.](#)
- [McInnis, Kathleen J., Defense Primer: Commanding U.S. Military Operations, Congressional Research Service, updated February 18, 2020, pp. 1-2.](#)
- [Eilon, Lindsey and Jack Lyon, White Paper: Evolution of Department of Defense Directive 5100.01, Office of the Secretary of Defense, revised January 2014, pp i-32.](#)

🖥️ Foundational Resources

- [Walsh, Kathleen A. "Legislative Affairs and Congressional-Military Relations," Newport, R.I.: Naval War College faculty paper, updated 2012, pp. 1-11.](#)
- [Serafino, Nina, USNWC Lecture of Opportunity video segments, 29 Aug 2019.](#)

OBJECTIVES

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





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 10

LIBERAL INTERNATIONALISM

Focus

Liberal internationalism draws on the “liberal paradigm” in international relations theory. The strategy accepts the idea that world politics does not have to consist of zero-sum conflict; instead, economic trade, collective security, and transnational problem-solving offer win-win outcomes. International institutions, rules, and norms facilitate the cooperation needed to achieve international peace and prosperity. Liberal internationalists also generally agree that the nature of regimes matter; democracies are expected to be more peaceful and are more open to trade and cooperation than authoritarian governments. With important international institutions “born in the USA,” such as the United Nations, NATO, and World Bank, liberal internationalists argue that the United States benefits through a strategy of multilateral cooperation.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze the utility of liberal internationalism to advance and defend national interests.
- Understand the “democratic peace” theory and counterarguments, and examine the place of democracy promotion in U.S. grand strategy.
- Evaluate the role the United Nations plays in international security in general, and U.S. foreign policy in particular.
- Support CJCS Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2c, and 3e.

Guidance

- Why has the United States promoted international institutions? What role does international security cooperation play in U.S. grand strategy?
- How does liberal internationalism create costs and benefits for the United States? What are the implications of liberal internationalism moving forward?
- Where does the United Nations fit into the strategy of liberal internationalism? How might UN institutions change to address contemporary challenges?
- Why do some scholars believe that all U.S. administrations, regardless of party, promote democracy? Why does the U.S. Government prefer democratic regimes?

Required Readings (60 Pages)

- [Posen, Barry and Andrew Ross, “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy,” *International Security*, Winter 1996/1997, pp. 21-30.](#)
- [Ikenberry, G. John, “The End of the Liberal International Order?” *International Affairs*, Vol. 94, No. 1 \(January 2018\), pp. 7-23.](#)
- [Miller, Paul, “American Grand Strategy and the Democratic Peace,” *Survival*, April 2012, Vol.54 \(2\), pp. 49-76.](#)
- [Weiss, Thomas G. “The United Nations: before, during and after 1945,” *International Affairs*, November 2015, Vol.91\(6\), pp. 1221-1235.](#)
- [Poast, Paul, “Changing the Rules of International Relations.” *UChicago News* video. 5:38. April 27, 2020.](#)

Foundational Resources

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





POLICY ANALYSIS - 11

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, asymmetric, and non-traditional. This session explores the role of the U.S. judiciary and analyzes cases arising from Guantanamo; the Presidential Executive Orders governing detainees; the rise of military commissions; and Congressional efforts to revise the Authorization for the use of Military Force (AUMF) to accommodate legal rulings.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze the role of the judiciary as a key player in adjudicating national security policy questions.
- Analyze recent legal cases directly affecting the military and national security, such as Authorization for Use of Military Force, Military Commissions, and Detention.
- Compare Executive Orders from Presidents Bush, Obama, and Trump on the detention and interrogation of accused terrorists.
- Evaluate recent Supreme Court decisions regarding detentions in Guantanamo.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 3a, and 4a.

Guidance

- How have Presidential Executive Orders evolved since 9/11 to cover detention and treatment; and why did it prove so difficult to close Guantanamo?
- How have the courts dealt with successive administration attempts to deal with "enemy combatants," and why did they [prove to be vulnerable?
- How has Congress' reluctance to update AUMF played out in conflicts between the executive and the judiciary?
- How have three president's executive orders on Guantanamo addressed (or failed to address) the legal issues surrounding captured military combatants?

Required Readings (39 Pages)

- [Breyer, Stephen "The Court and the World: American Law and the New Global Realities. \(New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2015\), Chapters 1 and 4 \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)
- [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](#)
- [Finn, Peter, and Del Quentin Wilber. "Guantanamo Detainees See Legal Progress Reversed." The Washington Post. WP Company, July 5, 2011](#)
- [Caton, Jim. "The Importance of Hedges v. Obama." Legal Reader, December 4, 2015.](#)

Foundational Resources

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





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 11

PRIMACY

Focus

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

OBJECTIVES

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

Guidance

- At the end of the Cold War, the United States found itself as the sole superpower; however, in the last twenty years or so, U.S. power vis-à-vis other rising states has attenuated to a certain degree: in light of this trend, how would advocates of a grand strategy of primacy prefer to see American power used?
- What role do national interest calculations play in a grand strategy of primacy (particularly when compared to the previous grand strategies analyzed in prior sessions)?
- How do the required military capabilities for this strategy differ from those of other grand strategies?
- What are the positive and negative effects of a strong and activist global role for the United States?
- What are the strategic risks associated with a grand strategy of primacy?

Required Readings (52 Pages)

- [Posen, Barry and Andrew Ross, “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy”, International Security, Winter 1996/1997, pp 32-43.](#)
- [Thornberry, Mac and Andrew F. Krepinevich Jr. "Preserving Primacy: A Defense Strategy for the New Administration." Foreign Affairs, Vol. 95, No. 5 \(SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER 2016\), pp. 26-35.](#)
- [Norrlöf, Carla, and William C. Wohlforth. “Is U.S. Grand Strategy Self-Defeating? Deep Engagement, Military Spending and Sovereign Debt.” Conflict Management and Peace Science 36, no. 3 \(May 2019\), pp. 227–47. \(Scan only.\)](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS - 12

CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS

Focus

Civil-military relations is the study of the relationships among the military, the government, and the population. In Policy Analysis, we are particularly concerned with how interactions between civilian policymakers and military officers influence policy formation and execution, as well as how the public's perception of the military might affect the viability of various policy options. This session provides an opportunity to reflect on the status of American civil-military relations today, as well as how individual officers', politicians', civil servants', and citizens' actions shape these key relationships. It is an opportunity to develop a common understanding of the values of your chosen profession in national security.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze the relationships among the U.S. military, American society at large, and the nation's civilian leadership.
- Analyze civilian control of the military and why it is important in a democratic society.
- Assess the factors that affect American senior military and civilian leadership's perspectives on force planning and the use of force.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1d, 1e, 3a, 4a, 5a, 5f, 5g.

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?
- What is meant by "the civil-military gap"? How would we know if one exists? What consequences might such a gap have?

Required Readings (56 Pages)

- [Blankshain, Jessica. "A Primer on US Civil-Military Relations for National Security Practitioners." Wild Blue Yonder, Air University, July 6, 2020.](#)
- [Davidson, Janine. "Civil-Military Friction and Presidential Decision Making: Explaining the Broken Dialogue" Political Science Quarterly, 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. "Having fewer veterans in Congress makes it less likely to restrain the president's use of force," Washington Post The Monkey Cage, Nov 10 2017.](#)
- [Cohn, Lindsay. "NWC Talks: Civil-Military Relations." YouTube video, 19:01, March 24, 2020](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 12 SOUTH AND CENTRAL ASIA

Focus

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

OBJECTIVES

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

Guidance

- What are the United States' strategic interests in South and Central Asia?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses in current U.S. policies and strategies vis-à-vis Afghanistan?
- Is the strategy of deterrence waning in South Asia? What policy options exist for the United States to mitigate nuclear threats and ensure the security of nuclear weapons in South Asia?
- What are the major challenges pertaining to U.S. interests in Central Asia?
- How should the United States approach the risk to regional instability from insurgent/terrorist groups in the region?
- How susceptible is the region to other transnational or nontraditional security challenges such as climate change, water insecurity, and infectious disease?

Required Readings (59 Pages)

- [Blackwell, R. D., A. J. Tellis. "The India Dividend: New Delhi Remains Washington's Best Hope in Asia." *Foreign Affairs*. Sept/Oct 2019, pp. 173-183.](#)
- [Mirimanova, N., C. Born, and P. Nordqvist. "Central Asia: A Climate Related Security Risk Assessment." *Report from Expert Working Group on Climate Related Security Risks*. Dec 2018, pp. 1-15.](#)
- [Joshi, S. "How Terrorist Actors in Pakistan Use Nuclear Weapons for Political Influence." *Asian Security*. Mar 2019, pp. 2-17.](#)
- ["Dowd, A. Lessons Learned, Relearned, and Unlearned in Afghanistan," April 6, 2020](#)
- [Lushenko, Paul. "Book Review Roundtable: A Look Into the Islamic State-Khorasan." *TNSR*. Aug, 13, 2019, pp. 13-27.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [U.S. Department of State. "U.S. Strategy for Central Asia 2019-2025: Advancing Sovereignty and Economic Prosperity." Mar 05, 2020, pp. 1-6.](#)
- [Umarov, Temur. "China Looms Large in Central Asia." *Inside Central Asia*. Carnegie Moscow Center. March 3, 2020, pp. 1-10.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 13

DECIDING WAR: EXECUTIVE-LEGISLATIVE TENSIONS

Focus

Is the United States 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. This has led to growing tensions between the legislative and executive branches.

This session raises difficult questions on the definition and character of modern war; about the potential for war and use of force 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 in the use of military force.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze 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.
- Analyze the use of Authorizations of the Use of Military Force (AUMF) in recent U.S. military conflicts, why and how AUMFs have been employed, and how this and other legislative tools relate to current strategies and policies.
- Examine the use of drones and other new or innovative approaches to waging war and how policymakers decide their use in military conflicts.
- Evaluate the ways in which U.S. military missions have expanded over time.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1d, 3a, and 4a.

Guidance

- 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 to engage U.S. military forces since then? Building on discussions in earlier sessions, how difficult or easy is it for the Commander-in-Chief to commit military forces today? Why?
- The growing use of drone strikes unveils a relatively new phenomenon where the American public does not necessarily know that a war and/or use of U.S. military forces (in addition to intelligence assets) has been decided. If war is the “organized use of violence to achieve political ends” as Clausewitz argues, Brooks asks: what if the war itself is secret?

Required Readings (51 Pages)

- [Congressional Research Service. “The War Powers Resolution: Concepts and Practice” \(R42699\), updated March 8, 2019 - Summary and pp 44-54 only.](#)
- [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. \(24 pages\). \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)
- [Congressional Research Service, “UPDATED: Recent U.S. Airstrikes: Legal Authorities and Questions” \(CRS Legal Side Bar LSB10391, updated February 18, 2020\).](#)
- [Rudalevige, Andrew. “Attacking Syria Wasn’t Legal a Year Ago. It’s Still Not,” The Monkey Cage, Washington Post \(April 13, 2018\).](#)
- [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 \(“draft” AUMF\)](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 13

ASIA-PACIFIC

Focus

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

OBJECTIVES

- Identify and analyze United States and regional interests in the Asia-Pacific region.
- Identify and assess significant threats, challenges, and opportunities for the United States and allied nations in the Asia-Pacific region.
- Support CJCS Joint Learn Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2c, 3a, and 3c.

Guidance

- What makes Xi Jinping so different from previous Chinese leaders? Why has Xi been so focused on enhancing and centralizing government power? What does this portend for both Chinese domestic and foreign policy along with Sino-U.S. relations?
- What are the respective American and North Korean goals vis-à-vis nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula? Is North Korea willing to give up its nuclear weapons program? What is the correct strategy for dealing with North Korea?
- What are United States' 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 should the United States' goals be in its relations with China? How should the United States seek to achieve those goals?

Required Readings (64 Pages)

- [Economy, Elizabeth C. "China's New Revolution: The Reign of Xi Jinping." Foreign Affairs 97, no. 3 \(2018\): 60-74.](#)
- [Mount, Adam, Andrea Berger, et. al., "Report of the International Study Group on North Korea Policy," Federation of American Scientists," 2019, pp. 1-31.](#)
- [Brands, Hal and Zack Cooper. "Getting Serious about the Strategy: the South China Sea." Naval War College Review 71, no. 1 \(Winter 2018\): 1-22.](#)
- [Campbell, Kurt M. and Jake Sullivan. "Competition without Catastrophe: How America can both Challenge and Coexist with China," Foreign Affairs 98, no. 5 \(2019\): 96-110.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Department of Defense, INDO-PACIFIC Strategy Report: Preparedness, Partnerships, and Promoting a Networked Region, June 1, 2019.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 14

MEDIA AND PUBLIC OPINION

Focus

Mass media and public opinion are important influences on the policy-making process and national security, but they can also influence each other and be influenced by policy elites. The relationship of these institutions can be contentious: how much should elected leaders follow the opinions of those they represent? How should the military's legitimate concern for operational security be balanced with journalists' right to report information? How does the fragmentation of TV news and the rise of social media affect the spread information and misinformation to the public? In this session you will explore some of these debates and evaluate the role of the media as an influence upon and target of the policymaking process.

OBJECTIVES

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

Guidance

- Do the U.S. military and the American news media have an adversarial relationship? Has it varied over time?
- How do senior leaders use the media to advance policy and political goals? How does the media influence their decisions? Does "the media" constitute an interest group with an independent agenda?
- How does the political fragmentation of news sources and the rise of social media as a main information source for Americans affect foreign policy making? What new challenge for national security might it pose?
- How does public opinion constrain national security decision-making? How responsive should national security leaders be to public opinion? Does the U.S. military need to care about its public image?
- Where does "the public" stand on major national security debates today? Where is public opinion more in line or less in line with national policy? How much does foreign typically factor into votes for Congress and the president?
- What military-related are mostly likely to draw media coverage and/or public interest? What is controversial?

Required Readings (81 Pages)

- [Diamond, John M. "The Media: Witness to the National Security Enterprise", in George, Roger Z., 1949, Harvey Rishikof, and Georgetown University. Center for Peace and Security Studies. The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth, 2nd Edition. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2017, pp 353 - 378. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)
- [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 \(2019\) \(9 pages\).](#)
- [Dina Smeltz, Ivo Daalder, Karl Friedhoff, Craig Kafura, and Brendan Helm. Divided We Stand: Democrats and Republicans Diverge on US Foreign Policy, Chicago Council on Global Affairs, 2020, pp 4-34](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Burbach, David, "NWC Talks: Trust in the Military." YouTube video, 19:38, Sept. 20, 2019](#)
- [Bump, Phillip. "Why You Can Largely Be Confident in Public Political Polling", Washington Post, January 18, 2019](#)
- [Harvard University Library, "LibGuide to Resources on Fake News, Disinformation, and Propaganda"](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 14

AFRICA

Focus

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

OBJECTIVES

- Identify and analyze the global and regional factors that shape Africa's security environment.
- Analyze U.S. national interests and strategic options in Africa.
- Identify and assess the key traditional and nontraditional security threats in Africa and how they manifest in different subregions.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2c, 3a, and 3c.

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 should be the highest strategic priority for American planners and strategists vis-à-vis Africa- geopolitical competition, transnational security threats, or human security challenges?
- Explain how various factors on multiple levels (geopolitics and economics at the international level, regional issues such as politics, culture and resources at the local level, etc.) combine to shape security dynamics in Africa and thus affect U.S. interests.

Required Readings (51 Pages)

- [Englebert, Pierre. “The ‘Real’ Map of Africa.” Foreign Affairs Snapshot, November 8, 2015, pp. 1-6.](#)
- [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.](#)
- [Duchâtel, Mathieu, Richard Gowan and Manuel Lafont Rapnouil. “Into Africa: China’s Global Security Shift,” Policy Brief, European Council on Foreign Relations, June 2016, 16 pages.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Stock, Robert. “Chapter 1: The Map of Africa” in Africa South of the Sahara: A Geographical Interpretation 3rd Edition \(New York: Guilford Press, 2013\), pp. 15-30. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)
- [Singh, Nauniha. "NWC Talks: China in Africa." YouTube.com Video 13:50 December 18, 2019.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 15

LOBBYISTS, INTEREST GROUPS & THINK TANKS

Focus

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

Guidance

- Why are lobbies and interest groups formed? How and why do they express their policy preferences, and to what extent do they influence the policy and legislative decision-making processes?
- What is the impact of the “revolving door” between government service, lobbying firms and/or think tanks and of the “iron triangle” among government, industry, and Congress? How do these sectors influence decision-making processes 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? Specifically, how did one think tank (the Center for Strategic & International Studies or CSIS), according to Brannon & Hicks, attempt to influence U.S. strategy and policy decision-making on dealing with a pandemic, before and after the COVID-19 outbreak?
- Given the growth and dynamism of the lobbying, interest group and think-tank sectors, what implications arise for policy and legislative decision-making processes, and what impact might they have on your role in supporting national security affairs?

Required Readings (67 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. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)
- [Cloud, John A. and Nikolas Gvosdev, Chapter 6, “Deploying Influence and Expertise: Think Tanks, Interest Groups and Lobbyists in the Theater Security Enterprise,” in Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise, pp. 97-118.](#)
- [Kingdon, John W. “Wrapping Things Up,” in Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies, 2nd ed., New York: Little, Brown & Company, 1995, pp.196-208. \[Accessed via E-Reserve\]](#)
- [Brannon, Samuel and Kathleen Hicks. “We Predicted a Coronavirus Pandemic: Here’s What Policymakers Could Have Seen Coming,” Politico Magazine \(March 7, 2020\).](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify the missions and roles of lobbyists, interest groups, think tanks and consultants in influencing policy and legislative decisions in the defense and national security realms.
- Examine how these institutions and individuals function, why they function this way(s), what stakes and interests they have in policy and legislative decision making processes, as well as what impact they might have (or not) on decisions, and the implications thereon for policymakers.
- Discuss the potential influence of lobbyists, think tanks and other non-state actors or non-governmental organizations in the formation of policy and how this might be changing.
- Analyze how and why both domestic U.S. actors and non-U.S. interest groups (including other governments) might seek to lobby and influence the U.S. government.
- Develop the ability to critically assess the product, sources of information, and analyses that these institutions produce as well as the networks they employ to try to influence policy decisions.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Area 2c, 3a, 4a, and 5b.





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 15 EUROPE AND RUSSIA

Focus

According to the 2017 National Security Strategy, the United States places a high priority on its relationship with Europe: "A strong and free Europe is of vital importance to the United States. We are bound together by our shared commitment to the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law." The goal of this session is to provide an overview of the European theater and the dynamics of European security, as well as the role of the United States within the European security system.

Guidance

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

Required Readings (45 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.](#)
- [Garganus, Julia and Eugene Rumer. "Russia's Global Ambitions in Perspective." Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, February 2019.](#)
- [Petersen, Mike. "NWC Talks: Russia's Great Power Competition." YouTube video. 12:10, November 25, 2019.](#)
- [Belkin, Paul. "NATO: Key Issues Following the 2019 Leaders' Meeting." Congressional Research Service, April, 2020.](#)
- [Kunz, Barbara. "Europe's Defense Debate is All About America." War on the Rocks, March 4, 2020.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Archick, Kristin. "The European Union: Ongoing Challenges and Future Prospects." Congressional Research Service, December 3, 2018.](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas. "NWC Talks: Will NATO Live to 75?" YouTube video. 21:26, May 17, 2019.](#)
- [Hardt, Brent. "NWC Talks: The European Union: America's Indispensable Global Partner." YouTube video. 15:01, October 16, 2019.](#)

OBJECTIVES

- Understand and analyze the importance of the trans-Atlantic relationship to U.S. national security.
- Identify and analyze the principal challenges and issues facing the European theater.
- Examine the Russian strategic outlook and points of contention with U.S. preferences.
- Assess trends in the European theater and their likely impact on U.S. interests.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2c, 3a and 3c.





POLICY ANALYSIS - 16

ASSISTANCE DEVELOPMENT, AND PHILANTHROPY

🔍 Focus

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

OBJECTIVES

- Examine 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
- Assess some examples where goals of the USG and private philanthropic organizations do not align.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 1e, 2c, and 3a.

📖 Guidance

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

📖 Required Readings (46 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)
- [Lawson, Marian and Morgenstern, Emily. Foreign Assistance: An Introduction to U.S. Programs and Policy. \(Washington, D.C. CRS, 2020\) Read 1-13 and 18-22.](#)
- [Giving USA Foundation, Americans gave \\$427.71 billion to charity in 2018 amid complex year for charitable giving, Jun 18, 2019.](#)
- [Giving USA Foundation, Giving USA 2019 Infographic](#)
- [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](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 16

THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Focus

The Western Hemisphere is one of the most important and influential parts of the world with respect to global security and economic development. The United States has a strong interest in the viability and well-being of its two most significant neighbors: Canada and Mexico. From a regional security perspective, some of the more important security issues are the illegal movements of people, narcotics trafficking, increased criminal and gang activity, transnational organized crime, as well as the confluence of Marxist insurgency movements and criminal cartels with established global terrorist organizations. Simultaneously, the region continues searching for the right balance between three competing economic systems: 1) extreme socialism led by authoritarian, populist leaders, 2) moderate socialism where democratically elected figures blend the virtues of public and private economic activity to promote trade and development, but also legislate programs designed to reduce poverty, and 3) a traditional neo-liberal, free-market form of capitalism. Complicating the diplomatic challenge is a long-standing suspicion and distrust of the United States. Countries of the region, particularly in the Caribbean and Central America, have experienced U.S. military interventions creating a very difficult environment for U.S. foreign policy execution. U.S. policymakers must accept the new “diplomatic competitiveness” as a more sophisticated Latin America increasingly engages with new partners such as China, India, Russia and Iran. The challenge for the current U.S. administration is to implement policies that both respect the growing economic and political independence of Latin America and protect the U.S. homeland from an alarming increase in regional transnational criminal activity.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify and analyze how major political and geopolitical trends affect the security of countries in Latin America and the Caribbean.
- Identify and analyze key issues in the U.S. - Canada relationship.
- Assess how history, culture and geography matter within Latin America and the Caribbean.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2c, 3a, and 3c.

Guidance

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

Required Readings (80 Pages)

- [Wiarda, Howard J. and Harvey F. Kline. "The Context of Latin American Politics," "The Pattern of Historical Development," and "Interest Groups and Political Parties," pages 3-16 in Latin American Politics and Development. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)
- [Campos, Carlos Oliva, "The Trump Administration in Latin America: Continuity and Change," International Journal of Cuban Studies 11.1, Summer 2019, pp 13-22.](#)
- [Cone, Jason and Marc Bosch Bonacasa. "Invisible War: Central America's Forgotten Humanitarian Crises." Brown Journal of World Affairs. Spring/Summer 2018, Volume XXIV, Issue II, pp 225-237.](#)
- ["Canada-U.S. Relations." Congressional Research Service, June 14, 2018, pp. 1-35.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Sullivan, Mark P. "Latin America and the Caribbean: U.S. Policy Overview." Congressional Research Service. March 11, 2020.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 17

THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL AND THE INTERAGENCY

Q Focus

The National Security Act of 1947 established the National Security Council and tasked this deliberative body with the following purpose:

“The Council shall ...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 NSC policy formulation process is supported by subordinate committees with membership across government departments and agencies, often referred to as the “interagency.”

The session analyzes the characteristics of the NSC-led interagency process and environment, specifically the effects of statutory authority, executive leadership, organizational interests and culture, as well as institutional proprietary processes.

NSA

OBJECTIVES

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

Guidance

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

☰ Required Readings (48 Pages)

- [Presidential Memorandum: Organization of the National Security Council, the Homeland Security Council and Subcommittees, White House, April 4, 2017 pp. 1-6](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas and John Cloud. "Issues with the Interagency and Theater Security." Chapter 5 In *Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise*. \(eds.\) pp.77-96.](#)
- [Chollet, Derek, “The National Security Council: Is It Effective, or Is It Broken?” In *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security* \(Derek Reviron, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and John A. Cloud, eds., Oxford University Press New York, 2018\) pp. 111-122.](#)
- [Russia and NATO in the Baltics, NSC Hypothetical Case Study, Council on Foreign Relations Model Diplomacy, Jan 3, 2020.](#) [Follow instructions provided by moderators to create account]

🖥️ Foundational Resources

[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.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 17 GREATER MIDDLE EAST

Focus

The last several years in the Greater Middle East have witnessed tremendous geopolitical upheaval resulting from the 2011 Arab Awakening and numerous changes in government leadership, Syria's ongoing civil war, the rise of ISIS, the atrocious conflict in Yemen, an emboldened Iran, and other potentially destabilizing actions. Despite these challenges, the United States remains committed to promoting stability in the region, ensuring trade flows, combating terrorism, and preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. Finally, COVID-19 will most certainly impact the region and must be taken into account for any strategy for the region.

Guidance

- What are U.S. national interests relative to the Middle East?
- Why is the Greater Middle East strategically important?
- Why is the Greater Middle East fraught with conflicts and violence?
- What is the role of state and non-state actors in the conflicts/violence in the region?
- What are the "white/black swans" in the region?
- What will be the principal security issues in the years to come? What can the United States do to prevent/manage these issues?
- What impact will COVID-19 have on the Middle East?

Required Readings (44 Pages)

- [Scheinmann, Gabriel. "The Map that Ruined the Middle East." The Tower. July 2013.](#)
- [Hiim, Henrik Stålhane, Stenslie, Stig. "China's Realism in the Middle East." Survival, Vol. 61, No. 6 \(2019\) pp. 153-162.](#)
- [Kandeel, Amal. "In the Face of Climate Change: Challenges of Water Scarcity and Security in MENA." Atlantic Council. 11 June 2019.](#)
- [Goldenberg, Ilan, Nicholas A. Heras, Kaleigh Thomas, and Jennie Matuschak. "Countering Iran in the Gray Zone." April 2020, pp. 1-20.](#)
- [Nakhleh, Emile. "The Devastating Impact of COVID-19 on the Middle East." The Cipher Brief. 27 April 2020.](#)

Foundational Resources

- ["Bitter Rivals," Frontline PBS Documentary video. 1:56:41. February 2018.](#)
- [International Institute for Strategic Studies. "The Middle East and North Africa," The Military Balance, Chpt. 7. February 2020, pp. 324-387.](#)

OBJECTIVES

- Identify and analyze United States and regional interests in the Greater Middle East region.
- Identify and assess significant threats, challenges, and opportunities for the United States and allied nations in the Greater Middle East region.
- Analyze the complex relationships between the concepts of security and national interests, while examining the political and military challenges facing the nations in the Greater Middle East.
- Assess the strategic alternatives available to the United States in the Greater Middle East region.
- Support JCS Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2c, 3a and 3c.





POLICY ANALYSIS - 18

DIPLOMACY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Focus

Diplomacy is the foremost instrument of statecraft to manage foreign relations, minimize external threats, defuse regional crises, and advance security and prosperity in the global arena. Diplomacy is the art of managing interactions with friends and foes alike to find common ground and advance national interests. Diplomatic success is often measured by crises resolved or conflicts avoided, while diplomatic failures may lead to war or loss of influence. Diplomats represent the American people and the president in remote outposts, warzones, and bustling capitals, building enduring relationships that allows the United States to manage global challenges, provide unique understanding and insights to policymakers on emerging threats and opportunities, and protect American citizens abroad. This session offers a recent case study where U.S. diplomacy led a far-reaching and complex international diplomatic effort that involved all the great powers -- the United States, European Union, Russia and China -- in a multilateral framework to constrain Iranian nuclear development and remove a major source of regional tension in the Middle East. The case study demonstrates how persistent, creative, and skillful diplomatic engagement, drawing on all the tools of statecraft, can advance core national interests, reduce the risk of military conflict, and enhance regional stability.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify the vital role of diplomacy and the Department of State in advancing national and regional security and stability.
- Examine the unique strengths, capabilities, and constraints of the State Department as an instrument of theater security.
- Analyze the inter-relationship between diplomatic and military elements of national power.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 1c, 3a, 4a, 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d.

Guidance

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

Required Readings (68 Pages)

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

Foundational Resources

- [Cloud, John A. "NWC Talks: The Role of Diplomacy." YouTube video, 9:52, Sept 10, 2019](#)
- ["Regaining the Strategic Initiative on Iran," and "A New Strategy Toward Iran," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, The Backchannel, The Archive: \(Scroll to 2008-2014\)](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 18

PAPER PEER REVIEW

Focus

Writing well requires practice. Even the best writers--especially the best writers--repeatedly revise their work to ensure that their ideas are clearly and powerfully conveyed. Honest, critical, constructive feedback from others is a critical part of this process. Your Security Strategies paper provides you an opportunity to address an issue of global significance. 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 at least two of your fellow students.
- Support CJCS Learning Area 5b.

Guidance

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

Required Readings (15 Pages)

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

Foundational Resources

- For access to videos and other writing resources, go to the [Writing Center Blackboard Course.](#)
- Click [here](#) to schedule appointments and sign up for Writing Center workshops.





POLICY ANALYSIS - 19 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 national, 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.
- Examine how economic and security matters are integrated in the interagency process.
- Differentiate the economic tools at the disposal of the president (such as sanctions) and those which require the active concurrence of the Congress (such as trade agreements).
- Analyze the international and the domestic economic systems and how they seek to impose limits on the U.S. agenda.
- Assess some of the costs and benefits of trade barriers.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 1e, 3a, and 4a.

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 elevated 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 (54 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. \(CHROME or SAFARI only, IE/EDGE do not work\)](#)
- ["Dethroning the dollar: America's aggressive use of sanctions endangers the dollar's reign," The Economist, January 18, 2020.](#)
- [Powell, Jerome H., "Current Economic Issues." Speech, Peterson Institute for International Economics, Washington D.C., May 13, 2020.](#)

Foundational Resources

- Bishop, Matthew. "Essential Economics." London, England: Profile Books, 2004. [Available in Library]
- ["Gini in the Bottle: Inequality in America." The Economist November 26, 2013.](#)





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 19

NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

Focus

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

OBJECTIVES

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

Guidance

- The current NSS published by the Trump administration in December 2017 is the most recent NSS for the United States. It is also the longest and most detailed. What can you discern from its organization? How does it signal national priorities? How well does it align with the actions, thus far, of President Trump's foreign policy?
- 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?
- Some argue the NSS has failed to map out strategy and became no more than a rhetorical exercise. Does the NSS serve any useful purpose? Should the NSS be abolished?

Required Readings (77 Pages)

- [Trump, Donald J. "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America." The White House, December 2017.\]](#)
- [Blankenship, Brian D. and Benjamin Denison. "Is America Prepared for Great- Power Competition?" Survival 61, no. 5 \(2019\): 43-64.](#)
- [Lissner, Rebecca Friedman. "The National Security Strategy is Not a Strategy." Foreign Affairs, Dec. 19, 2017, pp. 1-4.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





POLICY ANALYSIS - 20 INTELLIGENCE

Focus

This session provides an overview of the extensive U.S. Intelligence Community (IC) and addresses how it contributes to U.S. national security policy, as well as strategic decision-making. The session makes clear the critically important advisory role that the IC plays in national security policy decision-making and its connections with and beyond the military and defense communities. Intelligence plays an important role in anticipating surprise and prepares policymakers to deal with uncertainty.

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 1b, 1c, 2c, 3a, 3c, 3d, 4a, and 5b.

Guidance

- What roles and functions does the IC play in advising and supporting U.S. national security policy and strategic decision-making and how does it support civil and military leaders?
- How does the IC advise and support policy making and what are some of the challenges it faces in doing so? What do policymakers, legislators and military leaders expect and is that something the IC can deliver?
- How do changes in the international and domestic political systems impact the IC and how it advises and supports national security policy?

Required Readings (64 Pages)

- [Lowenthal, Mark M. "The U.S. Intelligence Community," Chapter 3 in Intelligence: From Secrets to Policy \(CQ Press, 2019\), pp. 37-66. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)
- [Jervis, Robert. "Why Intelligence and Policymakers Clash," Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 125, No. 2, Summer 2010, pp. 185-204.](#)
[George, Roger Z. "The Art of Strategy and Intelligence," in Analyzing Intelligence: National Security Practitioners' Perspectives, 2nd ed., Roger Z. George and James B. Bruce, eds., Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2014, Chapter 11.](#)

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 20 ISSUES IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

Focus

The National Defense Strategy (NDS) and National Military Strategy (NMS) are intended to shape the future development of the U.S. military, to support the National Security Strategy (NSS). The Defense Department is currently focused on orienting future forces for great power competition. This session asks you to assess those changes with a focus on the future conduct of war, disruptive technologies and modalities, and the associated debates within U.S. military circles.

OBJECTIVES

- Identify and assess major directions of current U.S. defense strategic guidance.
- Analyze emerging strategic challenges and assess how they may affect future U.S. defense strategy.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2b, 2c, 2e, 3a, 3c, 5b, 5c, and 5d.

Guidance

- How is military competition and conflict changing? What are the most significant challenges confronting U.S. forces?
- How should the United States and allies adapt their forces, operational concepts, and posture to respond to new challenges? Do you agree with the National Defense Strategy (NDS) vision? What would you do differently?
- Has DoD actually made choices to prioritize great power competition as the NSS, NDS, and NMS state? Are "hard choices" politically sustainable? If not, how should DoD respond? Should it build a more general-purpose force?
- Is "the American way of war" feasible against peer nuclear states? How might conventional operations be affected by the possibility of nuclear escalation? What should our expectations for "victory" be against a peer nuclear state?
- Is the United States losing its technological warfighting advantage? If so, what factors are driving this trend? How should DoD respond? What emerging technologies and warfighting concepts will be key in the future?
- What is "political warfare"? How do you assess the United States' ability to defend against or to employ it relative to competitors? What is the military's role in responding? How should the United States respond with non-military means?
- How does space matter to U.S. national security and to American national power? What role will space play in future conflicts? Will it be a theater of armed conflict itself? What should be the missions and capabilities of the Space Force?
- How might the lessons learned from COVID-19 impact national security and what is the military's role in responding to a pandemic?

Required Readings (61 Pages)

- [Moulton, Seth and James Banks, et al. Future of Defense Task Force Report 2020." HASC, September 2020.](#)
- [Dougherty, Christopher M. "Why America Needs a New Way of War". Center for a New American Security, June 2019, pp 1-8, 32-37, \(scan remainder\).](#)
- [Work, Robert and Greg Grant. "Beating the Americans at Their Own Game: An Offset Strategy with Chinese Characteristics." Center for New American Security, 6 June 2019, pp. 1-6, 15-17, \(scan remainder\).](#)
- [Talmadge, Caitlin. "The U.S. - China Nuclear Relationship." The Brookings Institute, September 2019, pp. 1-9.](#)
- [Robinson, Linda, Et al. "Modern Political Warfare." RAND Corporation, 2018, pp xiii - xxiv, 2-6.](#)
- [Cook, James. "The Coronavirus and U.S. National Security: An Opportunity for Strategic Reassessment?" The Strategy Bridge, September 2020.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [U.S. Department of Defense. "Summary of the 2018 National Defense Strategy." October 2018.](#)
- [Joint Staff. "Description of the National Military Strategy 2018." July 2019.](#)
- [Berger, Rick and MacKenzie Eaglen. "Hard Choices' and Strategic Insolvency: Where the National Defense Strategy Falls Short." War on the Rocks, May 2019.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 21 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 President-chaired NSC meeting in real time. While only an approximation, it illustrates the challenges and difficulties of developing a policy that can encompass and support the agenda and priorities of different regional and functional components of the U.S. national security system.

This scenario will require you, as a group, to navigate among competing equities and preferences of a constellation of interests and organizations, including the White House, the Joint Staff, OSD, the combatant command, the geographic and functional bureaus of the Department of State, the Departments of the Treasury and Commerce, the intelligence community, and various functional agencies to gain a broad understanding of joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational capabilities and policies to inform planning.

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. Our goal for you is to demonstrate critical and creative thinking, along with interpersonal skills.

For the simulation, the Council on Foreign Relations online NSC Model Diplomacy Tool will be utilized. This tool provides regionally focused & global up-to-date scenarios along with concise videos.

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.
- Assess the operation of the interagency process in dealing with a pressing theater security issue.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2b, 2c, 3a, 3c, 4a, 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, 5g, and CJCS SAE 6.d.2.

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?

Required Readings (30 Pages)

- Two weeks before execution, your professor will setup the scenario, assign roles, and invite you to navigate to modeldiplomacy.cfr.org to review case material and prepare.

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 21

MARITIME STRATEGY AND STRATEGIC CONCEPTS

Focus

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

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze principal traditional and non-traditional maritime security challenges.
- Comprehend U.S. maritime strategy and examine its suitability to the maritime security environment.
- Assess future and emerging challenges in the maritime realm.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2b, 2c, 2e, 3a, 3c, 3d, 3e, 5b, 5c, and 5d.

Guidance

- What are the principal maritime interests of the United States? What are some current challenges facing maritime strategists? How are those challenges different from those confronting maritime strategists five or ten years ago?
- Who is responsible for dealing with maritime security challenges? What organizations and entities have a "piece of the maritime interest pie?"
- The 2005 National Strategy for Maritime Security represents a multi-departmental effort to develop a cohesive strategy, not merely a naval strategy. The term maritime security includes a broader range of challenges than traditional naval threats -- what does it encompass? Who is responsible for dealing with maritime security challenges?
- What do "hybrid warfare" and "gray zone" mean in a maritime context? How should the United States respond to hybrid/gray zone maritime challenges around the world?
- The CNO's "FRAGO 01/2019: A design for Maintaining maritime superiority" is much more focused on warfighting than has been seen in previous years. There is also a keen sense of urgency - that time is of the essence. Do you agree with this focus -- what is missing or mischaracterized?
- An important defense planning debate is "forward presence" versus other demands on forces -- readiness, maintenance, training, wargaming, investing in future technology. The CNO makes it clear he expects the fleet to be forward. What are the strategic risks associated with this plan?

Required Readings (49 Pages)

- [Hattendorf, John B. "What is a Maritime Strategy?" Soundings, October 2013, No. 1, pp. 1-10.](#)
- [Maritime Security Working Group. "The National Strategy for Maritime Security." September, 2005, pp. 1-31.](#)
- [Gilday, M.M. "FRAGO 01/2019: A Design for Maintaining Maritime Superiority." December, 2019, pp. 1-8.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Richardson, John M. "A Design for Maintaining Maritime Superiority, ver 2.0." Washington D.C., December, 2018.](#)
- [Berger, David. "Commandant's Planning Guidance." United States Marine Corps. August, 2019.](#)
- [United States Government Accountability Office, Report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, U.S. Senate, " MARITIME SECURITY: National Strategy and Supporting Plans Were Generally Well Developed and Are Being Implemented," June, 2008.](#)





POLICY ANALYSIS - 22

EXAM PREPARATION - CASE STUDY ANALYSIS

Focus

This session will allow you to demonstrate your comprehension of the material presented in the Policy Analysis sub course in preparation for the final exam. You will be provided readings that provide different perspectives and information on a contemporary national security decision case. These materials will collectively provide the context by which a policy decision can be analyzed

Guidance

- You are required to use course concepts and materials while relying on the insights and critical thinking expertise you have gained through our readings and classroom discussions to analyze the provided case.
- Note that there will be no "school solution" for this case or for the final examination. The case materials can support a variety of interpretations and may even include contradictory perspectives. Your task is to use course tools to analyze the evidence provided in order to provide your own answer to the question in a well-reasoned argument.
- Additional guidance will be provided on the specific question, methodology, and format for the analysis (please be sure to carefully read any instructions on the cover page of the case packet). Your instructor will provide guidance on how your seminar will discuss the case analysis in class.

Required Readings (TBD Pages)

- Required materials will be provided prior to the session.

Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session. However, you may find it useful to refer back to readings and other materials from the course in conducting this analysis.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze materials concerning a contemporary U.S. policy decision, demonstrate the ability to successfully synthesize the concepts and theories presented throughout the entirety of the Policy Analysis sub-course.
- Demonstrate the ability to assess and evaluate which influences and actors were the most critical in the case study provided.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2c, 3a, 3c, 4a, 5a, 5b, and 5d.





SECURITY STRATEGIES - 22

CYBER, TECHNOLOGY AND THE FUTURE OF WAR

Focus

The previous 21 sessions of the Security Strategies sub-course analyzed the international security environment and assessed the utility of various grand strategies to advance and defend U.S. national interests. This final session examines questions regarding the future of conflict, war and emerging technologies and how national security professionals ought to think about and incorporate these important trends into future operational planning and strategy development.

OBJECTIVES

- Analyze alternative views of the future of international security and analyze their strategic assumptions.
- Assess the relevance of these views to the development of strategy.
- Support CJCS Joint Learning Areas 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 2a, 2e, 2f, 3e and 4c.

Guidance

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

Required Readings (56 Pages)

- [Symonds, Matthew. "The New Battlegrounds – The Future of War." The Economist Group. 25 January 2018, pp. 1-6.](#)
- [Segal, Adam. "The Anatomy of Cyber Power." The Hacked World Order, Chapter 2. Public Affairs - Hachette Book Group. 2017, pp. 31-56. \[Accessed via E-Reserves\]](#)
- [Cyberspace Solarium Commission. Final Report. March 2020, pp. 1-19.](#)
- [Paulauskas, Kestutis. "Space: NATO's Latest Frontier," NATO Review, 18 March 2020, pp. 1-6.](#)

Foundational Resources

- [Department of Defense. "Summary: The DOD Cyber Strategy." 2018.](#)
- [Jaikaran, Chris. "Cybersecurity: Selected Issues for the 116th Congress." Congressional Research Service, 9 March 2018.](#)
- [White, T.J., "U.S. Fleet Cyber Command/U.S. 10th Fleet Strategic Plan 2020-2025." August 2020.](#)

