



# NATIONAL SECURITY DECISION MAKING COURSE INTRODUCTION

## Focus

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

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

## OBJECTIVES

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

## Guidance

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

## Required Readings (71 Pages)

- [Jones, James L. "Foreword: U.S. National Security for the Twenty-First Century" in The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security, 2018.](#)
- [Gates, Robert M. Exercise of Power: American Failures, Successes, and a New Path Forward in the Post-Cold War World, \(New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2020\), chapters 1 and 2 \(pp. 13-76\) \[Accessed via Leganto.\]](#)
- [Hardt, Brent. "NWC Talks: What on Earth is the Liberal International Order?" YouTube video. 18:03. Nov 13, 2019.](#)

## Foundational Resources

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





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 01

## INTRO TO FPA AND FOUNDATIONAL CASE

### Focus

We launch the Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) sub-course by examining various theories of foreign policy analysis and providing an overview of the international, domestic, and bureaucratic forces that shape national security policy. This session lays out themes that will be discussed in more detail in subsequent sessions and explores ways in which the study of decision-making can be a valuable way to analyze foreign policy actions at the national level. These decisions often deal with issues such as going to war, negotiating a cease fire, imposing sanctions, entering an alliance, or signing a treaty. This session examines some of these types of decisions and provides a brief introductory look at various decision-making models. We also introduce a case study--the Cuban Missile Crisis--that has been foundational to the development and study of FPA.

### OBJECTIVES

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

### Guidance

- The textbook 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?
- What is the "two-level games" framework? How does it help to explain how international and domestic political systems interact to influence policymaking?
- Decision makers inevitably must act with incomplete information. Foreign policy analysts face similar informational challenges. What information would be especially important in a foreign policy context, and what data is easiest to come by, harder to come by, and nearly impossible to come by? What tools and methods can analysts use to understand foreign policy actions and their consequences?
- How can the various FPA frameworks and tools discussed in the textbook chapters help us to understand the actions taken by the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cuban Missile Crisis?

### Required Readings (82 Pages)

- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain, and David A. Cooper, "Foreign Policy Analysis," Chapter 2 in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 14-51.](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Domestic Politics," Chapter 9 in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 284-296.](#)
- [Blankshain, Jessica D. and Andrew L. Stigler, "Applying Method to Madness: A User's Guide to Causal Inference in Policy Analysis," Texas National Security Review 3, no. 3 \(2020\), 76-89.](#)
- [Allison, Graham, "The Cuban Missile Crisis," in Foreign Policy: Theories Actors Cases, 3rd edition. eds Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield, and Tim Dunne. Oxford University Press, 2016, 263-279. \[Accessed via Leganto.\]](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Cuban Missile Crisis, Harvard Kennedy School Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs.](#)
- [JFK and the Cuban Missile Crisis, University of Virginia Miller Center.](#)





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 1

## INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

### Focus

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

### OBJECTIVES

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

### Guidance

- What is strategy and what are the various levels of strategy? How can strategy be viewed as a science?
- What is meant by the phrase "liberal international order"? How does U.S. grand strategy relate to this concept?
- What are some probable long-term structural effects of the COVID-19 pandemic?
- Is major power war more probable now (compared to 1991); if so, what factors might reduce its likelihood?

### Required Readings (63 Pages)

- [Brodie, Bernard. "Strategy as a Science." World politics 1, no. 4 \(1949\): 467–488.](#)
- [Colgan, Jeff D. "Three Visions of International Order." The Washington Quarterly 42, no. 2 \(2019\): 85-98.](#)
- [Miehe, Luca, Sophie Eisentraut, and Juliane Kabus. "Fueling Underdevelopment, Fragility and Conflict: The Long-Term Damage of Covid 19." Chapter 3: in Poly pandemic: Munich Security Report Special Edition on Development, Fragility and Conflict in the Era of COVID-19. November 30, 2020. pp. 35-58.](#)
- [Mandelbaum, Michael. "Is Major War Still Obsolete?" Survival \(London\) 61.5 \(2019\): 65–71.](#)

### Foundational Resources

There are no foundational readings for this session





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 02

## UNITARY STATE PERSPECTIVE

### Focus

Level I of the levels of analysis framework focuses on international systemic-level explanations. One lens with which to view these systemic explanations is the state perspective. This perspective draws attention to states as unitary actors who make decisions through a process of weighing the costs and benefits of different options in the pursuit of national interests. This is, of course, a theoretical abstraction. We know that states are, in fact, made up of people and organizations, as will be discussed in later sessions. But assuming that states act as if they are rational unitary actors allows the analyst to explain and predict a wide range of foreign policy actions with limited information. As a result, this perspective has been widely used, implicitly or explicitly, by scholars, practitioners, and the press.

### OBJECTIVES

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

### Guidance

- What does it mean to think of a state as a unitary actor? What sorts of disagreements and divisions does this perspective assume away?
- What is "rational" decision-making, in a social science context? What would it mean for a state to make rational foreign policy decisions? What factors would we expect to influence these decisions?
- How does the unitary state perspective help us understand the U.S. response to the 1999 Kargil crisis?

### Required Readings (50 Pages)

- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain, and David A. Cooper, "Unitary State Perspective," Chapter 3 in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 52-87.](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Annex: Case Studies," in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 378-382.](#)
- [Pegahi, T. Negeen and David T. Burbach, "The Indopakistani Kargil Conflict of 1999" USNWC Faculty Paper, revised by Jessica D. Blankshain, April 2021.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Allison, Graham and Philip Zelikow, "The Cuban Missile Crisis: A First Cut," Chapter 2 in Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. New York: Longman Press, 1999, 109-120. \[Accessed via Leganto.\]](#)





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 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 scholars. 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. This session examines four of the dominant theoretical perspectives -- realism, liberalism, constructivism, and feminism/women, peace & security -- that seek to explain the international security environment as well as influence how policy makers and analysts view the world. Phenomena such as international anarchy, the role of states vs. ideas, international organizations, balance of power, democratic peace, globalization, human security, the lens of gender, 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

- Assess various theories of international relations to understand the different conceptions of how the world works.
- Examine linkages among the theories of international relations and begin to determine the implications for the development of grand strategy.

## 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 four 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. \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)
- [Morgan, Patrick. "Liberalism," Chapter 3 in Alan Collins \(ed\), Contemporary Security Studies, 5th ed. \(Oxford University Press, 2019\). \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)
- [Agius, Christine. "Social Constructivism," Chapter 6 in Alan Collins \(ed\), Contemporary Security Studies, 5th ed. \(Oxford University Press, 2019\), pp. 74-83. \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)
- [Whitworth, Sandra. "Feminisms," in Paul D. Williams \(ed\), Security Studies: An Introduction, 2nd ed \(Routledge 2013\), pp. 107-118.](#)

## Foundational Resources

- [Schweller, Randall. "Theory in Action: Realism." YouTube.com. 3:51. May 4, 2011.](#)
- [Bowen, J.D., "Theory in Action: Liberalism," YouTube.com. 5:32. May 11, 2011.](#)
- [Gallemore, Caleb. "Theory in Action: Constructivism." YouTube.com. 5:19. June 10, 2011.](#)
- [Johnson-Freese, Joan. Women, Peace, and Security: An Introduction. \(Routledge 2019\) Chapters 1 & 2. \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 03

## ORGANIZATIONAL PROCESS PERSPECTIVE

### Focus

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

### OBJECTIVES

- Identify the behavioral characteristics and limitations of organizations, such as major staffs, in formulating and implementing effective policies.
- Identify the behavioral characteristics of, and competing cultures inside, different types of military and civilian organizations.
- Examine the possible cascading and reinforcing effects of organizational behavior on mission accomplishment.
- Apply the organizational process perspective to a case study to better understand a U.S. foreign policy decision.

### 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 studies on the 2007 Minot-Barksdale Bent Spear incident?

### Required Readings (39 Pages)

- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Organizational Process Perspective," Chapter 5 in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 125-161.](#)
- [Grier, Peter. "Misplaced Nukes," Air Force Magazine, 26 June, 2017.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Halperin, Morton H. and Priscilla Clapp, with Arnold Kanter, "Organizational Interests," Chapter 3 in Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy, 2nd edition, 25-27, 38-40, 49-61. \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)
- [Allison, Graham and Philip Zelikow, "The Cuban Missile Crisis: A Second Cut," Chapter 4 in Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. New York: Longman Press, 1999. 217-236. \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Annex: Case Studies," in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 378-382. \(Accessed via Leganto. Review as needed\)](#)







# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY-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 in this session that will be more robustly examined later in the course to guide thinking about power, interests, challenges, and approaches.

### OBJECTIVES

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

## Guidance

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

## Required Readings (40 Pages)

- [Reveron, Derek S. and Nikolas K. Gvosdev. "National Interests and Grand Strategy." Chapter 2 in \*The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security\*. Oxford University Press, 2018, pp. 35-55.](#)
- [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\*, October 29, 2009. pp. 1-9.](#)
- [Walker, Christopher and Jessica Ludwig. "The Meaning of Sharp Power." \*Foreign Affairs\*, 16 November 2017.](#)

## Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 04

## BUREAUCRATIC AND SUB-BUREAUCRATIC POLITICS PERSPECTIVES

### Focus

A federal official named Rufus E. Miles, Jr. once 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 system 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 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 better understand a U.S. foreign policy decision.

### Guidance

- How does the bureaucratic politics perspective challenge the common assumption that countries function as unitary actors that make foreign policy decisions that are intended to optimize their national interests? Why does high-level bargaining among senior leaders of key national security agencies sometimes lead to an outcome that was nobody's initial preference?
- 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 (83 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, 162-191.](#)
- [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, 238-241, 253-283.](#)
- [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

- [Allison, Graham and Philip Zelikow, "The Cuban Missile Crisis: A Third Cut," Chapter 6 in Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. New York: Longman Press, 1999, 329-347. \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Annex: Case Studies," in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 378-382. \(Accessed via Leganto. Review as needed\)](#)







# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 4

## DETERRENCE THEORY AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS

### Focus

The United States was the first nation to develop nuclear weapons and is the only state (so far) to have used them in war. Throughout the Cold War, nuclear weapons and theories of nuclear deterrence were central to U.S. strategy and defense planning. This was a paradox: nuclear weapons were unlikely to be used, but their destructive power demanded continual thinking and planning about their role in protecting American national security. In the years following the Cold War, both civilian and military analysts gave far less thought to deterrence and nuclear weapons as the threat of an existential nuclear conflict appeared to recede. Over the past decade, however, the nuclear question has resurfaced, not only because of the competition with a rising China and a resurgent Russia, but also because of the threats from a nuclear North Korea and continual concern over a potential Iranian nuclear program along with the consideration of deterrence in other domains such as cyber space and "gray zone" conflict.

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend and assess the workings of deterrence and the role deterrence plays in protecting U.S. interests.
- Assess, evaluate, and apply the tools available for implementing deterrence in the individual AORs.
- Evaluate the role and composition of the U.S. nuclear force in the 21st century.

### 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 about right? Should certain parts of the force be adjusted? 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 (56 Pages)

- [Freedman, Lawrence. "The Meaning of Deterrence," Chapter 2 and "Strategic Coercion" Chapter 7 in \*Deterrence\*, \(Cambridge, MA: Polity Press, 2004\), pp. 26-42 and 109-115. \[Accessed via E-Reserve\]](#)
- [Chyba, Christopher F. "New Technologies & Strategic Stability." \*Daedalus\* \(Cambridge, Mass.\) 149, no. 2 \(2020\): 150–170.](#)
- [Colby, Elbridge and Walter Slocombe. "The State of \[Deterrence by\] Denial." \*War on the Rocks\*, March 22, 2021.](#)
- [Woolf, Amy F. "U.S. Strategic Nuclear Forces: Background, Developments, and Issues." \*Congressional Research Service\*, 10 December 2020, pp. 1-9 and pp 49-58.](#)
- [Nichols, Tom. "NWC Talks: Preventive War in the 21st Century." YouTube.com. Video 12:51, May 29, 2019.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Biddle, Tami Davis. "Coercion Theory: A Basic Introduction for Practitioners." \*Texas National Security Review\* 3:2 \(Spring 2020\): 94-109.](#)
- [Department of Defense. "Nuclear Deterrence: America's Foundation and Backstop for National Defense." April 6, 2020.](#)





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 05 PALACE POLITICS PERSPECTIVE

## Focus

Previous sessions introduced theories of foreign policy analysis at the systemic (unitary state) and state (organizational process, bureaucratic and sub-bureaucratic politics) levels. This session moves to the individual level of analysis and introduces a further approach, one that is often overlooked in academic studies of executive level decision-making: the impact of "palace politics." This perspective focuses on key individuals as they attempt to influence the primary decision maker. Put simply, it matters a great deal who is whispering in the president's ear; advisers therefore jockey for position in trying to get as close as possible to the centers of power. In examining this process, we will look at the influence these dynamics within the president's inner circle exert on the shaping of American foreign policy.

## OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend how palace politics can cause policy to intersect with or diverge from the unitary state perspective's "national interest" as agency leaders, White House staff, and other members of the President's inner circle jockey to gain the president's ear.
- Comprehend 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 better understand a U.S. foreign policy decision.

## Guidance

- Why is this perspective termed "palace politics" and what does this mean? What examples stand out from the readings to illustrate the palace politics approach?
- How does this approach differ from perspectives we have previously discussed, 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 U.S. policy toward Afghanistan? Compare and contrast the dynamics of the Trump administration's 2017 decision vs. the Biden administration's 2021 decision.

## Required Readings (51 Pages)

- [Gvosdev, Nicholas, Jessica Blankshain and David Cooper, 'Palace Politics Perspective', Chapter 7 in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 192-237.](#)
- [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.](#)
- [Cooper, Helene, Eric Schmitt and David Sanger, "Debating Exit from Afghanistan Biden Rejected Generals' Views," The New York Times, 17 Apr 2021.](#)

## Foundational Resources

- [Allison, Graham and Philip Zelikow, "The Cuban Missile Crisis: A Third Cut," Chapter 6 in Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. New York: Longman Press, 1999, 329-347. \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Annex: Case Studies," in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 378-382. \(Accessed via Leganto. Review as needed\)](#)





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 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 of those states 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.

### 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 (107 Pages)

- [Cohn, Lindsay P. "Introduction to Political Economy Parts I & II: Comparative & International." U.S. Naval War College. 2020 \(Revised\)](#)
- [Job, Brian L. "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: The Dilemmas of Middle Powers." Issues and studies - Institute of International Relations 56, no. 2 \(2020\).](#)
- [Farrell, Henry, and Abraham L Newman. "Weaponized Interdependence: How Global Economic Networks Shape State Coercion." International security 44, no. 1 \(2019\): 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.](#)





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 06

## COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE

### Focus

The “unitary state perspective” filters out the influence of individual human beings by treating the state as a single “rational actor.” Similarly, the organizational process and bureaucratic politics perspectives focus on organizations as actors in their own right. But, as we saw in the palace politics perspective, states and organizations are composed of people who bring to the table a range of human characteristics when trying to reach decisions, including biases, intuition, previous experiences, limited information, and other factors. 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

- Comprehend 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 better understand a U.S. foreign policy decision.

### 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 advisers tend to misperceive the leaders and actions of other states in the national security environment? Why do they assume, for example, that their own actions are clear and positive, while those of their adversaries are ambiguous or even hostile? What cognitive factors sometimes push otherwise intelligent and prudent leaders toward conclusions that are based more in belief than in reality?
- How does the cognitive perspective help us understand the mini case study on the 2017 military strike against Syria?

### Required Readings (42 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, 88-124.](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Annex: Case Studies, Case No. 5: Military Strike against Syria \(2017\)," in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 406-410.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Kelly, Anne, "Think Twice: Review of Thinking, Fast and Slow by Daniel Kahneman \(2011\)." Numeracy 10, Iss. 2 \(2017\): Article 15.](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Annex: Case Studies," in Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019, 378-382. \(Accessed via Leganto. Review as needed\)](#)





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 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 international relations (IR) theory can elucidate the underlying dynamics of transnational security issues and perhaps aid in the development of effective strategies that can address these issues.
- Assess the basic dynamics that drive the severity and probability of process-based and actor-based transnational challenges.

### Guidance

- What are the differences between process-based and actor-based threats and how they can interact?
- Explain the global, historical, geographical and economic context in which non-traditional and transnational security challenges emerge and occur. How do these threats intersect with human security, state security and economies?
- How do non-traditional/transnational threats intersect with each other and with great power competition? What challenges and opportunities do these interactions pose for strategists and U.S. national interests?
- Assess the value and utility of the three IR theories (introduced in International Security 2) in describing, explaining, and predicting the effects of transnational challenges on the international system.

### Required Readings (43 Pages)

- [McQuaid, Julia, Pamela G. Faber, and Zack Gold. \*Transnational Challenges and U.S. National Security: Defining and Prioritizing Borderless Threats\*. CNA, November 2017. \[Read pp. 3-10, 13\].](#)
- [Mobjörk, Malin, Florian Kkrampe, and Kheira Tarif. “Pathways of Climate Insecurity: Guidance for Policymakers.” SIPRI Policy Brief, November 2020.](#)
- [Kissane, Carolyn. “Welcome to the Era of Competitive Climate Statecraft in Trade, Finance, Development, and Security, Governments Are Racing to get Closer to Net-Zero.” Foreign Policy, Feb 2021.](#)
- [Ong, Sandy and Edward Carver. “The Rosewood Trade: An Illicit Trade from Forest to Furniture.” Yale Environment Online, 2019.](#)
- [Kruglanski, Arie W, Rohan Gunaratna, Molly Ellenberg, and Anne Speckhard. “Terrorism in Time of the Pandemic: Exploiting Mayhem.” Global security \(Abingdon, England\) 5, no. 1 \(2020\): 121–132.](#)
- [UN University “REDD+ - Traditional Knowledge and Climate Change Series” YouTube.com, Video 9:48. August 1, 2012.](#)

### Foundational Resources

There are no additional foundational resources for this session.







# FOREIGN 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 policymakers 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 foreign policy analysis, helps illustrate how the theoretical concepts used in this sub-course highlight the entire spectrum of influences at work in particular cases in order to grasp the full breadth of the policy environment and gain a better understanding of how and why decisions are made.

### OBJECTIVES

- 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 a major foreign policy decision.

### 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 (28 Pages)

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

### Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.







# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 07 GREAT POWER COMPETITION

## Focus

In recent years, the U.S. leaders have sought to balance America's military focus between the post 9/11 missions of counterterrorism and state-building and the more traditional, high-end missions associated with state-on-state competition. The March 2021 "[Interim National Security Strategic Guidance](#)" calls on the United States to adopt measures that will "allow us to prevail in strategic competition with China or any other nation." This echoes language in the 2017 National Security Strategy which maintains that competition and rivalry with other great powers are "intertwined, long-term challenges" that are not merely "passing trends or momentary problems." While the interim guidance specifically mentions China, the 2018 National Defense Strategy singled 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." Yet at the same time the interim guidance argues that challenges from great powers should not ignore transnational threats including extremism, disease and climate change, nor preclude economic recovery.

## OBJECTIVES

- Analyze the concept of great power competition and relate this to current U.S. strategy.
- Examine the putative causes of great power competition, especially with China and Russia.
- Assess how a renewed emphasis on great power competition might influence force planning and operational concept development.

## Guidance

- How would you assess and differentiate U.S. competition dynamics with China and Russia? Are they the same? How are they different?
- What are the structural causes of U.S.-China competition? Can these structures be overcome? How?
- What are the structural causes of U.S.-Russia competition? Can these structures be overcome? How?
- The Interim National Security Strategic Guidance calls on the United States to "manage the risk that competition will lead to conflict" and notes that conditions of strategic competition with other major powers "does not and should not preclude" common action "when it is in our national interests to do so." Describe some ways in which the United States can compete with China and Russia without resulting in conflict or war? Does the mindset of "great power competition" assume that conflict is inevitable? How does competition in the areas of values or governance play out, for instance, in terms of Women, Peace and Security initiatives? Can the United States find "new advantages" in these areas?
- How useful is the concept of "great power competition" for understanding structural rivalries with China and Russia? Does the concept help to guide the development of effective strategies?

## 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.](#)
- [Ashford, Emma. "Great Power Competition is a Recipe for Disaster." Foreign Policy, April 1, 2021.](#)

## Foundational Resources

- [O'Rourke, Ronald. "Renewed Great Power Competition: Implications for Defense--Issues for Congress" \(Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, March 12, 2020\), pp. 1-15. \[This Is A Resource for the FX\]](#)
- [Institute of World Politics. "Examining the Construct of Great Power Competition," YouTube.com. Video 1:11:32. November 25, 2019.](#)





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 08

## 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 seventy 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 successful or not. The increasing complexity of foreign policy 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, but the president's world view and decision-making style can also play a key role in shaping national security.

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the role of the president, and tools available, in shaping and implementing foreign policy.
- Analyze 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.
- Examine how theater level problems rise to the level of the presidential agenda.
- Examine lessons learned from how presidents handled specific foreign policy making challenges.

### Guidance

- Brattebo and Landsford write that "the personal characteristics of the president can often reinforce, eclipse, or even contradict the objective national security interests of the United States when it comes to making important decisions about the direction, scope, and tenor of national security policy." Considering the presidents who have served since the establishment of the National Security Council, which ones -- and which structures -- were most adept at organizing what can be an unwieldy system?
- How does the long-established practice of "multiple advocacy" (encouraging debate rather than groupthink) within the NSC and Interagency play out in the formulation of national security policy? Can you think of examples where lack of debate limited presidential choices?
- How important is "chemistry" in the relationship between a president and his National Security Advisor (NSA)? What are some common traits and workplace practices among NSAs seen as most successful? What causes this relationship to fail? How does this relate to palace politics?
- How has the presidency changed over time? Is the executive branch too big for the president to lead today? What are the factors that limit the president's ability to make effective national security policy?

### Required Readings (25 Pages)

- [The U.S. Constitution.](#)
- [Brattebo, Douglas M. and Tom Landsford., "Chapter 5: The Presidency and Decision-Making," The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security, ed. Derek S. Reveron, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and John Cloud, \(New York: NY: Oxford University Press, 2018\), 1-16.](#)
- [Dickerson, John., "What if the Problem Isn't the President it's the Presidency?" The Atlantic 321, no. 4 \(2018\): 46.](#)
- [Knott, Stephen, "NWC Talks: Presidential Power and National Security." YouTube video, 17:15, May 1, 2019.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 08

## STRATEGIC RESTRAINT

### Focus

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

### OBJECTIVES

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

### Guidance

- Although the "Come Home America" article was written over 20 years ago, do you believe its primary arguments are still relevant today?
- Are the core assumptions that have underpinned U.S. grand strategy since the end of the Cold War still valid?
- Given the contemporary security environment that includes a return to geopolitics and "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? How would global competitors and rivals respond to this grand strategy? 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 (49 Pages)

- [Posen, Barry R. and Andrew L. Ross. "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy." International security 21, no. 3 \(1996\): 5–53. \[Read pp 5-16\]](#)
- [Gholz, Eugene, Daryl G. Press, Harvey M. Sapolsky, "Come Home, America: The Strategy of Restraint in the Face of Temptation," International Security, Spring 1997 \(Vol. 21, No. 4\) pp. 5-17.](#)
- [Hjelmgaard, Kim. "A reckoning is near': America has a vast overseas military empire. Does it still need it?" USA Today, February 25, 2020.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 09

## PRESIDENCY CASE STUDY: MEDIA AND PUBLIC OPINION

### Focus

In March 2003, the United States invaded Iraq, invoking the recently announced "Bush Doctrine" on preemptive war. The Iraq invasion was the biggest gamble of George W. Bush's presidency, and one that altered the landscape of the Middle East and arguably broke the Bush presidency. The idea that "Bush Lied and People Died" persists to this day, as does the accusation that many members of the media acted as "cheerleaders" in the run-up to the war. This session will examine the role of the media in the buildup to the war in Iraq, and also analyze the administration's efforts to sell the public on the idea that Saddam Hussein's regime presented an existential threat to the United States.

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the role the media plays in both the formal and informal national security process.
- Discuss the impact of media coverage on both the development and the execution of security policy.
- Analyze the role of public opinion in democratic policy-making and civil-military relations, and what influences can affect it.

### Guidance

- What limitations exist, or should exist, regarding the ability of a president to "sell" their policy preferences to the public?
- What advantages does the presidency possess in terms of marketing its policies and building public support?
- Why did many members of the media put aside their skepticism regarding claims that Saddam was linked to Al Qaeda and that he was developing a wide-array of WMD?
- What role did Bush's post-9/11 popularity play in convincing the public to support the invasion of Iraq?
- What limits exist, or should exist, regarding the media's access to information in the planning and conduct of war?
- Does the media's role as an independent watchdog protected by the First Amendment hold greater, lesser, or equal weight to those roles performed by the constitutionally established branches of government?
- Why does Congress seem to lack the ability to check the President in the battle for public opinion, particularly in national security matters?
- Does this case undermine the notion that the American media is intrinsically "adversarial"?
- Has the proliferation of sources of information through social media networks made it less likely that another Iraq could happen?

### Required Readings (35 Pages)

- [Cappello, Dan and Ken Auletta, "Bush's Press Problem," The New Yorker, January 11, 2004.](#)
- [PBS News Hour, "The New York Times WMD Coverage," May 26, 2004 \(read transcript\).](#)
- [Lewis, Charles and Mark Reading-Smith, "False Pretenses," The Center for Public Integrity, June 30, 2014.](#)
- [Kessler, Glenn, "The Iraq War and WMDs: An Intelligence Failure or White House Spin?," The Washington Post, March 22, 2019.](#)
- [Abramson, Jill, "Merchants of Truth: The Business of News and the Fight for Facts," Prologue and Conclusion, 1-12, 423-430. \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [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".](#)





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

### Guidance

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

### Required Readings (44 Pages)

- [Posen, Barry R. and Andrew L. Ross. “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy.” \*International security\* 21, no. 3 \(1996\): 5–53. \[Read pp 17-23\]](#)
- [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 Stephen M. Walt. “The Case for Offshore Balancing.” \*Foreign Affairs\*. Volume 95, number 4, July-August 2016, pp. 70-83.](#)
- [Blinken, Antony. “Reaffirming and Reimagining America’s Alliances.” Speech at NATO Headquarters, March 24, 2021.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.







# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 10

## THE JUDICIARY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

### Focus

The U.S. judiciary is the third and co-equal branch of the U.S. government. The Supreme Court adjudicates 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. Importantly, both decisions and non-decisions by the judiciary have consequences on the scope of executive and legislative power, and the role of the military and national security establishment in executing U.S. foreign policy.

One of the most current, consequential, and neglected areas of constitutional law now concerns the issue of targeted killings, particularly by drone strikes against U.S. citizens. The U.S. government has extrajudicially killed American citizens while the Supreme Court has declined to adjudicate the power of the executive branch and rights of American citizens in this crucial domain of the Constitution. This session explores an unsettled area of constitutional law and judicial oversight that requires urgent attention as the U.S. policy of drone strikes is poised to continue and expand.

### OBJECTIVES

- Discuss the role of the judiciary as a key player in adjudicating foreign policy issues.
- Discuss legal cases directly affecting the military and national security, such as AUMF, Targeted Killing, and Drone Strikes.
- Weigh different arguments over Executive power and constitutional rights.
- Examine the targeted killing of Anwar al-Awlaki, a U.S. citizen killed by a CIA-operated drone in Yemen.

### Guidance

- Analyze the Constitutional issues that surround the targeted killing of terrorist suspects, and especially U.S. citizens. Is the current precedent with al-Awlaki sound policy? Should it change, and if so, how?
- What are the powers and limits of the executive branch in targeted killings?
- What is the role of the judiciary relative to the executive and legislative branches in foreign policy decisions like drone strikes?
- What sources of law does the executive draw upon to support its targeted killing policy? What sources of law can the judiciary rely on as a check on the executive?

### Required Readings (40 Pages)

- [Reinhardt, Stephen, "The Judicial Role in National Security," 86 B.U. L. Rev. 1309 \(2006.\)](#)
- [Cole, David, "Killing Citizens in Secret," The New York Review, October 9, 2011.](#)
- [Goldsmith, Jack, "Fire When Ready," Foreign Policy, March 20, 2012.](#)
- [Coll, Steve, "Kill or Capture," The New Yorker, August 2, 2012.](#)
- [Mazzetti, Mark and Schmitt, Eric, "Terrorism Case Renews Debate Over Drone Hits," The New York Times, April 12, 2015.](#)
- [Dow, David R. "In assassinating al-Awlaki, Obama left the Constitution behind," Daily Beast, March 12, 2016.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- ["Legality of U.S. Government's Targeted Killing Program Under Domestic Law," Lawfare \(See suggested readings at end of article\).](#)







# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 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. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, COVID-19 has had a disruptive impact on the international liberal order with the question of its impact still unknown.

### OBJECTIVES

- Analyze the utility of liberal internationalism to advance and defend national interests.
- Understand the “democratic peace” theory and counterarguments, and evaluate the place of democracy promotion in U.S. grand strategy
- Analyze the role the United Nations plays in international security in general, and U.S. foreign policy in particular.

### 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 U.N. institutions change to address contemporary challenges?
- Why does Miller think all U.S. administrations, regardless of party, promote democracy? What are the implications for the national security system discussed in the Foreign Policy Analysis subcourse?
- Some argue that COVID-19 has the potential to bring an end to the liberal international order. Others argue that the pandemic could reignite its positive aspects. Which is more likely in the context of today's international system?

### Required Readings (80 Pages)

- [Posen, Barry R. and Andrew L. Ross. “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy.” \*International security\* 21, no. 3 \(1996\): 5–53. \[Read pp 23-32\]](#)
- [Ikenberry, G. John. “The End of the Liberal International Order?” \*International Affairs\*, Vol. 94, No. 1 \(January 2018\), pp. 7-23.](#)
- [“2020 Civil Society Roadmap on Women, Peace and Security.” NGO: Working Group on Women, Peace, and Security, Dec 2020, pp. 1-26.](#)
- [Miller, Paul. “American Grand Strategy and the Democratic Peace,” \*Survival\*, Apr 2012, Vol.54 \(2\), pp. 49-76.](#)
- [Weiss, Thomas G. “The United Nations: before, during and after 1945.” \*International Affairs\*, November 2015, Vol.91\(6\), pp. 1221-1235.](#)
- [Poast, Paul. “Changing the Rules of International Relations.” University of Chicago, Video 5:39. April 27, 2020.](#)

### Foundational Resources

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





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 11

## CONGRESS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

### 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.

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend 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.
- Discuss how Congress works with the Executive Branch, especially the Department of Defense, to establish effective national security policies, institutions, and processes.
- Analyze how military officers and other national security professionals interact with the Legislative Branch.

### Guidance

- How do members of Congress seek to balance a strategic vision of the national interest with the need to focus on constituent service?
- How much influence does Congress have on defense policy relative to the executive branch?
- How does Congress conduct oversight of the executive branch?
- How does Congress exercise the "power of the purse" in overseeing the national security budget?

### Required Readings (68 Pages)

- [Serafino, Nina M. and Eleni G. Ekmektsioglou, "Chapter 9: Congress and National Security," The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security, ed. Derek S. Reveron, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and John A. Cloud, \(New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2018\), 1-21.](#)
- [Bent, Rodney, "Chapter 14: Budgeting for National Security," The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security, ed. Derek Reveron, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and John A. Cloud, \(New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2018.\), 1-14.](#)
- [Walsh, Kathleen A. "Legislative Affairs and Congressional-Military Relations," Newport, R.I.: Naval War College faculty paper, updated 2012, pp. 1-11.](#)
- [Heflin, Zane, "The War Powers Act Explained." The New Center, January 16, 2020.](#)
- [Vladek, Steve, "The courts don't even try to settle fights about war powers anymore," The Washington Post, January 15, 2020.](#)
- [Smithberger, Mandy and William Hartung, "Making Sense of the \\$1.25 Trillion National Security State Budget," POGO, May 7, 2019.](#)
- [Dale, Catherine, Nina M. Serafino, and Pat Towell, "A Unified National Security Budget? Issues for Congress," CRS, March 14, 2013.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Joint Resolution, Public Law 107-40, 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, September 18, 2001.](#)
- [Joint Resolution, Public Law 107-243, 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> session, October 16, 2002.](#)
- [Under Secretary of Defense \(Comptroller\), "Defense Budget Materials – FY2022".](#)





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 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 not only dissuade new competitors from emerging, but also to promote American values such as democracy, human rights and a global free market.

### OBJECTIVES

- Identify, analyze and evaluate the components of primacy to include its underlying assumptions, key concepts, objectives, risks, and force requirements.
- Evaluate the utility of primacy to advance and defend national interests.

### Guidance

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

### Required Readings (52 Pages)

- [Posen, Barry R. and Andrew L. Ross. “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy.” International security 21, no. 3 \(1996\): 5–53. \[Read pp 32-43\]](#)
- [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.](#)
- [Norrlof, Carla, and William C. Wohlforth. “Is US Grand Strategy Self-Defeating? Deep Engagement, Military Spending and Sovereign Debt.” Conflict Management and Peace Science 36, no. 3 \(May 2019\), pp. 227–47. \[Scan only.\]](#)

### Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 12

## CONGRESSIONAL CASE STUDY: CREATING A NEW AGENCY

### Focus

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

### OBJECTIVES

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

### Guidance

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

### Required Readings (54 Pages)

- [Chaplain, Christina \(U.S. Government Accountability Office\), "SPACE ACQUISITIONS: DOD Continues to Face Challenges of Delayed Delivery of Critical Space Capabilities and Fragmented Leadership" \[testimony\], May 17, 2017, 2-6, 11-16.](#)
- [Harrison, Todd, "Why We Need a Space Force," Center for Strategic and International Studies, October 3, 2018.](#)
- [Johnson, Kaitlyn, "Why a Space Force Can Wait," Center for Strategic and International Studies, October 3, 2018.](#)
- [Burbach, David, Space Force Case Reader, U.S. Naval War College, 23 April 2021.](#)
- [Farley, Robert, "Space Force: Ahead of Its Time or Dreadfully Premature", Cato Institute, December 1, 2020, 1-15.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Center for Strategic and International Studies, "Commanding Space: The Story Behind the Space Force", video, 20:00, April 2019.](#)
- [Spirtas, Michael, et. al., A Separate Space: Creating a Military Service for Space \(Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2020\).](#)
- [United States Department of Defense, Proposed Space Force Legislative Text, March 1, 2019.](#)
- [United States Public Law 116-92, "National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2020", 116<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, December 20, 2019, 365-373.](#)





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 12

## SOUTH AND CENTRAL ASIA

### Focus

As Washington considers policy options toward South and Central Asia, geopolitical rivalries among major powers influence the prospects for future cooperation, growth, and stability in the region. South Asia faces regional and transnational challenges such as terrorism, inter-ethnic tension, territorial disputes, resource constraints, and the specter of nuclear conflict. In

Afghanistan, long-simmering tensions among regional rivals complicate Kabul's efforts to overcome persistent security challenges and establish stability necessary to develop its economy. Farther to the north, Central Asia is at the fulcrum of a great power rivalry among Russia, China, and the United States. Despite the challenges, some countervailing opportunities are emerging in the form of regional trade, energy, and security arrangements. With efforts to link resource-rich regions with fast-growing markets, the region is positioned to play a key role in the evolving geopolitics of the 21st century

### OBJECTIVES

- Identify the U.S. 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.

### Guidance

- What are U.S. strategic interests in South and Central Asia? What are the major challenges pertaining to U.S. interests in Central Asia? Do U.S. interests in the region merit increased attention and investment or is this an area where the United States can afford to do less?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses regarding the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan? What approach might the United States and its allies take to help bring durable stability to this troubled region? How should the United States approach the growing risk to regional instability from insurgent/terrorist groups in the region?
- Is the strategy of deterrence waning in South Asia? What policy options exist for the United States to mitigate nuclear threats and ensure the security of nuclear weapons in South Asia?
- What is the climate related security risk in South and Central Asia? Is climate change an issue the United States should take seriously in the region? How will COVID-19 impact South and Central Asia?

### Required Readings (75 Pages)

- ["China's Influence on Conflict Dynamics in South Asia." USIP Senior Study Report, Dec 2020 pp. 1-56.](#) [Read pages 1-25, skim rest]
- [Mirimanova, Natalia, Camilla Born, and Pernilla Nordqvist. "Central Asia: A Climate Related Security Risk Assessment." Report from Expert Working Group on Climate Related Security Risks, Dec 2018 pp. 1-15.](#)
- [Baisalov, Ermek. "Central Asia 2021: Challenges and Trends." CABAR. Institute for War and Peace Reporting, January 08, 2021.](#)
- [Zafar, Rabia. "Enterprising Extremists': Crime, Religion, and the Business of Violence in Pakistan." Orbis \(Philadelphia\) 65.2 \(2021\): 305-321. Web.](#)
- ["Women Belong at the Peace Table – In Central Asia Too," Interview with Armands Pupols of the UN Regional Centre for Preventive Diplomacy for Central Asia in 2020.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 13

## THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL AND INTERAGENCY

### Focus

This session provides an overview of the national security structure of the U.S. government, focusing on the National Security Council (NSC) and the interagency process. The United States has evolved its national security establishment over time to address perceived flaws and shortcomings in its structure and organization. Both Congress and the executive branch have periodically reformed the national security policymaking process in an effort to bring expertise to the table. The number of federal agencies that are stakeholders in the policymaking process is surprising, but reflects the sophistication of today's foreign policy issues that range from traditional diplomacy to energy, environment, economics, science, and technology. Taken as a whole, the elements of this session explain the U.S. national security policymaking structure and process. This session also introduces the players in this arena to help prepare for the interagency simulation in FPA-18.

### OBJECTIVES

- Understand the organization of the national security establishment.
- Identify changes in the structure and operation of the national security establishment.
- Apply organizational and bureaucratic theories to analyze the interagency process.

### Guidance

- What are the advantages and disadvantages of the structure of the executive branch as it pertains to policymaking?
- How has the NSC changed shape over time? Is the NSC too big or too small? What issues should the NSC primarily address?
- Which FPA perspectives does the U.S. interagency process reflect?
- What are the tradeoffs involved in the interagency process? Is there a cost to this method of formulating national security policy?
- Review the structure and roles of the actors in the NSC.

### Required Readings (55 Pages)

- [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 \(2017\), 13-30. \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)
- [Destler, I.M. and Ivo H. Daalder, "A New NSC for a New Administration," Brookings, November 15, 2000.](#)
- [White House, National Security Council.](#)
- [Deutch, John, Arnold Kanter, and Brent Scowcroft, "Strengthening the National Security Interagency Process," Belfer Center.](#)
- [Eaton, David and Gus Otto, "Interagency: Nice to Talk About...Hard to Do," Interagency Journal, The Simons Center, Interagency Journal, Vol. 6, Issue 3, Summer 2015, 23-31.](#)
- [CFR Model Diplomacy: Review NSC Structure and Roles.](#)

### 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, 296-333. \(Accessed via Leganto. Review as needed\)](#)







# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 13

## ASIA-PACIFIC AND CHINA

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

### 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 U.S. and North Korean goals regarding denuclearization? If not, what should be the goal of U.S.-North Korea strategy? Is North Korea willing to give up its nuclear weapons program? What is the correct strategy for dealing with North Korea?
- What are U.S. and Chinese interests in the South and East China Seas, how important are these interests, and why do they clash? What is the best strategy for the United States in dealing with this clash of interests?
- What should U.S. goals be in its relations with China? How should the United States seek to achieve those goals?

### Required Readings (81 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

- [White House. "U.S. Strategic Framework for the Indo-Pacific." Declassified in Part on January 5, 2021.](#)





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 14

## DOD, WASHINGTON, AND COMBATANT COMMANDERS

### Focus

This session provides an overview of the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) and its component organizations and commands. Each component plays a vital role in the defense of U.S. national interests: from development of national defense and military strategies and doctrine, to execution of statutory authorities, missions, roles, capabilities, processes and product development, through the conduct of military operations.

### Guidance

- Why is DoD organized the way it is, and how does this affect the formulation of defense policy? Where are the power centers, how do they operate, and what impact do they have on defense policy? How has DoD changed over time, why, and what implications are these changes likely to have in the future?
- What are the cascading effects on the Defense Department from internal changes (i.e., to a focus on great power competition) or surprising events around the globe that have strategic impact (e.g., the outbreak of a global pandemic)? What other internal and external factors affect DoD's mission, why and how? How do decisions in the Pentagon impact combatant commands?
- How does the addition of a new military department affect national and theater security decision-making in the Pentagon, combatant commands and beyond? How do changes in national and defense policy and budgets impact U.S. defense planning, policymaking, operations and the war-fighting abilities as well as day-to-day experiences of Sailors, Soldiers, Airmen, Marines, and Guardians?

### Required Readings (49 Pages)

- [McInnis, Kathleen J., "Defense Primer: The Department of Defense" IFI0543 \(Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, updated January 15, 2021\).](#)
- [McMillan, Joseph and Miller, Franklin C., "The Office of the Secretary of Defense," Chapter 6 in The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth, Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof, eds. \(Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2nd edition \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)
- [Garamone, Jim. "Space Force Leader to Become 8th Member of Joint Chiefs of Staff," DoD News \(December 20, 2020\).](#)
- [O'Rourke, Ronald, "Renewed Great Power Competition: Implications for Defense -- Issues for Congress" R43838 \(Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, updated March 4, 2021\), 1-20.](#)
- [Eaglen, Mackenzie, "Putting Combatant Commanders on a Demand Signal Diet," War on the Rocks \(November 9, 2020\).](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Peters, Heidi M., "Defense Primer: The Military Departments," IFI0550 \(Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, updated November 28, 2018\).](#)

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend the structure, hierarchy, and functions of the Department of Defense, National Command Authority and subordinate actors and organizations in U.S. national and theater security decision-making and policy processes.
- Identify the strategic and theater issues facing the US Department of Defense and the role of DoD components in deciding or executing policy.
- Understand the role that DoD components play in developing and implementing national defense and military policy.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 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 stresses present complex challenges. Assessing the region’s future security environment and developing and implementing appropriate strategies is further complicated by resource limitations, the fragile state of emerging African democracies and a highly fluid regional political-security situation. To make sense of this, this session examines three interlocking components: geography, the political-security environment, and U.S. strategy.

### OBJECTIVES

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

### Guidance

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

### Required Readings (51 Pages)

- [Wilkins, Sam. “Does America Need an Africa Strategy?” War on the Rocks, April 2, 2020.](#)
- [Natulya, Paul. “Reshaping African Agency in China-Africa Relations.” ACSS Spotlight, March 2, 2021. pp. 1-6.](#)
- [Alden, Chris and Lu Jiang. “Brave New World: Debt, Industrialization and Security in China–Africa Relations.” International Affairs. Volume 95, Issue 3. May 2019, Pages 641–657.](#)
- [“Seasick as COVID Locks Africa Down its Waters Remain Open to Plunder.” Greenpeace Africa. October 2020. pp. 6-23.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Stock, Robert. “The Map of Africa” Chapter 1 in \*Africa South of the Sahara: A Geographical Interpretation\*. 3rd Edition \(New York: Guilford Press, 2013\), pp. 15-30. \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)
- [Singh, Naunihal. “NWC Talks: China in Africa.” YouTube.com. Video 13:50, December 18, 2019.](#)
- [Englebert, Pierre. “The ‘Real’ Map of Africa.” Foreign Affairs Snapshot, November 8, 2015, pp. 1-6.](#)
- [Hicks, Marcus, Kyle Atwell, and Dan Collini. “Great-Power Competition Is Coming to Africa.” Foreign Affairs, March 4, 2021.](#)





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 15

## THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

### Focus

The Intelligence Community (IC) is an integral part of the interagency and the national security process. The IC is comprised of many disparate agencies, each with its own purpose, history, and organizational culture. This session addresses how the IC contributes to U.S. theater and national security policy decision-making, as well as strategic and operational decisions. The session illustrates the critically important advisory role that the IC plays in theater and national security policy decision-making and its connections within and beyond the military and defense sectors.

### OBJECTIVES

- Identify the roles, functions, structure, relationships, and organizational behavior of the Intelligence Community.
- Examine how changes in the domestic and international systems can affect intelligence and, in turn, defense policy, military strategy and operations.

### Guidance

- What role(s) does the IC play in advising and supporting U.S. national and theater security policy, defense strategy, and military operations?
- How does the IC advise and support the U.S. Department of Defense at the national and theater levels?
- What is the relationship between the IC and policymakers? What does each side seek and value, and how does this impact their relationship? How does an advisory role differ from an advocacy role in policy decision-making?
- How do changes in domestic and international political systems impact the IC and how it advises and supports policy decision-making?
- What role, if any, might cognitive bias or political influence and other policy-relevant dynamics and analytical perspectives play in developing and communicating intelligence findings, assessments, estimates and warnings to policy decision makers?
- How does intelligence impact U.S. policy decision-making? The case study provides insights into how strategic-level intelligence influenced or failed to influence U.S. policy decisions at a key turning point in history, with ripple effects across strategic theaters and beyond. Would anything have made a difference in how this intelligence was delivered or received? If so, why? What lessons are there for the future?

### Required Readings (68 Pages)

- [Lowenthal, Mark M., "The U.S. Intelligence Community," Chapters 1, 2 and 9 in \*Intelligence: From Secrets to Policy\* \(Thousand Oaks, CA: CQ Press, 8th Edition, 2020\), 1-9, 11-20, 253, 256-274. \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)
- [Lundberg, Kirsten, "A Case Study: CIA and the Fall of the Soviet Empire - The Politics of 'Getting it Right'". \(Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency Reading Room,\) 1994, document declassified 2014.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Gibson, Lt. Gen. Karen, "The Role of Intelligence in the National Security Decision-Making Process," Address to the U.S. Naval War College \(January 22, 2020\), watch through 20:21.](#)





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 15

## EUROPE AND RUSSIA

### Focus

The goal of this session is to provide an overview of the Euro-Atlantic basin and the dynamics of European security and the trans-Atlantic relationship, 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 if tensions in Europe are unresolved?
- What are Russia's strategic objectives? How do they impact U.S. preferences? Are Russia and the United States destined to be strategic competitors?

### OBJECTIVES

- Understand and assess the importance of the trans-Atlantic relationship to U.S. national security.
- Identify and analyze the principal challenges and issues facing the European theater.
- Understand 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.

### Required Readings (59 Pages)

- [Posture statement: Wolters, Tod D. "Statement" \(U.S. Armed Services Committee\), 13 April 2021, pp. 1-20.](#)
- [Gvosdev, Nikolas K. "Does America Still Need to Worry So Much About Europe?" National Interest. March 29, 2021.](#)
- [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.](#)
- [Goldgeier, James. "U.S.-Russian Relations Will Only Get Worse," Foreign Affairs, April 6, 2021.](#)
- [Colby, Elbridge and Ian Brzezinski. "How NATO Manages the 'Bear' and the 'Dragon.'" Orbis 65:1 \(2021\), pp. 8-16.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [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.](#)
- [Petersen, Mike. "NWC Talks: Russia's Great Power Competition." YouTube video. 12:10, November 25, 2019.](#)







# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 16

## INFLUENCING DEFENSE POLICY: INTEREST GROUPS, LOBBYISTS, AND 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 capitals around the world. But what impact are they having on U.S. national security and defense policy decision-making? Can this impact be measured, and how do they gain and wield their influence? Can such actors influence how theater security policy is conceived, developed and executed? This session raises questions about what types of power and influence these non-governmental actors possess, how they seek to influence lawmakers and policy decision makers, and what impact this can have on the defense policy decision-making process.

### Guidance

- Why are interest groups formed? What mechanisms do they use to express their policy preferences, and to what extent do they influence policy or legislative decision-making processes?
- What makes some interest groups more influential than others? What sorts of interest groups are likely to be most relevant in influencing foreign and defense policy?
- What is the impact of the “revolving door” between government service, lobbying firms and think tanks and the “iron triangle” among government, industry, and Congress? How might these sectors influence Executive Branch policy?
- 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?
- How might foreign actors -- allies, adversaries, and non-state actors -- access and influence the U.S. policy making process through lobbying, think tanks, and working with domestic interest groups?
- In what ways are the role of interest groups, lobbies, and think tanks changing?

### Required Readings (71 Pages)

- [Holyoke, Thomas T., Excerpts from Interest Groups and Lobbying: Pursuing Political Interests in America, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2014, 1-5, 133-149, 169-173, 272-276. \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)
- [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, 97-118.](#)
- [Jones, Christopher M, and Kevin P Marsh, “The Politics of Weapons Procurement: Why Some Programs Survive and Others Die.” Defense & security analysis 27, no. 4 \(2011\), 359–373.](#)
- [Thompson, Ginger and Ron Nixon, “Leader Ousted, Honduras Hires U.S. Lobbyists: \[Foreign Desk\].” New York Times, \(October 08, 2009\).](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Wiarda, Howard J. “Think Tanks and Foreign Policy in a Globalized World: New Ideas, New ‘Tanks,’ New Directions” in International Journal; Toronto Vol. 70, Iss. 4, \(Dec 2015\): 517-525.](#)

### OBJECTIVES

- Identify the missions and roles of interest groups, lobbyists, and think tanks in influencing policy and legislative decisions in the defense and national security realms.
- Comprehend how these institutions and individuals function, why they function this way, 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.
- Examine 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.
- Discuss how to critically assess the products, sources of information, and analytic methods of these institutions as well as their networks of influence.







# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 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.

### 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 (45) Pages)

- [Wiarda, Howard J. and Harvey F. Kline. "The Context of Latin American Politics." Chapter 1 in \*Latin American Politics and Development\*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press. pp 3-16. \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)
- [Piccone, Ted. "China and Latin America: A Pragmatic Embrace." The Brookings Institute. Global China-Regional Influence and Strategy, July 2020. pp 1-8.](#)
- [McKinley, Michael. "The Case for a Positive U.S. Agenda with Latin America." Center for Strategic & International Studies, April 2021, pp 1-8.](#)
- [Restrepo, Dan. "Central Americans Are Fleeing Bad Governments." Foreign Affairs, 5 March 2021. pp 1-8.](#)
- [Meyer, Peter J. "Central America's Northern Triangle: Challenges for U.S. Policymakers in 2021." Congressional Research Service Insight, February 16, 2021. pp 1-3.](#)
- [Seelke, Clare. "Venezuela: Challenges for U.S. Policymakers in 2021." Congressional Research Service Insight, pp 1-3.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Sullivan, Mark P. "Latin America and the Caribbean: U.S. Policy Overview." Congressional Research Service, January 26, 2021.](#)





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 17

## STATE DEPARTMENT, FOREIGN SERVICE, AND DIPLOMACY

### 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 can 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 allow 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 effort that involved all the great powers -- the United States, EU, Russia, and China -- in a multilateral framework to constrain Iranian nuclear development and remove a major source of regional tension in the Middle East. The case study demonstrates how persistent, creative, and skillful diplomatic engagement, drawing on all the tools of statecraft, can advance core national interests, reduce the risk of military conflict, and enhance regional stability.

### OBJECTIVES

- Comprehend 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.

### Guidance

- What are the primary roles of a diplomat? How is the State Department staffed and resourced as compared to DOD? What is the role of an Ambassador in coordinating the interagency process overseas? What is the country team and what purposes does it serve?
- Why do states engage diplomatically with both friends and adversaries? How does this engagement differ? What is the difference between bilateral and multilateral diplomacy, and what advantages and disadvantages does each offer?
- What foreign policy priorities did Secretary of State Blinken lay out in his February 2021 speech? What was/were the intended audiences for the speech? How did Secretary Blinken signal the primacy of diplomacy in the current administration?
- How does the case of the Iranian nuclear deal demonstrate diplomacy can be used to resolve and prevent conflict? How did bilateral and multilateral efforts complement one another in reaching agreement? What role did economic pressure and the threat of military action play in supporting diplomatic efforts? What other factors shaped the diplomatic outcome of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) and the subsequent U.S. decision to withdraw from the agreement?

### Required Readings (68 Pages)

- [Cloud, John A. and Damian Leader, "Chapter 10: Diplomacy, the State Department, and National Security," The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security, ed. Derek S. Reveron, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and John A. Cloud, \(New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2018\), 185-195.](#)
- [U.S. Department of State, "A U.S. Embassy at Work." \(Washington, DC: U.S. State Department, September, 14, 2009\).](#)
- [Blinken, Antony, "A Foreign Policy for the American People," video, 27:44, or transcript, \(March 3, 2021\).](#)
- [Burns, William, "Iran and the Bomb: The Secret Talks," in The Back Channel: A Memoir of American Diplomacy and the Case for Its Renewal \(New York, Random House, 2019\), 337-387. \[Accessed via Leganto\]](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Cloud, John A. "NWC Talks: The Role of Diplomacy." U.S. Naval War College YouTube video. 9:52, \(September 10, 2019\).](#)
- [Putnam, Thomas. "Leveraging US Embassy Support to Assist Joint Force Commands." Fires \(July 2017\), 18-22.](#)





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 17 GREATER MIDDLE EAST

## Focus

In 1980, the Carter Doctrine articulated how U.S. national interests are intertwined with the Greater Middle East. Since that time the United States has been deeply engaged with the region, including through military intervention. The region faces a number of seemingly intractable challenges such as continuing social unrest stemming from the 2011 Arab Awakening, authoritarianism, the ongoing civil wars and humanitarian crises in both Syria and Yemen, the persistence of militant extremism, Iran's destabilizing actions, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and climate instability. COVID-19 has exacerbated many of these challenges. This session explores these challenges and questions how the United States can remain committed to promoting stability in the region, ensuring trade flows, combating terrorism, and preventing the spread of nuclear weapons.

## 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.

## Guidance

- What are U.S. national interests relative to the Middle East? How have they changed over the last two decades?
- What will be the principal security issues in the years to come? How would you rank-order or prioritize these issues? What can the United States do to prevent/manage these issues?
- What are the larger strategic implications of U.S. engagement or disengagement from the region?

## Required Readings (39 Pages)

- [Bolan, Christopher J., Jerad I. Harper, Joel R. Hillison. "Diverging Interests: US Strategy in the Middle East." Parameters, Winter 2020-21.](#)
- [Nasr, Vali. "The Middle East's Next Conflicts Won't be Between Arab States and Iran." Foreign Policy, March 2021.](#)
- [Scheinmann, Gabriel. "The Map that Ruined the Middle East." The Tower, July 2013.](#)
- [Lynch, Marc. "The Arab Uprisings Never Ended: The Enduring Struggle to Remake the Middle East." Foreign Affairs, January / February 2021.](#)
- [Kandeel, Amal. "In the Face of Climate Change: Challenges of Water Scarcity and Security in MENA." Atlantic Council, June 11, 2019.](#)

## 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.](#)
- [Nakhleh, Emile. "The Devastating Impact of COVID-19 on the Middle East." The Cipher Brief, April 27, 2020.](#)





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 18

## INTERAGENCY SIMULATION

### Focus

Having examined the interagency policy making process across a wide range of agencies and departments charged with national security, you will now engage in a simulation, designed to exercise the mechanics of an interagency Principals Committee. 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, within a group, to navigate among competing equities and preferences of a constellation of interests and organizations, including the White House, the Joint Staff, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, combatant commands, the geographic and functional bureaus of the Department of State, the Departments of the Treasury and Commerce, the intelligence community, and various functional agencies. You will be asked to prioritize and adjudicate between multiple, overlapping concerns, including counter-terrorism, cyber security, financial controls, counter-narcotics, human rights and democratization.

For the simulation, we are employing the Council on Foreign Relations' online NSC Model Diplomacy Tool. This tool provides regionally focused and global up-to-date scenarios along with concise videos.

### OBJECTIVES

- Identify the challenges in interagency decision-making and coordination of national security policy across the various agencies and departments of government.
- Demonstrate the role of the National Security Council staff in organizing and facilitating the interagency process.
- Identify the roles of different members of an interagency working group.
- Apply the operation of the interagency process in dealing with a pressing theater security issue.

### 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 saying 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 identify a regional case to use, set up the scenario, assign roles, and invite you to [modeldiplomacy.cfr.org](http://modeldiplomacy.cfr.org) to review case material and prepare.

### Foundational Resources

- [Chollet, Derek, “Chapter 6: The National Security Council: Is It Effective, or Is It Broken?,” The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security, ed. Derek S. Reveron, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and John Cloud, \(New York: NY: Oxford University Press, 2018\), 1-12.](#)
- [Schake, Kori, “Chapter 7: The National Security Process,” The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security, ed. Derek S. Reveron, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and John Cloud, \(New York: NY: Oxford University Press, 2018\), 1-11.](#)





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 18

## PAPER PEER REVIEW

### Focus

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. 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 International Security paper provides you an opportunity to address an issue of global significance.

### OBJECTIVES

- Using the questions provided in the Guidance section, provide critical feedback to at least two of your fellow students.
- Receive critical feedback from two of your fellow students.

### 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.](#)
- [International Security Paper Instruction.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 19

## CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS

### Focus

Civil-military relations is the study of the relationships among the military, the government, and the population. In Foreign 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 the actions of military officers, politicians, civil servants, and citizens shape these key relationships.

### OBJECTIVES

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

### Guidance

- 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 (52 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 \(March 2013\), 129-145.](#)
- [Brooks, Risa, with Jim Golby and Heidi Urben, "Crisis of Command: America's Broken Civil-Military Relationship Imperils National Security," Foreign Affairs \(May/June 2021\).](#)
- [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.







# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 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

- Comprehend the purpose of National Strategic Guidance documents and how current strategies define U.S. security concerns and efforts to address them.
- Consider the coordination between the ends, ways, and means.
- Assess how well the NSS lays out key national priorities.
- Evaluate how well the NSS serves modern planning needs.

### Guidance

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

### Required Readings (65 Pages)

- [Biden, Joseph. "Interim National Security Strategic Guidance." The White House, March 3, 2021.](#)
- [Blankenship, Brian D. and Benjamin Denison. "Is America Prepared for Great-Power Competition?" Survival 61, no. 5 \(2019\): 43-64.](#)
- [Scobell, Andrew, et al. "China's Grand Strategy: Trends, Trajectories, and Long-Term Competition." RAND Corporation, 2020. \[Read pg. 1-35\]](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Lettow, Paul. "U.S. National Security Strategy: Lessons Learned." Texas National Security Review, Vol 4, Iss 2, Spring 2021.](#)
- [Reagan, Ronald. "National Security Decision Directive 238." Declassified October 27, 2005. The Reagan Library. September 2, 1986.](#)





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 20 ECONOMIC STATECRAFT

## Focus

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

Economic measures often receive additional attention because they are viewed as less confrontational (depending on the specific situation), and generate less of a public commitment to achieve a positive outcome than other tools of statecraft. For example, President Obama's response to Russia's invasion of Ukraine relied heavily on economic sanctions, but even critics of his response in the U.S. Congress did not recommend a military response.

## OBJECTIVES

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

## Guidance

- What is the spectrum of economic tools available when policymakers seek to either alter or reinforce the international status quo? How has the United States historically viewed the role of economic tools in foreign policy?
- For a nation with an economy that is smaller than that of the United States, under what conditions are such nations more likely to be able to resist American economic pressure? Are particular types of governments and societies better able to withstand economic pressure?
- In recent years, the use of economic sanctions has often been used to deal with national security concerns. Do you think sanctions have become a substitute for military action?
- What are the similarities and differences between Trump's and Biden's approaches to the steel tariff issue? Are you surprised?

## Required Readings (20 Pages)

- [Blackwill, Robert D., and Jennifer M. Harris, "The Lost Art of Economic Statecraft," Foreign Affairs, March/April 2016.](#)
- [Drezner, Daniel W., "The United States of Sanctions: The Use and Abuse of Economic Coercion," Foreign Affairs, September/October 2021, pp. 142-154.](#)
- [Blenkinsop, Philip, and Rachelle Younqlai, "Banking's SWIFT Says Ready to Block Iran Transactions," Reuters, February 17, 2012.](#)
- [Swanson, Ana, and Peter Eavis, "Trump Expands Steel Tariffs, Saying They Are Short of Aim," New York Times, January 27, 2020.](#)
- [Swanson, Ana, "Biden Reinstates Tariffs in One of His First Trade Moves," New York Times, February 2, 2021.](#)
- [Gavin, Francis J., "Economics and U.S. National Security," War on the Rocks, June 29, 2021.](#)

## Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 20

## NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGIC GUIDANCE

### Focus

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

### OBJECTIVES

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

### Guidance

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

### Required Readings (52 Pages)

- [Summary of the 2018 National Defense Strategy \(Washington DC: Pentagon, 2018\), pp. 1-11.](#)
- [Joint Staff. "Description of the National Military Strategy 2018." July 2019.](#)
- [Mazarr, Michael J., Katharina Ley Best, Burgess Laird, Eric V. Larson, Michael E. Linick, and Dan Madden. "The U.S. Department of Defense's Planning Process: Components and Challenges." Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2019. \[Read Chapter 2 only\]](#)
- [Brands, Hal and Evan Braden Montgomery. "One War is Not Enough: Strategy and Force Planning for Great-Power Competition." The Strategist: Texas National Security Review, Volume 3, Issue 2 \(Spring 2020\).](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Hale, Robert F. "Financing the Fight: A History and Assessment of Department of Defense Budget Formulation Processes" \(Washington, DC: Brookings, April 2021\), pp. 1-44.](#)





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 21

## DECIDING THE IRAQ WAR

### Focus

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

### OBJECTIVES

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

### Guidance

- What motivated the United States to take offensive action against Iraq? What are the factors and events that drove this decision?
- What Iraqi actions, both in the years prior and in the weeks and months immediately preceding the invasion, played a role in the decision process?
- What were the assumptions and beliefs that motivated this decision? Was the decision the product of a rational process? Did cognitive factors impact the development of the policy of confronting Saddam?
- How did senior Iraqi officials perceive the unfolding crisis prior to the invasion?
- George W. Bush states that he "had tried to address the threat from Saddam Hussein without war." Was the war in Iraq something that could have been avoided?

### Required Readings (81 Pages)

- [Fisher, Louis, "Deciding on War Against Iraq: Institutional Failures," Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 118 No. 3 \(2003\), 389-410.](#)
- [Woods, Kevin, James Lacey, and Williamson Murray, "Saddam's Delusions: A View From the Inside," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 85 No. 3 \(May/June 2006\), 2-26.](#)
- [George W. Bush, Decision Points \(New York: Crown Publishers, 2010\), 223-253.](#) [Accessed via Leganto]
- [Walt, Stephen M., "Top 10 Lessons of the Iraq War," Foreign Policy \(March 20, 2012\).](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Purdum, Todd S., A Time of Our Choosing \(New York: Times Books, 2003\).](#) [Accessed via Leganto]





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 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.

### 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?
- As the challenges of the 21st century become more and more defined, senior maritime leaders emphasize the need to cooperate and integrate their capabilities and operations in order to deal with revisionist powers and rising near peer powers. Can such preparation by committee truly succeed? How seriously would you expect U.S. friends and potential enemies to view this proposal?

### Required Readings (77Pages)

- [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.](#)
- [Berger, David, M.M. Gilday, and Karl L. Schultz. "Advantage at Sea: Prevailing with Integrated All-Domain Naval Power." Washington, D.C., December 2020, pp. 1 -35.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Gilday, Michael. "FRAGO 01/2019: A design for Maintaining maritime superiority." United States Navy, December 2019.](#)
- [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.](#)
- [Gilday, Michael. "CNO NAVPLAN." United States Navy, January 2021.](#)





# FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS - 22

## ARMS SALES TO UKRAINE

### Focus

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

### Guidance

- In December 2017, the Trump administration notified Congress that the United States would sell arms to Ukraine. You are required to use course concepts and materials to conduct an analysis of this case. What are the most important influences or factors that led to this decision? What were the differences in the security assistance packages proposed to President Obama and President Trump for approval? Can you apply and distinguish between the analytical perspectives in this case study analysis?
- Note that there will be no "school solution" for this case or for the final examination. The case materials can support a variety of interpretations and may even include contradictory perspectives. Your task is to use course tools to analyze the evidence provided in order to provide your own answer to the question in a well-reasoned argument.
- Additional guidance will be provided on the specific question, methodology, and format for the analysis. Your instructor will provide guidance on how your seminar will discuss the case analysis in class.

### Required Readings (61 Pages)

- [Cameron, Andrea, Arms Sales to Ukraine Case Reader, U.S. Naval War College, 23 May 2021.](#)

### 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.





# INTERNATIONAL SECURITY - 22

## CYBER, TECHNOLOGY AND THE FUTURE OF WAR

### Focus

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

### 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.

### Guidance

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

### Required Readings (56 Pages)

- [The Economist. "The New Battlegrounds – The Future of War." The Economist Group, January 25, 2018. pp. 1-6.](#)
- [Tangredi, Sam J, Captain, USN \(Ret\). "Sun Tzu Versus AI: Why Artificial Intelligence Can Fail in Great Power Conflict." Proceedings, May 2021, VOL 147/5/1,1419. Pp 1-7.](#)
- [Perloth, Nicole. "Epilogue." In \*This is How They Tell Me the World Ends: The Cyber Weapons Arms Race\*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2021. pp 387-406. \[Accessed Leganto\]](#)
- [Caliskan, Murat and Michel Liegeois. "Technology and War Strategy." Beyond the Horizon ISSG, behorizon.org. June 12, 2017, pp 1-8.](#)
- [Sargent, John F. Jr. "Defense Primer: RDT&E." Congressional Research Service: IN FOCUS, November 25, 2020. Pp 1-2.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Cyberspace Solarium Commission. Final Report. March 2020, pp. 1-19.](#)
- [Department of Defense. "Summary: The DOD Cyber Strategy." 2018.](#)
- [Jaikaran, Chris. "Cybersecurity: Selected Issues for the 116th Congress." Congressional Research Service. March 29, 2019.](#)





# CAPSTONE - 01

## STRATEGIC PLANNING: THE GOLDEN THREAD

### Focus

For the past eleven weeks, we have studied how the U.S. government makes foreign policy decisions and the role of the U.S. in the world. This session provides insight into how to use the analytical skills you have developed to assess an environment based on strategic goals and values, to think about risk and assumptions, to envision strategic end-states, and to think systematically through possible ways to achieve those goals.

### Guidance

- Strategists and planners make strategic estimates about the future security environment and assess potential adversaries, threats, risk, and the character of potential conflict. How can you use what you have learned to assess a future security environment? How do you identify important trends to create alternate visions of the future?
- To what extent should strategists take into consideration risks, opportunities, and political, practical, or budgetary obstacles in developing guidance?
- What strategic and structural factors do planners need to take into account when developing a future joint force?
- Joint Concepts describe the methods or ways that the Joint Force will operate in the future security environment and help identify required capabilities and future force attributes. What is the relationship among strategy, concepts, and specific capabilities?
- How can you use what you have learned to think through the practical implementation of your ideas? How do you identify stakeholders and their likely behavior?

### Required Readings (32 Pages)

- [Milley, Mark A. Opening Statement, SASC Department of Defense Budget Hearing. 4 March, 2020.](#)
- [Cook, James. "The Importance of Joint Concepts for the Planner." \*Joint Force Quarterly: JFQ\*, no. 99, 2020, pp. 95-100.](#)
- [Flournoy, Michele. 2021. "America's Military Risks Losing Its Edge." \*Foreign Affairs\* 100, no. 3 \(May/June\): 67-91.](#)

### Foundational Resources

- [Ripsman, Norrin M., Rosella Cappella Zielinski, Kaija E. Schilde, "The Political Economy of Security," \*The Oxford Handbook of US National Security\*, \(Oxford University Press, 2018\) pp. 249-264](#)
- [Biden 2021 Interim Strategic Guidance; Trump 2017 NSS; Obama 2010 NSS; Bush 2006 NSS; Clinton 1996 NSS](#)
- [Russian Federation's 2015 National Security Strategy; CSIS analysis of Russian 2015 NSS; EU's 2016 Global Strategy for Foreign and Security Policy.](#)

### OBJECTIVES

- Analyze how strategic direction guides the development of the Joint forces.
- Assess the role of resource constraints and risk consideration/mitigation in the force planning process.
- Assess the necessary elements of effective strategic direction from the Secretary of Defense to Component force planners in the development of force structure.





# CAPSTONE – 02

## FORCE PLANNING: STRATEGY MEETS BUDGET PANEL

### Focus

P. H. Liotta and Richmond Lloyd, writing in the Naval War College Review in 2005, observed: “Today’s decisions about strategy and force planning will fundamentally influence future strategy and force posture. Done well, such decisions and choices can prove a powerful investment in the future.” Needless to say, the opposite also applies. In this session we shift our focus from the conceptual logic of strategic planning to the real-world challenges of reconciling competing strategic and budgetary pressures. We will engage with a former and a current senior DoD official who bring extensive experience in the strategy development and budget processes. This discussion will delve into how the interaction of strategic and budgetary factors can impact force planning decisions, including the impact of political realities.

### OBJECTIVES

- Gain perspectives from former officials on budgetary realities for DoD, and how this affects planning and programming for the future, including what current budgetary challenges may mean for future investments and personnel costs.
- Understand the tradeoffs in the current defense and national budget and how senior officials must navigate between competing spending priorities.
- Assess the question as to whether strategy drives budgets or vice versa.

### Guidance

- Engaging panelists with extensive hands-on experience provides us with the opportunity to compare the theory of strategic planning with the practice. After an initial panel discussion moderated by a faculty member, students will have the chance to ask questions. Some of the issues that could be raised in the initial part of the discussion are:
- Over its first year, the Biden administration has undergone the process of rebooting national strategies. To what extent do you think budget considerations shaped these strategies, particularly the national military strategy? Or did strategic considerations shape the budget? How does this track with the experience of previous administrations?
- How has the shift in focus to great power competition in recent years affected the budget and changed force planning priorities?
- How might (or has) the COVID-19 pandemic affect(ed) the defense budget for the near future? Will this drive a fundamental shift in how Americans think about security?
- How do the various policy and budget offices read and interpret strategy documents? Do these documents matter? Do they provide significant guidance? How much attention do the various policy and budget offices pay to the NDS and NMS?
- What role did the Office of Management and Budget or Congress play in pushing budgetary or other considerations over strategic ones?

### Required Readings (0 Pages)

- Review readings from Capstone-1 and FX-1

### Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session





# NSDM FX - 01

## THE FINAL EXERCISE

### Focus

The Final Exercise (FX) is the NSDM capstone event where students must demonstrate that they understand and can apply concepts from the International Security and Foreign Policy Analysis sub-courses. Each seminar will play the role of a National Security Council Staff strategic planning working group developing the key tenets of a national security strategy, national military strategy, operating concepts, and a future force concept that advance and defend U.S. national interests over the next 20 years. They will communicate their vision and strategy to persuade audiences on their perspective.

### OBJECTIVES

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

### Guidance

- Your working group is assigned to produce and present a strategic estimate of the future security environment over the near (0-5 years), medium (5-15 years), and long (15-20 years) term, an outline of a national security strategy that advances and defends U.S. interests, an outline of a national military strategy, a list of three to five operating concepts (at least one of which must DoD-focused) necessary to advance the strategies, and a future force concept to support all of these. Finally, the group must choose one aspect of their strategies or of their force concept, or one operating concept, and describe in detail how the initiative would be executed.
- The output will be a brief between 40 and 45 minutes in length, including the six elements outlined above, followed by a 30-min Q&A period. Seminars will designate at least two briefers. All students are expected to participate in the Q&A.
- The teaching team will be available as consultants but will not lead the seminar's efforts. Seminars must do a rehearsal of their brief with their teaching team no later than the Seminar Presentation Review (FX-7).
- Each seminar will present their briefing to a faculty grading panel. Time and location of the final presentation and grading panel members will be provided by the National Security Affairs Department during product development.
- Faculty grading panels can award the seminar up to 100 points based on their brief and Q&A performance. Because the NSDM FX is a collective team effort, the seminar receives one presentation grade that applies to all members.
- Students are required to complete a peer review for each member of their seminar's contribution to FX. The review will be anonymous, accomplished via MS Form, and be used to determine each student's FX contribution grade.
- The student-derived contribution grade will be combined with the seminar's FX-presentation grade to yield an overall FX grade unique to each student.

### Required Readings (28 Pages)

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

### Foundational Resources

- [Commission on America's National Interests, America's National Interests \(Cambridge, MA: Belfer Center, 2000\), 5-21.](#)
- [Kennan, George F., "The Inauguration of Organized Political Warfare \(Redacted Version\)," April 30, 1948.](#)
- [Greer, Jim, "The Weaker Foe," Strategy Bridge, March 7, 2017](#)





## NSDM FX - 02 - 07

# SEMINAR PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT

### Focus

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

### OBJECTIVES

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

### Guidance

- The required elements of the brief are:
- Strategic estimate (out to 20 years)
  - The seminar is not bound by current strategic documents and should determine its own national priorities and preferences. The seminar should understand the security environment and consider contributions of all instruments of national power. The seminar should evaluate the major trends that may challenge the U.S. government's ability to advance and defend those interests over the near (0 to 5 yrs), medium (5-15 yrs), and long (15-20 yrs) term. Consider what is happening in terms of demographics, economics, politics, the environment, etc.
  - Where might U.S. interests align with those of other actors, and where might there be tension?
  - Consider both the likelihood and the severity of various potentially negative global or regional events/trends.
- National Security Strategy
  - Having determined which trends and actors the United States would like to influence, the seminar will develop an outline of a national security strategy.
  - What is the seminar's vision or desired strategic end-state (Ends) for the world in each time period? The reason for the near, medium, and long-term analyses is to encourage the seminar to think about threat not just in terms of likelihood and severity, but urgency and order of occurrence.
  - Describe and discuss concepts and activities the U.S. government could employ (Ways) required to achieve the seminar's strategic objectives.
  - Which other actors will the United States need to influence in order to arrive at this end-state? What forms of leverage might the United States have over these actors? How can the United States exert that leverage at the least cost/risk?
- National Military Strategy
  - Nested within the outline of the national security strategy the seminar has devised, the seminar will formulate an outline for a National Military Strategy (NMS) that broadly describes how the military instrument of power will advance and defend national interests. Describe how the NMS supports the NSS.
  - Broadly assess the risks inherent in the proposed military strategic approach.
- Operating Concepts (3-5, minimum 1 DoD)





## NSDM FX - 02 - 07

### SEMINAR PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT

- Describe three to five operating concepts the seminar believes the U.S. government needs to carry out its strategy.
- At least one of these must be a military joint force operating concept; the rest may involve other executive agencies and departments or remain DoD-focused.
- Future Force Concept
  - Develop a conceptual Joint Force that supports the NSS and NMS and is capable of achieving the strategic objectives assigned to the military. Here, you should describe broad strategic and operational force characteristics required to support the NSS/NMS/operating concepts. Be sure to address issues of divestment and investment (which platforms would you eliminate? Which capabilities would you seek?), modernization (where would you focus R&D? Which types of platforms need a next-generation upgrade and why?), organization (is the U.S. military organized well to deal with future threats?), and any other aspect of force planning that you think supports your NSS/NMS/operating concepts.
  - You should focus on strategic appropriateness of your proposed force, but you must be aware of the political and budgetary feasibility issues it would entail. Furthermore, you should consider the risks, obstacles, and tradeoffs over the near, medium, and long term associated with realizing your future force concept. You should expect your grading panel to ask you policy-relevant questions about how you would justify your proposed force concept to, e.g., members of Congress. The seminar must be able to persuade the grading panel that they have considered likely obstacles to their plan and have a reasonable argument that their plan is both necessary and feasible. This is likely to include a discussion of what trade-offs the seminar might propose to get their recommended force concept.
- Implementation case
  - Identify one of the more challenging or ambitious aspects of the seminar's ideas that would require the supporting efforts of a senior leader to facilitate its successful implementation. This can be an element of the NSS or NMS, one of the operating concepts, or a feature of the force concept.
  - Based on the issue, the seminar will identify the senior leader charged with its implementation (for example, President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, CJCS, Service Chief, or Combatant Commander).
  - Identify the relevant stakeholders (for example, Secretary of Defense, CJCS, Service Chiefs, Secretary of State, Congress, special interest groups, or foreign governments) that may oppose or support the initiative. What are their interests?
  - Address the full range of influences and obstacles associated with the implementation of the seminar's challenging or ambitious idea or innovation. The seminar must consider the influence of domestic politics and international relations (for example, organizational resistance, existing legislation or policies, industry sectors, media interest, lobbyists, or international norms).
  - Provide specific recommendations that explain how the senior leader could convince the relevant stakeholders to support the initiative's implementation. The recommendations should include a plan to overcome any identified opposition or obstacles, while directly addressing the stakeholders' interests (for example, the benefits of the initiative for the stakeholders).
  - Depending on the complexity of the initiative, the seminar's recommendations could include an implementation "timeline" or key milestones that describe specific actions that the senior leader would take to obtain necessary support.

#### Required Readings (0 Pages)







## NSDM FX - 02 - 07

# SEMINAR PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT

- There are no additional required readings for this session.

### **Foundational Resources**

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





# NSDM FX - 08

## SEMINAR PRESENTATION REVIEW

### Focus

This session provides a dedicated time period for the seminar to present their strategic estimate, NSS, NSM, operating concepts, force concept, and implementation case to the faculty teaching team for feedback. Each student must complete the FX contribution peer review before the seminar can conduct the presentation review and rehearsal.

### OBJECTIVES

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

### Guidance

- This session concludes the preparation phase for NSDM FX. The seminar should be prepared to present the briefing in a format that closely resembles the final product that will be graded.
- The seminar may choose, in consultation with the faculty teaching team, to do this practice briefing before the date FX-7 is scheduled on the NSDM calendar. Every student must complete their seminar's FX contribution peer review before conducting the presentation review with the teaching team.
- No later than this session's scheduled date, the seminar will complete NSDM FX product development by making desired changes to the presentation. After the final changes are made, and no later than 1500, electronically submit the presentation/brief to the FX director and deputy-director. This will serve as the read-ahead for the faculty grading panel. Seminars are authorized to continue to make changes up to their scheduled presentation, at which time they will e-mail any updated presentations to the FX director and deputy director.

FX Director: [name, email]

FX Deputy Director: [name, email]

- The FX "Main Themes" questionnaire will be available at the conclusion of FX-7. Each seminar will complete an online questionnaire to catalogue the main themes of their FX products by FX-10. The questionnaire link will be delivered via Blackboard and e-mail

### Required Readings (0 Pages)

- There are no additional required readings for this session.

### Foundational Resources

- There are no additional foundational resources for this session.





## NSDM FX - 08 SEMINAR PRESENTATION REVIEW

### PRESENTATION REVIEW CHECKLIST

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





## NSDM FX – 09 - 10

# SEMINAR PRESENTATION TO THE GRADING PANEL

### Focus

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

### Guidance

- The faculty teaching team will provide additional guidance on the conduct of FX-8/9, including the specific time and location for the seminar presentation. The seminar must bring four black and white copies of the presentation (two-slides per page) for use by the faculty panel. The FX is a team effort; it is expected that all seminar members engage during the Q&A period.
- At the completion of the brief, the grading panel will provide feedback and the FX presentation grade to the seminar.
- Grading criteria (also see rubric from FX-7):
  - Are the strategic estimate, national and military strategies, operating concepts, future force concept, and implementation case in alignment and do they reflect consistent analysis? Does the presentation consider geography, culture, class, ethnicity, and religion when appropriate? Does the brief present a broad overview of the significant military, economic, political, environmental, and social issues that the seminar thinks should concern the U.S.? Is the information presented in a clear, logical and organized way?
  - Does the brief clearly articulate national priorities including the relative importance of the various instruments of national power in addressing the future operating environment? Do the NSS, NMS, and operating concepts address the issues identified in the security assessment?
  - Does the seminar link the future force concept to the security assessment, strategies, and operating concepts? To what extent does the future force concept support the strategies? To what extent does the force concept reflect the (military) operating concepts and necessary force attributes?
  - To what extent does the seminar's presentation provide innovative, well-argued and imaginative approaches to meet security environment challenges anticipated in the next twenty years?
  - To what extent is the seminar persuasive that their strategies and concepts are not only appropriate, but feasible from a policy perspective?
  - Did the seminar choose a challenging or ambitious aspect of its presentation as an implementation case? Does the case identify the senior leader charged with its implementation and all relevant stakeholders? Did the seminar address the full range of domestic and international influences and obstacles associated with implementing the innovation or idea? Did the implementation case provide recommendations that explain how the senior leader will convince the relevant stakeholders to support the initiative's implementation?
  - How well did the seminar handle the Q&A? Was there broad participation? Was the seminar able to discuss how it handled difficult questions and disagreements?

### OBJECTIVES

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

### Required Readings (0 Pages)

- There are no additional required readings for this session.





# NSDM FX - 11

## FX & NSDM WRAP-UP WITH TEACHING TEAM

### Focus

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

### Guidance

- Seminars will coordinate the time and location of FX-10 with their faculty teaching team. Seminars must complete their FX presentations and receive feedback from the grading panel prior to FX-10.
- Seminars must complete the FX "Main Themes" questionnaire by FX-10

### Required Readings (14 Pages)

- [Flournoy, Michele. 2021. "America's Military Risks Losing Its Edge: How to Transform the Pentagon for a Competitive Era." \*Foreign Affairs\* 100, No. 3 \(May/June\): 76-91.](#)

### OBJECTIVES

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

